FEES NOT PAID BY HOUSE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that some of the local employment agencies are advertising positions on Capitol Hill with the notice that all fees are paid by the employer. I am certain it is well known to everyone on the Hill that there is no provision in our system whereby the House of Representatives can pay a fee to an employment agency for recruiting personnel for officers or members of the House. It might be well if the appropriate officials of the House were to investigate the possibility of misleading advertising which could be embarrassing to the House and to prospective employees. I assume that the same considerations would apply to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I am as you know a longtime champion of the private employment agencies, feeling that they do a vital, useful, and necessary service in our society. The problem I mention may seem of little significance but it can be of great significance if through misunderstanding or oversight any agency is misleading applicants for positions on the Hill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 28, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John L. Meares, Evangel Temple, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bow our heads and hearts before Thee in worship and honor. We need help. There are many perplexing problems that have sprung up around us like a wilderness. We do not know the way. We are like sheep without a shepherd. In Thy divine providence You have ordained these Congressmen to lead us. You said, if any man lack wisdom let him ask of God who giveth liberally. When men set their hearts to seek after Thee, You are faithful to answer. May the ears of each leader of our Nation be open to hear the voice of the Great Shepherd who is the Prince of Peace and the everlasting Father. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of the Daily News Digest of yesterday from the Republican congressional committee public relations office. One of the items in that paper is as follows:

> Representative Michael J. Kirwan, Democrat-Ohio, second oldest member of Congress who since 1937 doled out billions of dollars of "pork barrel" water projects and campaign funds, died today.

Mr. Speaker, this item has a UPI dateline. Somebody down at Republican headquarters probably picked it up and copied the first sentence. I think it is a reprehensible piece of business, both on the part of whoever wrote it downtown in the Republican headquarters, and UPI, for that matter.

Mike Kirwan was responsible for probably more public works projects for the benefit of Americans than any man who ever sat in this body, and he did not make any political decisions about it. They are in every district in the country. I think it is a poor way to honor the memory of a man who died only yesterday morning and who has such an outstanding record.

I will say that his reputation as a builder of America will live on long after these snide remarks and the people who wrote them are forgotten.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader who, I know, deplores this as much as I do.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mike Kirwan was a dear personal friend of mine. I served with him on the Committee on Appropriations many, many years. We worked together on innumerable programs and projects. I am saddened by his passing. I apologize for the article or the line or the newspiece that appeared in that publication. Mike Kirwan was a great American.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. I just want to close, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that there are some people who think that everything in the past and all the traditions we have had are old-fashioned and outmoded, and there is something better for everything.

I remember my grandfather saying—and I think it is just as applicable today as it was then—"If you cannot say anything good about a person, you ought not to say anything." I think that is as applicable today and I think it ought to be followed.

TRIBUTE TO GIRLS NATION

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Girls Nation is one of the finest programs for youth citizenship training which has ever been devised. This week 100 young women, two from each of the 50 States in the Union, are gaining practical experience in the functions and procedures of the Federal Government.

I am particularly proud of West Virginia's two senators who are represented in Girls Nation, Miss Teresa Alderson, of Vienna, W. Va., and Miss Charlene Hill, of Elkins, W. Va. It was a great thrill yesterday to get a telephone call from Miss Alderson in which she told me of the success which she and Miss Hill had in getting their bill passed by the senate of Girls Nation. The bill is to authorize that the crime of possession of marihuana be reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor.

I wish that all the young people throughout the Nation had the opportunity to have the practical training in citizenship which Girls Nation and Boys Nation provide. I would like to congratulate the American Legion auxiliary for its leadership in arranging and supervising this excellent program.

More especially, I extend my personal congratulations to the 1970 participants in Girls Nation, who I am sure will return to provide leadership in good citizenship as they return to their home communities.

FLY BEFORE YOU BUY

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since I have not always agreed with Secretary of Defense Laird, I am glad of the opportunity to rise today to commend him on the announcement he made yesterday of the adoption of a new policy in Defense procurement: Fly before you buy.

Last year and this year I offered amendments to military authorization bills, seeking to eliminate the procurement phase of the F–14 contracts until the F–14 had been flight tested. My amendments failed in the face of strenuous opposition by members of the Armed Services Committee, who said in effect that I did not know what I was talking about. I am delighted that the Secretary of Defense has now come around to my point of view.

I do hope that the policy the Secretary has announced will be put into effect immediately and that the requests the Pentagon has made for authorizations that do not comply with the policy of "Fly before you buy" will be withdrawn. This will reduce the military authorization for fiscal year 1971 to $658 million for the F–14 alone.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take this time to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

extend my congratulations to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) who, after many years of effort, has succeeded in bringing to this body the constitutional amendment to provide equal rights for women.

In the petition, which Members will find in the RECORD for the 20th, I believe, she secured the most bipartisan group of people I have ever seen—Republicans, Democrats, some who classify themselves as conservatives, some who classify themselves as liberals, or progressives, committee chairmen. There are 13 committee chairmen who signed the petition. They are: Mr. FALLON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. MILLS, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. PATMAN, and Mr. MCMILLAN.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS, in my judgment, deserves high commendation. I was happy I was one of those who signed the petition.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15733, RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 15733) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 15-percent increase in annuities, to change for a temporary period the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1337)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15733) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 15 per centum increase in annuities, to change for a temporary period the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 7, 8, and 11.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 6 of the House engrossed bill, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. The fifth sentence of section 15(c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out 'obligations' the second place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'notes'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "6."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 3, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Sec. 6." and insert the following: "Sec. 7."; and the Senate agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
GAYLORD NELSON,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
RALPH T. SMITH,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
WILLIAM B. SAXBE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15733) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 15 per centum increase in annuities, to change for a temporary period the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical or conforming changes: 1, 2, 5, and 9. With respect to these amendments the House either recedes or recedes with amendments which are technical or conforming in nature.

Amendment No. 3: The Senate amendment made a largely technical modification in the provision of the House bill dealing with the application of the 15-percent benefit increase to persons receiving pensions under section 6 of the Act and to certain survivor annuitants, in order to simplify the computation of the increase for certain widows and widowers by avoiding the necessity of going back to recompute the employee's annuity on which a widow's or widower's annuity is based and instead permitting the Board simply to increase the widow's or widower's annuity by 15 percent. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: The House bill provided for a temporary change in the method of computing interest payable on the obligations of the United States in which the railroad retirement account is invested. The new method would have provided for reinvestment of the account in Government obligations bearing interest at a rate equal to the highest rate then payable on any obligations of the United States then outstanding. The Senate amendment deleted this provision.

The conference substitute provides that the rate of interest to be borne by investments in the railroad retirement account will hereafter be computed on the basis of U.S. "notes," rather than "obligations", thereby providing an increase in the interest rate currently payable on these investments.

Present law provides that the special obligations issued to the railroad retirement account shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield, computed at the end of the month preceding the date of issue, borne by all marketable Treasury obligations not due until after the expiration of 3 years. For obligations issued during July, this formula produces a rate of 7⅝ percent.

The interest rates on special obligations issued to the social security trust funds are governed by similar statutory formulas. The current Advisory Council on Social Security (such a council is set up every 5 years to make recommendations on social security matters) is recommending that, if the statutory limit on interest rates (which now prevents the issuance of long-term bonds, leaving for investment of the funds only notes, which can be no more than 7 years to maturity) is not repealed, the statutory formula governing interest rates on special obligations issued to the social security trust funds should be changed to make the interest rate computations consistent with the fact that only notes can be issued. This would be done by eliminating, in computing the average yields on outstanding obligations, the yields on Treasury bonds, which would result in a formula producing a higher yield. The reason it would produce a higher yield is that outstanding bonds, all of which were issued in earlier years when rates were lower, have lower market yields that notes because of two tax advantages: (1) a substantial part of the income earned on them is taxable at the capital gain rate, and (2) they can be used at par value to pay estate taxes. Since neither of these tax advantages has any value to a Government trust fund, there is logic in eliminating these lower yielding bonds from the average used in computing the rate which will be applied to the obligations which can be issued to the funds, whose permissible maturity excludes bonds. Legislation would be required to make this change.

If such a formula were used to compute the rate on obligations issued to the railroad retirement account, it would produce a rate of 7¾ percent for obligations issued during July. This is one-eighth percent higher than the rate derived from the present statutory formula. It is estimated that the higher rates under the proposed formula would increase the account's interest income by $27.5 million over the next 8 years. The attached table shows the increase by years.

Estimated increase in interest income to railroad retirement account

[In millions]

1971	$0.1
1972	.5
1973	.8
1974	1.7
1975	2.8
1976	4.1
1977	7.3
1978	10.2
Total	27.5

In addition, agreement has been reached with the Treasury Department upon an administrative change in the investment procedures governing the railroad retirement account. It is estimated that this new procedure will provide increased income to the railroad retirement account in the amount of $168 million over the next 8 years, which, when combined with the $27.5 million estimated to accrue as a result of the change in the interest rate computation, will provide over the next 8 years $195.5 million in additional income to the railroad retirement account.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury embodying the terms of this proposed modified investment procedure is set forth below in the following table:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT TRUST FUND

Proposed procedure (proposed July 22, 1970):

1. First use current year's investments to cover current year's expenditures.

2. Use holdings which were part of rollover pattern prior to bond rate (market yield) exceeding 4¼-percent ceiling (use 4 percent and 4⅛ percent first).

3. Holdings nearest maturity.

ESTIMATED INTEREST COST

Fiscal year	Current procedure	Proposed procedure	Increased income
1971	$205,000,000	$206,000,000	$1,000,000
1972	221,000,000	234,000,000	13,000,000
1973	227,000,000	258,000,000	31,000,000
1974	245,000,000	275,000,000	30,000,000
1975	254,000,000	281,000,000	17,000,000
1976	263,000,000	290,000,000	27,000,000
1977	274,000,000	297,000,000	23,000,000
1978	287,000,000	303,000,000	16,000,000
Total	1,976,000,000	2,144,000,000	168,000,000

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The House-passed version of H.R. 15733, a bill to provide a temporary increase in railroad retirement benefits, included a provision which would change the method of investing funds of the retirement account. This provision was designed to increase the account's income as a way of financing the increased benefits. As you know, the Treasury opposed this provision in the House-passed bill on the ground that the proposed formula was an unsound procedure and that it would be an unwise and costly precedent. The provision was deleted from the bill as it passed the Senate.

I understand that this difference has been a principal matter of disagreement between the conferees. In order to assist in the resolution of that disagreement, the Treasury has carefully reviewed the investment procedures of the railroad retirement account. On the basis of this review, we are prepared, as a substitute for the House's proposed change in the investment procedure, to change the procedure under which special obligations issued to the account are redeemed to make benefit payments. We estimate that this change, which can be made administratively, would produce $168 million of additional interest income for the account over the next 8 years, after which the change in redemption procedure would not increase income (although the additions to the account through increased income in those 8 years would, of course, continue forever to earn interest).

Under the present procedure, receipts during a fiscal year are invested in temporary special obligations which mature on the last day of that fiscal year; on the last day of the fiscal year, all available funds, including the temporary special obligations maturing that day, are invested in special obligations maturing in 7 years, the maximum permissible because of the statutory interest-rate ceiling on longer term obligations. To make benefit payments and other outlays, temporary special issues maturing within the current fiscal year are redeemed first, starting with the ones with the lowest yields; if funds are needed for outlays and there are no current year maturities, special issues maturing in the earliest year after the current year are redeemed, beginning with those with the lowest yield and working through the year.

Since the account runs at a substantial deficit through the fiscal year, until the social security interchange and interest payments are made at the end of the year, redemption of current year investments does not provide enough money to meet outlays, and it is always necessary to redeem throughout the year a substantial amount of special issues maturing in later years. Through this process, over half a billion dollars of special obligations issued when rates were lower in earlier years are redeemed before maturity each year (even through permanent investments in an even greater amount are made at current higher rates at the end of the year). Our proposal would speed up this conversion of the account's portfolio to higher yields by moving to the end of the redemption cycle those special obligations whose maturity had to be shortened because of the statutory ceiling on long-term-bond rates.

The attached table, showing the account's investments in special issues at the time of the annual permanent investment last June 30, will illustrate how this will operate. Since receipts will not be adequate during the current year to cover outlays, under the present procedure the first redemptions will be the 4 percent notes of 1974, next the 4⅛ percent notes of 1974, then the 4¾ percent of 1974, and, if that is still not enough, the 4 percent notes of 1975 will be used. The proposal is to change this procedure in only one respect: After the 4 percent notes of 1974 and the 4⅛ percent notes of 1974 are used, the 4¾ percent notes of 1974 will be skipped, the 4 percent and 4⅛ percent notes of 1975 will be redeemed, and so on. The 4¾ percent notes of 1974 can be skipped because the reason those notes mature in that year is that the statutory interest-rate ceiling, which does not permit the issuance of obligations with rates over 4¼ percent at maturities of over 7 years, prevented the use, when these obligations were issued in 1967, of maturities of up to 15 years, as had been the policy when interest rates were below 4¼ percent and the statutory rate ceiling did not inhibit the use of longer maturities.

By speeding up the conversion of the portfolio to higher yields, the proposed change will substantially increase the account's interest income. The Treasury recognizes that, in all the circumstances, there may be valid reasons for the proposed method of handling redemption of special issues in the railroad retirement account.

Assuming the Congress approves a conference report deleting the House-passed provision changing the method of investing funds of the railroad retirement account, the Treasury will adopt immediately this new redemption procedure.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. KENNEDY.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACCOUNT: CURRENT HOLDINGS OF SPECIAL ISSUES AS OF JUNE 30, 1970—FINAL

[In thousands]

Date	4 percent	4⅛ percent	4¾ percent	5¾ percent	6½ percent	Total	7¾ percent	Total holdings, special issues, June 30, 1970
June 30, 1971								
June 30, 1972								
June 30, 1973								
June 30, 1974	$72,129	$23,110	$409,289			$504,528		$504,528
June 30, 1975	185,091	23,110		$482,623		690,824		690,824
June 30, 1976	185,091	23,110			$647,948	856,149		856,149
June 30, 1977	18,091	23,110				208,201	$847,447	1,055,648
June 30, 1978	185,091	23,110				208,201		208,201
June 30, 1979		208,201				208,201		208,201
June 30, 1980		208,201				208,201		208,201
June 30, 1981								
June 30, 1982								
June 30, 1983								
June 30, 1984								
June 30, 1985								
Total	812,493	531,952	409,289	482,623	647,948	2,884,305	847,447	3,731,752

Note: Amount available for investment June 30, 1970: $847,447.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8: The House bill contained provisions terminating the 15-percent benefit increase on June 30, 1972. The Senate amendments provided instead for the termination of such increase on December 31, 1971. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 10: The House bill provided for a study of the railroad retirement system and its financing, to be made by the Railroad Retirement Board for the purpose of recommending to Congress on or before July 1, 1971, such changes in the system as might be needed to provide adequate benefits on an actuarially sound basis. The Senate amendment provided for the same study (with two additional areas to be considered) to be made by a temporary Commission consisting of five members, three appointed by the President and one each by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. The House recedes (with a conforming amendment).

Amendment No. 11: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section requiring that the 15-percent benefit increase under the bill be disregarded in establishing the amount of the income-related veterans benefits to which railroad retirement annuitants and pensioners may become entitled. The Senate recedes.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO MEET TOMORROW AFTERNOON

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1076, YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1338)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment during the summer months of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national

park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possession, who have attained age fifteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary.

(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

SECRETARIAL DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

(1) determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps;

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for at least five years for the operation of any Youth Conservation Corps project. Whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied federal facilities, including military facilities, shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps where appropriate and with the approval of the Federal agency involved. To minimize transportation costs Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

(5) prepare a report, indicating the most feasible and efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(b) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

SECRETARIAL REPORTS

SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed $3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And the House agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,
DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
JAMES G. O'HARA,
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
LLOYD MEEDS,
PHILLIP BURTON,
EDITH GREEN,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,
JAMES M. COLLINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK E. MOSS,
GORDON ALLOTT,
TED STEVENS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment called for Youth Conservation Corps members to be representative of "all segments of society." The Senate bill did not contain such a provision. The conference substitute adopts the language of the House amendment in this respect.

The Senate statement of purpose referred to activities of the corps on public lands and water areas "administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture." The House amendment contained comparable language with respect to conservation areas but did not refer to specific Federal agencies. The conference report makes specific reference to these Federal agencies.

The House amendment limited the corpsmen's minimum age to 16 years while in the Senate bill the minimum age would have been 14 years. The conference report specifies that the minimum age of a corpsman shall be 15 years.

The Senate bill required preference be given to disadvantaged youth to become corpsmen and that preference for selecting supervisory personnel be given to "primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines." The House amendment contained neither of these preference categories. The conference substitute does not contain this provision. In rejecting the Senate provision the Conferees do not want their action to be interpreted as precluding from participation those given preference in the Senate bill. To the contrary the Conferees expect that full and fair consideration will be given to all applicants.

The House amendment specifically included youth of both sexes in the program by reference in two places (sec. 2(a) and 2(b)). The Senate bill included youth of both sexes by reference in section 2(a). The conference report makes reference to youth of both sexes in sections 2(a) and 2(b).

The Senate bill required that Corps programs be carried out only on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture or Interior. Under the House amendment the Secretaries were to designate the public lands to be used and coordinate Corps efforts with those agencies having jurisdiction over such lands. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Both bills authorized contracting for equipment, transportation, lodging, subsistence and other services by components or as a package, although House language was more explicit. The House amendment required that any organization contracted with must have been in existence for at least 5 years. The House amendment allowed use of unoccupied Federal facilities including abandoned military installations. The Senate bill also allowed use of unoccupied facilities operated by Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, but required approval of the Secretary of Defense to use unoccupied military facilities. The Senate amendment qualified use of other Federal agency facilities to where "feasible and appropriate." The House amendment qualified such use as where "economically feasible." The conference report in resolving these differences provides that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the corps in their duties. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for at least 5 years for the operation of any youth conservation corps project. Whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities, including military facilities, shall be utilized for the purposes of the corps where appropriate and with the approval of the Federal agency involved.

Both bills required a report from the Secretary of Agriculture and from the Secretary of the Interior with respect to initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State agencies, but the Senate required the report to indicate the "feasibility" of such a program while the House amendment called for the report to indicate the "most efficient method for initiating" such a program. The conference report provides that the report indicate the most feasible and efficient method for initiating such a program.

CARL D. PERKINS,
DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
JAMES G. O'HARA,
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
LLOYD MEEDS,
PHILLIP BURTON,
EDITH GREEN,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,
JAMES M. COLLINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PERMISSION FOR HOUSE MANAGERS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17548, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HUD APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for the independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1971.

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

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), in a recent press release which I send to the desk, has made certain allegations with respect to the additional views which I filed to accompany the report of the Select Committee To Investigate U.S. Military Involvement in Southeast Asia. His allegations include charges which directly impugn my motives and veracity in submitting those additional views. I therefore rise to a question of personal privilege to respond to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the press release sent to the desk by the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS), and the Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman from California has stated a question of personal privilege under rule IX of the rules of the House.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) is recognized.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. 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. 235]

Alexander	Gallagher	Powell
Baring	Goldwater	Rarick
Brock	Gray	Reid, N.Y.
Brooks	Halpern	Rivers
Brown, Mich.	Hathaway	Roe
Burton, Utah	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Bush	King	Roudebush
Caffery	Lloyd	Ryan
Carey	Long, La.	Sandman
Clark	McCarthy	Scheuer
Clay	McEwen	Sikes
Conte	MacGregor	Thompson, N.J.
Cramer	Mailliard	Tunney
Culver	Meskill	Watson
Cunningham	Monagan	Weicker
de la Garza	Nelsen	Wold
Diggs	O'Neill, Mass.	Wydler
Donohue	Ottinger	Zwach
Fallon	Pelly	
Ford, William D.	Pike	
	Pollock	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) is recognized.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I use this time to set the RECORD straight concerning a news release issued by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) on July 23, 1970.

I can very well accept his statement that his trip was on his own initiative; that he himself appointed himself to make this trip; and that his demands were actually met. I can only hope that the other Members of this body and other committees would have the same privilege of being able to inspect prisons and other facilities in South Vietnam with a photographer and with the support of the State Department and of the South Vietnamese Government. I think that privilege should be enjoyed by each and every one of us. His guided tour was well staged and cleverly contrived by the officials there to allow him to see what they wanted him to see. I have no doubt in his veracity that he has reported what he actually saw, but I believe he saw only what certain persons wanted him to see.

I do object, however, to personal attacks whether on me or any other Member of this body. It is peculiar that I was singled out when other members of the committee saw exactly what I saw and reported so, including Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.

The members of the House Government Operations Committee, with Mr. Moss and Mr. REID, a few days ago issued a statement concerning testimony before their subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations which contains statements which are much broader in scope than those statements which I have made.

I apologize to this body that I acted with certain restraint and did not fully report, due to limited time to prepare a full report, as I might have, many of the other conditions in South Vietnam.

In the RECORD, also, in past RECORDS of this body, Mr. FRASER, on several occasions reported torture in South Vietnam in detention centers and elsewhere.

This is a matter of record and I shall offer at the conclusion of my remarks exhibits that will be inserted into the RECORD. The statement by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recorded on June 8, 1970, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, a correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Daniel Sutherland, interviewed some of the same witnesses that we interviewed, including Mr. Caao Nguyen Loi, a student leader who had spent many months on Conson, and who with four other students reported to the National Assembly their experience findings and what they found at Conson as prisoners. Mr. Sutherland's report is in the Christian Science Monitor of July 13 and I will eventually ask unanimous consent that that also be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) issued a release which went into the question of brutality and torture and which had this to say, and I quote from the joint statement of Mr. Moss and Mr. REID:

> For example, while it is abolishing the "tiger cages," it should also remedy the so-called "cattle cages," which although larger, are jammed with more human beings much like animals are in railroad cattle cars. We urge also the release of political prisoners unjustly sent to some of these caged hells on earth. Many civilians have never been tried and convicted of any crime by any tribunal, military or civilian, nor have they been afforded any protections of due process——

The Moss-Reid statement also called attention to something about which I did not report because we were denied entrance and that was to the cattle cages, and I assume the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) also did not see the cattle cages although he had the apparent authority to make this one of his demands.

Mr. Moss and Mr. REID go on to say:

> We especially deplore the imprisonment of mothers and their children. Actions of this sort are characteristic of totalitarian dictatorships, not democratic societies.

And then the Moss-Reid report goes into another situation which we do not even get into and that was the prisoner-of-war issue. In this they are referring to the International Red Cross reports and they—meaning Mr. Moss and Mr. REID—said this:

> The brutal torture of political prisoners at interrogation centers established and advised by Americans is a shocking indictment of the depths to which we, as a people, have fallen.

They also say—again referring to the International Red Cross:

> Those reports indicate some prisoners of war have not been treated humanely. For refusing to salute the flag of South Vietnam, seven prisoners of war were locked in cells 24 hours a day, kept in irons for 13 hours during the night and permitted no outside exercise or fresh air for at least 2 months, when the International Red Cross last inspected Con Son prison in February 1970. The Red Cross vehemently protested this treatment as a violation of the Geneva Conventions to the camp commandant.

Mr. Speaker, these were some of the things we did not even cover in our report. But the point is, why did the gentleman from Illinois single me out among all those who had seen these things and have reported on them?

It would seem to me that there must be some reason. I think it is difficult to find out why when some of these reports were just a few pages from those which I inserted into the RECORD in my supplemental views.

So, I can only conclude that there are some readers who are very selective, who are willing to read what they want to read and see what they want to see and not report the facts accurately as they should be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get into the exact statements made by the gentleman from Illinois. Only two or three

were even statements that I had made. They were taken out of Life magazine, from other documents that have been filed by other Members or persons and sometimes, in no way statements emanating from me.

He said:

They stated all the prisoners in the cages were sick with TB, open sores, eye diseases or malnutrition.

He says this is a complete misstatement of the facts.

He goes on to say:

None of the prisoners were sick, except those in the dispensary. I saw no evidence of open sores, eye disease or malnutrition.

Is the gentleman competent as a medical authority to draw this conclusion?

The point is that I will submit later as an exhibit medical testimony refuting the possibility that persons so incarcerated under these conditions for long months could possibly be in such good health and that there would be no evidence of such things such as sores of any kind, no eye disease or malnutrition. In any event, how could an individual go through as many cells as the gentleman from Illinois imply and conclude that "none of the prisoners were sick?"

Now, I think that it also is true that it depends a lot upon the interpreter that you have with you. We found when we were in Con Son, and throughout the country, that many times the interpreter interprets what he believes or wants others to believe to be the essence of what is said. We also found that in the prison, when the guard was standing over you—and they were always standing over you, unless you could just deliberately sneak away—that the prisoners said one thing when guards were near, and quite another thing when alone with you.

I will also ask unanimous consent to offer for the RECORD, following my statement, a statement by Mr. Don Luce, who reported to the Council of Churches his involvement with our inspection team, and I think graphically called attention to the fact that when we were talking to some of the prisoners in front of guards, that they completely denied there was any such thing as brutal treatment, they indicated that the food was good and that they had medical attention. And when we were able to get them off to themselves they denied this completely.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the statement of Mr. Don Luce, made to the Council of Churches, to be entered in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman also states that it was not true that, as we had indicated, the prisoners could not stand. He says that "in each cell we entered"—we entered—"the prisoners immediately stood up. Out of hundreds of prisoners only one experienced difficulty in standing, and this was due to an old injury."

Well, I do not know how many cells he entered. I do not know how many prisoners he saw, but I would doubt that he saw enough on that day to conclude that there were no prisoners who could not stand up. And I certainly indicate that Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee and I, did interview at least 40 or 50 prisoners, through an interpreter, and we were told by, I would say not less than 15 or 20, and that is a very conservative estimate of the persons who could not stand up, who said that they were paralyzed; that they had been shackled and could not use their legs.

There was no particular reason why these people with some courage could admit to us in the presence of the commandant these statements. I would certainly assume that they were not lying for they face reprisals for even telling the truth. I would, however, assume that anyone going there on a special trip, and with the commandant with him on a guided tour, is certainly going to be in a position where the prisoners are not going to tell the truth. I would say that to conclude that this statement that we made is a misstatement, is highly improbable.

Point 3. He said:

They claimed prisoners found it necessary to eat insects, lizards, and so forth.

He said:

I found absolutely no evidence to indicate this. All prisoners appeared healthy and well fed.

Well, I would refer the gentleman to page 39 of our report, which has been filed by the select committee, in which this is refuted, and in which five prisoners who had been released just a few weeks before we went there had filed with the National Assembly, and with the Minister of the Interior, a documented statement, a verified statement of theirs indicating that this was a fact. The statement, however, came from them, and not from me. But I believe the statement to be true, and at least the South Vietnamese Government, and no one else, has yet been able to refute the statement.

Point 4. He said:

They stated the air was foul, and the heat stupifying. This is not true. The cells in the "Tiger Cages" were well ventilated, well lighted, and relatively cool.

Now, I will show you a picture of these cells. I hope that you can see it. This is the top of the cell, looking down into the cell, and it is an exact replica of the cells on Devil's Island—the old Devil's Island built by the French—and these cells were also built by the French—and this is a cell in which the prisoners can be viewed from a catwalk above.

There is one door, which is here, which is a heavy door, which is bolted, and the only entrance of air or light is above.

I submit that it is very improbable for anyone to believe this is lighted—lighted how? Ventilated how?

There is contained in this type of cell 5 feet by 10 feet, five persons, sometimes two or three, but generally five persons.

There are no accommodations—that is, bathroom accommodations, except for a latrine—a small box about 1 foot by 1 foot wide and about 2 feet high for these five persons. They complained that often it was not emptied for days and they had to use that. There was no water available. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons why this island is not as beautiful as it is pictured to be is because there is no basic water supply on the island.

These prisoners are not given ample water because of the limited supply of water on that island. How you can describe that as anything other than terrible—I do not know.

Here is a box at the top of that cell. That is a lime box, which was used for holding lime which was sprinkled on them if they protested against food or against the conditions.

I understand that these boxes had been removed when the gentleman from Illinois went on his guided tour of the island.

The gentleman from Illinois said:

The cells were cleaner than the average Vietnamese home.

I do not know how long he was in South Vietnam. I do not know how many Vietnamese homes he visited, but I would say that that is a very unusual statement—to compare these cells with the average Vietnamese home which could only be done from a fair sampling.

He certainly did not have enough samples, I would suggest, of Vietnamese homes to compare these cells with. But I would certainly submit that any Vietnamese home that had lime boxes available for punishment and had no latrine facilities and which lacked water and which were as overcrowded as these cells are certainly not the type of Vietnamese home that I would want to compare anything with.

He stated we mentioned that the prisoners were shackled to an iron rod and that lying in this position caused paralysis.

I refer the gentleman to introductory remarks of the testimony of Mr. Walton, our American adviser in 1963 which indicated in the Benson report that these shackles were used not for escape, as the gentleman from Illinois said they were used for, but for discipline.

First of all—escape from what? From maximum security cells, heavily guarded and across two walls that were heavily guarded and with barbed wire at the top and from an island 45 miles off the mainland across dangerous waters they would have to swim to achieve an escape. Yet, he says they must be shackled in order to prevent their escape.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD at this point the statement by Mr. Walton in preface to the Benson report which contains the statement:

The confinement in a discipline cell may be from a few hours to several months, depending upon the center, the violation and the violator. For example in Con Son II, some of the hardcore communists keep preaching the "party" line, so these "Reds" are sent to the tiger cages in Con Son I where they are isolated from all others for months at a time.

This confinement may also include rice without salt and water—the U.S. prisons' equivalent of bread and water. It may include immobilization—the prisoner is bolted to the floor, handcuffed to a rod or bar, or legirons with the chain through an eyebolt, or around a bar or rod.

Also the gentleman from Illinois says—

If anyone cares to investigate, I am confident that everything I have stated will be backed up by the inspection teams of the International Red Cross.

Yet, in a statement issued by the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), we read that the International Red Cross has not backed them up, and that it has called attention to a situation that is prevailing which certainly needs correction.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Star of July 20, 1970, an AP release from Geneva, which states that the Swiss International Red Cross delegates visiting this prison have not given approval, and that in effect they are seeking to have the inspection so that they may look into this matter and thus to use the name of the International Red Cross to document loose statements is a little far-fetched and unfair.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Star, July 20, 1970]

APPROVAL BY RED CROSS OF CON SON IS DENIED

GENEVA.—Swiss International Red Cross delegates visiting the South Vietnamese prison of Con Son last February were able to talk to only about 20 of the 9,000 inmates, informed sources said today.

The delegates saw only a tiny portion of the vast detention center. But interviews with the prisoners, which took place without witnesses, were enough to prompt "serious recommendations" for improvement which were relayed to the Saigon government, the sources reported.

An official Saigon statement earlier this month claimed the representatives of the all-Swiss International Red Cross Committee reported "satisfactory conditions in all re-education centers." Later, press reports quoted Red Cross officials in Geneva as saying that conditions in Con Son were found to be "not so bad."

In line with committee policy that publicity does not help the work of Red Cross delegates, no official reaction to the Saigon statements is likely.

But the sources said they hope that the debate over Con Son and similar reports of alleged mistreatment of prisoners in South Vietnam would produce increased support for Red Cross efforts to obtain access to civil prison camps in addition to the prisoner of war centers now regularly visited.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to enter the statement of Mr. Moss and Mr. REID. I would also like to enter a letter from Senator PROXMIRE in which he details the situation at Conson as reported by a Mr. Mark Oliva, who was recently with the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam, and who was assigned to Conson as a responsibility. In this letter he goes into the question of health because the gentleman from Illinois said that health care, although limited, was adequate. How limited medical care can be adequate I do not know, but at least he says that.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN, AND REPRESENTATIVE OGDEN R. REID

The House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has been conducting an intensive investigation of the effectiveness of U.S. Public Safety assistance programs to the National Police Force and penal system of South Vietnam. The cost of these programs to the American taxpayer has been more than $110 million.

The main objectives of our assistance and advisory efforts in regard to the penal system have been described in sworn testimony before the Subcommittee by witnesses from the Agency for International Development and the Department of Defense.

The top priority one was "to improve prison conditions to an acceptable minimum standard." Among the other major goals listed were "to improve confinement and health conditions, to increase prisoner food allowance" and "to develop rehabilitation programs for prisoners."

Considerable Subcommittee attention has been given to conditions at Con Son Island prison—South Vietnam's largest penal institution—especially the use of small pit-like cells called "tiger cages." The South Vietnamese Government announced yesterday that the "tiger cages" would be discontinued and other reforms would be instituted at Con Son to provide better sanitary conditions and "comfort." The South Vietnam Government also promises to investigate its other correctional institutions and make "further improvements."

In these points, we feel that the world will judge South Vietnam by its deeds, not by its words. Needless to say, we hope that government will move quickly to make deeds out of what certainly are commendable words. For example, while it is abolishing the "tiger cages," it should also remedy the so-called "cattle cages," which although larger, are jammed with more human beings much like animals are in railroad cattle cars. We urge also the release of political prisoners unjustly sent to some of these caged hells on earth. Many civilians have never been tried and convicted of any crime by any tribunal, military or civilian, nor have they been afforded any protections of due process. We especially deplore the imprisonment of mothers and their children. Actions of this sort are characteristic of totalitarian dictatorships, not democratic societies.

We find it difficult to understand previous American indifference to these conditions, even though they were known to many. The brutal torture of political prisoners at interrogation centers established and advised by Americans is a shocking indictment of the depths to which we, as a people, have fallen. It is more painful to our consciences because of the principle we helped to establish at the Nuremberg war crimes trials—that there is a law of humanity, which supercedes immoral orders that are given in the name of national governments. The U.S. has a clear moral and legal responsibility. It is no solace that the North Vietnamese are guilty of the same offenses against mankind. We ask world public opinion to demand that International Red Cross teams ferret out and expose the maltreatment and injustices that exist in the prisons of both North and South Vietnam. It should be noted for the record that North Vietnam has consistently refused the inspection of POW camps.

In its investigation, the Subcommittee has been informed of the imprisonment on Con Son of a number of prisoners of war who have been sentenced for crimes committed after they became prisoners of war. For that reason, we have been interested in the treatment of these prisoners of war as documented in the periodic inspection reports of the International Red Cross.

Those reports indicate some prisoners of war have not been treated humanely. For refusing to salute the flag of South Vietnam, seven prisoners of war were locked in cells 24 hours a day, kept in irons for 13 hours during the night and permitted no outside exercise or fresh air for at least two months, when the International Red Cross last inspected Con Son prison in February, 1970. *The Red Cross vehemently protested this treatment as a violation of the Geneva Conventions to the camp commandant.* We did not even report these facts. Complaints also were made that the prisoners of war were not given adequate fresh food and drinking water. Only those in rags were provided with new clothing, according to the Red Cross reports. No tooth brushes or tooth paste were provided to the prisoners of war. In an inspection made last September, the Red Cross team found two prisoners of war who claimed that they had been beaten by other prisoners who serve as supervisors.

In our view, all of these conditions must be corrected immediately. Nations cannot expect their own soldiers who become prisoners of war to be treated humanely unless they treat enemy prisoners of war humanely. That is one of our prime concerns here—the North Vietnamese must be given no excuse or other justification to maltreat Americans who are their prisoners. In addition, simple humanity demands the proper treatment of prisoners of war on all sides.

Lest this sound like a hypocritical lecture, we pledge on our part to work for the righting of injustices in our own country—for the humanizing of our own civilian prisons, for the protection of basic civil liberties and a return to the idealism which made America a great nation and an inspiration to oppressed peoples throughout the world. We ask our youth to help in this effort even though it may be an agonizing and frustrating road. We believe the world can be changed, but it will require a deep commitment on the part of men of goodwill everywhere.

JULY 23, 1970.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, Government Operations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MOSS: It has come to my attention that your Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information is currently investigating the South Vietnamese prison on Con Son Island, and the involvement of the United States Government in this matter.

The brutal conditions of the prison, epitomized by the infamous "tiger cages," are most shocking to us all. The courageous efforts of Congressmen William Anderson and Augustus Hawkins to uncover this distressing matter should not be ended without a full investigation. I, therefore, commend you and your Subcommittee for pursuing this matter. You are performing a most valuable public service.

An article has come to my attention that may prove quite helpful to your Subcommittee as it continues its investigation. Entitled "Vietnam Concentration Camp Operates with U.S. Approval," this article describes the conditions which existed on Con Son one year ago.

I believe the author of this article, Mark O. Oliva, formerly on the staff of the Appleton (Wisconsin) *Post-Crescent*, is most qualified to write on this subject. Mr. Oliva spent two years with the Military Assistance Command-Vietnam (MACV), assigned as an advisor to the South Vietnamese General Political Warfare Department. During this pe-

riod, Mr. Oliva was twice sent to Con Son Island as part of MACV's psychological operations study group.

"Vietnam Concentration Camp Operates with U.S. Approval" was a direct result of what Mr. Oliva heard and saw during his visits to Con Son Island. I believe Mr. Oliva would be able to offer valuable first-hand information on the Con Son prison, if you would wish him to testify before your Subcommittee. He is now with the Press Enterprise Company in Riverside, California.

I trust this information will be helpful to your Subcommittee as it continues to bring the truth of this matter to light and attempts to instruct us on how we can avoid a tragedy of this nature in the future.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent]

DETENTION BASED ON SUSPICION: VIETNAM CONCENTRATION CAMP OPERATES WITH U.S. APPROVAL

(By Mark Oliva)

CON SON ISLAND, VIETNAM.—History again is witnessing the horrors of the concentration camp, this time with a helping hand from the United States.

Con Son, the French "Devil's Island of Indochina," now is South Vietnam's barbed-wire home for more than 7,000 Vietnamese who "had to be removed" but couldn't be convicted in a trial.

Log beds, malarial mosquitoes and a host of diseases with no effective medical program, no shelter from the tropical monsoon rains and a diet not much better than silage greet the unfortunates interned in the concentration camps here.

The United States provides both financial and advisory assistance to the Con Son island prison.

On March 1, Con Son housed in excess of 9,000 prisoners. Of these, more than 7,000 were detainees. A detainee is an individual suspected of being a Viet Cong sympathizer or supporter who never has been convicted or tried.

KING OF CON SON

Vietnamese Lt. Col. Nguyen Van Ve, a brash man who illustrates his every point with a swing or sway of his swagger stick, is the commander here. He calls himself the "King of Con Son," and the title fits his power. He has total rule over the island and its prison population.

Lt. Col. Ve explains the "detainee" system simply.

He says his government needs a means to remove the potential or possible enemy from causing or contributing to trouble. When a man is suspected of giving food, shelter or information to the Viet Cong, he cannot be convicted without evidence, according to Lt. Col. Ve.

Instead, he says, these Viet Cong suspects are brought before district security committees. The committee, according to Lt. Col. Ve, does not require evidence, only grounds to believe the individual may be aiding the Viet Cong. The committee then has the power to order the suspect sent to Con Son or one of several other detention centers for a period of six months.

Lt. Col. Ve says this dispenses with the need for a trial, conviction and evidence. He also admits that almost all of the detainees would be acquitted for lack of evidence if they were to be tried.

When questioned, Lt. Col. Ve said that he has the authority to detain these prisoners beyond the six-month period based upon his observations, and that very few actually are released after their initial six months' detention.

Our study group's tour of the prison included Camps Six and Seven, the camps that house all but 200 of the detainees.

BARBED WIRE

Each of these camps is surrounded by double fences strung heavily with barbed wire. Within, the camps are divided into many small sections, each also ringed with double fences of heavily-barbed wire. The main sections consist of two 60-foot rows of rough logs, each log five feet long, with the entire row elevated two feet off the ground. Canvas, perforated with holes is stretched about six feet overhead.

These rows of logs serve as bed, home and recreation area for the detainees. They are not allowed to leave the compound at any time. There is no shelter from malarial mosquitoes or monsoons.

At the end of each camp is a small dispensary stocked only with aspirins, salt tablets and anti-malaria pills that are ineffective against the fatal strains of malaria found on the island, according to the U.S. Army doctor accompanying our study group. These dispensaries are staffed with untrained personnel.

On the side of each dispensary is a disciplinary area used for detainees found guilty of even the smallest infraction of prison rules. It, too, is encircled with a double barbed wire fence. Barbed wire also is strung the length and width of the disciplinary area about 16 inches above the ground, with the strand about six inches apart.

Detainees being disciplined are forced to crawl under this layer of barbed wire and lie on their backs for the duration of their sentences, often several days. They are allowed only bread and water.

We were permitted to interview individual prisoners, but Lt. Col. Ve insisted the detainees be interviewed only in the presence of a guard. Detainees interviewed refused to answer questions, apparently in fear that a "wrong" answer, after being reported by the guard, would lead to days and nights under the barbed wire.

Lt. Col. Ve stated that the detainees come from all walks of life but mainly are farmers from the provinces. He listed the three main ways in which these prisoners come before the security committees:

—They are reported by a neighbor as aiding or being sympathetic to the Viet Cong.

—All persons in an area are held when an Army commander in the area states someone has been aiding the Viet Cong.

—When a village is being force-evacuated and relocated prior to being destroyed to eliminate Viet Cong havens, all persons in the village who resist in any way are brought before the committees.

As with most of the other prisoners on Con Son, according to Lt. Col. Ve, the majority of the detainees continue to be held there.

Basic living conditions in the Con Son concentration camps are extremely bad, but the island's prisoners also are faced with even worse medical problems.

Malaria is the major disease. The island's mosquitoes carry two strains, one which usually is fatal and the other which the victim usually survives, but with his strength sapped. The prison dispensaries are stocked, though inadequately, with chloroquine-primaquine anti-malarial pills. These combat only the nonfatal strain. No preventative for the usually-fatal strain is available to the prisoners.

Con Son's prison population also has severe problems with beriberi and tuberculosis, as well as year-round epidemic levels of diarrhea and dysentery. Almost non-existent latrine and sewage facilities contribute to this.

All the prison dispensaries are staffed by prisoners, mostly captured Viet Cong medics. None has been trained beyond the level attained by a student nurse in the U.S.

ONE DOCTOR

The island has one doctor, a first lieutenant in the Vietnamese Regional and Popular Forces (roughly equivalent to our National Guard). However he treats only the civil servants, national police and military.

A Vietnamese public health nurse also is assigned to Con Son, mainly to treat the non-prisoner population. The nurse makes a monthly visit to each of the seven prison dispensaries.

The government provides air evacuation for members of the non-prisoner population requiring mainland treatment, but prisoners requiring such treatment must wait for the monthly supply boat.

The public health nurse admits that several prisoners have died due to lack of proper medical attention.

In addition to the detainees, Con Son also houses about 2,000 other prisoners including Viet Cong, political, religious and criminal prisoners and military prisoners from the South Vietnamese forces. All these categories have been tried and convicted.

Convicted Viet Cong are considered civil prisoners and are held at Con Son. North Vietnamese prisoners of war are held at another island prison, Phu Quoc. The U.S. is not involved in the operation of Phu Quoc because the South Vietnamese government does not abide by the Geneva prisoner-of-war conventions.

With the exception of 200 detainees, the regular prisoners only are confined in Camps One through Five. Strangely, the convicted prisoners fare much better than the detainees. Camps One through Five consist of the old French prison buildings, and provide adequate though unpleasant shelter.

These prisoners leave the camps each day to go out in work parties. Although some of the prisoners still split rocks, the majority work on fishing teams or on the farms which produce most of the food other than rice which is consumed on the island. The prisoners raise mainly papaya, coconuts, pigs and chickens.

A large number of the sentenced prisoners have attained trustee status and are allowed to live outside the camps. All the prisoners except the detainees are allowed monthly three-day visits with their families, who are taken to the island on the supply boat. A beach home has been set up to house these families.

PRISONER DIET

All the prisoners, detainees included, are on the same diet. The catch of the fishing teams is laid out and salted on tin sheets placed on the streets daily. After a day in the sun, the fish, well-dried, are fed to the prisoners. Prisoners cook the fruits, vegetables and meats raised on the island as well as rice brought in from the mainland. The cooking is done in extremely unsanitary and antiquated outdoor kitchens surviving from French days.

Many of Con Son's political prisoners were sentenced several Vietnamese regimes ago but never were released by succeeding governments, including the current Thieu government.

One prisoner interviewed on death row had been there for 13 years, sentenced for political opposition to the late President Ngo Dinh Diem in the early days of his rule.

Another death row prisoner interviewed stated he has been confined seven years for the same reason, since the latter days of Diem.

A Buddhist monk stated he has served 11 years of a 15-year political sentence, also a Diem victim still on Con Son.

A student monk said he came here three years ago on a one-year sentence, for giving sanctuary to a Viet Cong in a pagoda. He too has been forgotten.

Prisoner interviews also produced some

surprising opinions. Many of the regular prisoners from rural Vietnam stated they were not too dissatisfied with their confinement because the prison living conditions were better than those they had experienced in the countryside. Other prisoners said they felt relieved to be at Con Son and away from the war.

But no prisoner was willing to say he is happy.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, we are told by the commandant that there was one doctor on the island. We did not even question that. But in the statement by Mr. Oliva he says this:

The island has one doctor, a First Lieutenant in the Vietnamese Regional and Popular Forces (roughly equivalent to our National Guard). However, he treats only the civil servants, the national police and the military.

That is the statement from a man who did occupy a rather strategic position in the U.S. service.

Also, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of supporting some of the statements which I have made, I would like to enter into the RECORD at this point as previously requested a full statement of Mr. Don Luce which has been filed with the Council of Churches and a letter from Mr. Luce to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement and letter are as follows:

COORDINATING CONFERENCE FOR RECONSTRUCTION IN VIETNAM

July 7, 1970.

Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: I should have written a long letter earlier, but I have been very busy. I have had to let my secretaries go for their own personal safety and things have been piling up. Enclosed is a copy of the account of our trip that I wrote. There has been an awful lot of feedback here due to your statements. There are some indications that this may lead to an improvement of conditions in the prisons. I think we can be sure that the press here will carefully watch prison conditions.

I have used the statement as a backgrounder for press people here. They have been anxious to have articles from here to give the story more Vietnam color. I even went out to Con Son Island once again with an NBC team but we did not get to see anything. They are quite nervous at the island now.

I shall never forget your efforts in making the trip to Con Son. I know that the Vietnamese people are very grateful to you, especially those who have been imprisoned and tortured. Your efforts confirm my belief in the goodness of people. It is also evidence that there are people in the "system" who are truly good people. I hope that this message is communicated throughout our land. Again my sincere thanks for your courage.

Sincerely,

DON LUCE.

THE TIGER CAGES OF CON SON

(By Don Luce)

CON SON ISLAND—"The tiger cages existed during the time of the French. It was the most inhuman kind of treatment you can imagine. Prisoners were shackled to iron bars in tiny cages and deprived of physical necessities and human dignity. But these cages no longer exist."

This was the official position of prison authorities in Vietnam before a Congressional committee. The committee included Congressman Augustus Hawkins of the Los Angeles Watts area, Congressman William Anderson, former commander of the Nautilus submarine, Thomas Harkin, a congressional aide, and myself. A group from the U.S. Public Safety office accompanied us.

Con Son prison is located in the South China Sea approximately 140 miles southeast of Saigon. It is Vietnam's largest civilian prison, having 9,916 prisoners as of June 1970 according to the U.S. Public Safety Director in Vietnam. Its seven camps have a total capacity of 9,750 inmates (about 2,000 trustees now have housing outside the seven camps). The prison was established in 1862 by the French. Sometimes called "Devil's Island," mention of the name Con Son brings fear to most Vietnamese. Although Ho Chi Minh was never imprisoned there, it was also called "University of Ho Chi Minh" because so many of its "graduates" changed from a strong anti-communist position when they entered to joining the Viet Minh on their release.

No, Con Son is not like Alcatraz or a "Devil's Island," claimed Frank E. Walton, Director of the U.S. Public Safety program in Vietnam at the beginning of the trip, commenting: "This (place) is more like a Boy Scout Recreational Camp."

But there had been other stories. After considerable pressure from the Vietnamese student movement, five students were released from Con Son where they claimed they had been held under terrible conditions in the same tiger cages that the French had used. They wrote in a report to the Vietnamese National Assembly:

"Living under these conditions lacking food, clothing and shelter, the prisoners had to endure confusion and serious disease. Food was inadequate, beatings were regular, feet were shackled day and night. Most of our fellow prisoners in the cages were paralyzed, not to mention the number suffering from chronic dysentery; tuberculosis due to long-term physical exhaustion; stomach disorders from the beating by trustees, from eating sand and pebbles in the rice, from being forced to eat too fast; gangrenous feet from a lack of vitamins, and endless other diseases. . . . Medicine was dispensed as the person in charge of medical problems was inspired to do so. Here, every time we wanted to ask for medicine we had to wait until we were in agony and then we generally only received a few aspirin tablets. Any medicine more valuable than this was all hoarded by the orderlies and their accomplices in the administration and was taken away and sold."

Was their story true? The two Congressmen went to Con Son to investigate. Earlier three Congressmen had backed out after two of them had heard detailed descriptions of the conditions in the tiger cages by a former inmate. It all seemed too preposterous. For a time it appeared that none of the Congressmen would go—but due to the hard work of aide Thomas Harkin and courageous personal qualities of the Congressmen Hawkins and Anderson the trip was made.

As the airplane approached the beautiful island of Con Son we read the prepared briefing:

"The Con Son Island National Correction Center, located in the South China Sea approximately 140 miles southeast of Saigon, is Vietnam's largest correctional institution. Established by the French in 1862 as a penal colony, it has long held a reputation of being a 'Devil's Island.' This reputation still prevails, in spite of an enlightened and modern administration of the facility."

We were perplexed. Former inmates had related tales of horror, yet the American advisors spoke in glowing terms. Other investigation teams had found nothing. No Westerners had seen the cages since the time of the French (or at least none would confirm their existence). "There are no tige. cages. Only a thing of the past," everyone had been told who visited the island by the officials. Yet they had left unconvinced because the prisoners on the island had told them secretly "you must see the tiger cages."

At 9:58, after a twenty minute drive from the airport, we began discussions with the Chief Warden, Col. Nguyen Van Ve. We talked about the plane ride and the beautiful island. "Con Son means Mountain Island," Col. Ve explained cordially. At 10:10 a prison guard brought us cafe filtre—the kind of coffee that drips slowly into your cup drop by drop while you wait. The conversation went on slowly.

At 10:23, Thomas Harkin abruptly changed the discussion about the weather and mountain. "Would it be possible to talk to some individual prisoners," he asked.

"Why, yes, of course," Colonel Ve said in his impeccable English, smiling. He could arrange that.

"We have a list of names of people we would like to see," Harkin said. "These are some people we have learned are here and we would like to see them."

A cloud passed over the face of Colonel Ve as he reached over to receive the list of six names.

"You must have permission from the Ministry of Interior if you want to see specific individuals," he said after reading the names. "You can't just come here and see anyone you want. This is a prison."

"We have come to investigate all aspects of American aid here and we would like to get as accurate a picture as we can," Congressman Hawkins explained. "Perhaps you could telegram the Ministry of Interior to ask permission."

At this point, Frank Walton, the top U.S prison advisor commented angrily: "We thought this trip was above-board. If you had wanted to see specific individuals, you should have informed us first. This is sneaky and unethical."

Colonel Ve then reverted to Vietnamese, using the U.S. Public Safety Division's interpreter to translate. "I'll send a message to the Ministry of Interior, but they cannot respond before eleven o'clock when you are scheduled to leave for Saigon."

"Oh, we can stay a few extra minutes," Congressman Hawkins said. "Perhaps we can go to see the prison wards now. Do you have a map of the island showing the location of the camps?"

"I'm afraid we don't," Colonel Ve said. When questioned further, Colonel Ve explained in Vietnamese that the camps were so small and the island so big that the camp locations would seem insignificant on a map of the island. But before this was translated, Mr. Walton interrupted and explained that security reasons did not allow them to make such a map. "The VC might get hold of it and come and release all the prisoners."

It was now 10:40 and, according to our schedule we were supposed to leave to catch the plane. At that point Colonel Ve went to his desk to give final instructions on sending the telegram to Saigon to get permission to see the specific six prisoners. "Whether they (Saigon) answer or not is not important," he told his aide in Vietnamese who was questioning the wording (at this point, they still did not know that I spoke Vietnamese).

"Why don't we go over to the curio shop?" Mr. Walton suggested. "They have some really nice things like the swagger stick that Col. Ve has. It's just across the road. It would be nice for you to have some souvenirs to take back to the U.S."

"I'd like to see the prison camps," Con-

gressman Hawkins replied. "We can pick up the souvenirs when we finish the tour of the prison sites."

The group then loaded itself into three jeeps and went to camp number 2. The prisoners were lined up, faces tightened into stiff, frightened masks.

At the infirmary, medical care to the prisoners was explained.

"We have a doctor who treats each patient separately. Medical care here meets modern standards."

The sick prisoners were asked a few questions by the congressmen:

"Do you get enough to eat?"

"Yes, plenty. Rice, dried fish, and vegetables," one answered .

"Do you receive medicine?"

"Yes, we get medicine every day."

As the questioning went on, I wandered over and talked to a man alone. He told me:

"I am a political prisoner from the time of Diem. I have no idea when I'll be released. It is so bad here. Do you see the man who is so sick? He has received no medicine until today when they put the bottle with water up (a dextrose bottle was being used to feed him intravenously). That was for you to see. No medicine. No vegetables . . ."

At this point a guard came up and he continued:

"Everything is quite good here. It's not like the mainland but we have plenty to eat and the people here are kind."

As I walked away, he pleaded with his frightened eyes.

That was the first time that the prison administration realized I spoke Vietnamese. From then on they made a desperate attempt to keep me from speaking to any prisoner alone.

In response to a question about whether the inmates had a chance to play sports, Randolph Berkeley, Chief of the Corrections and Detention Division of the U.S. Public Safety advisory program said:

"Colonel Ve even plays soccer with the prisoners. He is so well liked!"

"I play soccer with them on Sunday afternoon," Col. Ve said picking up the cue. "And sometimes they beat me—but I don't even punish them," Colonel Ve laughed pleasantly at his joke.

Congressman Hawkins suggested that we go on to Camp 4. We all got into the jeeps and were taken to Camp 5. I was asked to interpret by Thomas Harkin. This time a guard was standing by:

"Where are you from?"

"Ben Tre."

"When were you arrested?"

"Ten years ago."

"Why were you arrested?"

"I am a political prisoner."

"But what was the specific reason?"

"The provincial authorities arrested me."

"You were arrested because you are a traitor, weren't you?" the guard prompted.

"I was arrested because I am a traitor," the prisoner parroted.

In another case, a prisoner said he did not know why he was arrested.

"You had a grenade in your hand and you were planning to kill people. Isn't that true?" Colonel Ve shouted authoritatively.

"I had a grenade in my hand and was going to kill people," the prisoner said.

It was the same, situation after situation. Yes, the food was delicious—when the guards were around. No, we have almost no food, they said, when the guards were not around. Yes, we get letters from home—when the guards stood by and listened. No, we cannot receive or send out letters—when the guards were not listening.

After Camp 5, Representative Hawkins made his request once again to see Camp 4. It was there we had been told the infamous tiger cages were. As we entered the compound of Camp 4, it was as it had been been described and as we had put together clues from various people. Two wells on one end with Chinese imperial type decorative walls in front of the wells. Some beautiful flowers which one of the Representatives photographed. But what we could not see at first was the small alley which was supposed to be between the wall of one of the prison buildings and the outer wall. Thomas Harkin saw it first—a narrow path between the two walls with some vegetables growing along the side for the trustees. He passed the word on.

"It is good to see that you have an agricultural project here, Colonel," Representative Hawkins observed. "What are these plants?"

"These are called Vietnamese spinach," Colonel Ve replied. "We encourage the prisoners to plant things after they become trustees."

"Not really enough to feed many people though," the Congressman observed as he worked his way to the far end of the alley. "By the way, where does this little door lead to?"

We started to shake the door and rap on it. It was a tiny door, hardly large enough for one person to enter.

"Oh, that goes to another camp," Col Ve replied. "We can enter through the other side."

We looked at each other, remembering the words of one person who knew the location of the tiger cages: "There is only one way. You must go through the tiny door at the end of the path where the vegetables are grown."

"I'm tired," Representative Hawkins said. "Can't you send someone around to open the door? We can wait here."

"The Congressman is tired. Can you send someone around to open the door?" Thomas Harkin repeated the request.

"This door is always locked. You can't get in," the Colonel said.

Then miraculously someone came to the gate from the other side to see what was the matter. He opened the door and we slipped through. There before us were the tiger cages. We climbed to the top and looked down onto the prisoners huddled in the cages, three or four in each cage.

The tiger cages are small stone compartments. Inside each cage is a wooden bucket for sanitary purposes which is emptied once a day. The cages are not quite five feet across and about nine feet long. There were three prisoners in each one. To see them we climbed up a stairway and looked down on the prisoners through an opening at the top which is crossed with iron bars. There were 60 or 70 cages in the building.

"Donnez-moi d'eau," one prisoner said in French.

"I am sorry I cannot speak French," I answered in Vietnamese, not trusting my poor high school French. "But I can speak Vietnamese. This is a Congressional team from the United States who have come to look into prison conditions in Vietnam."

"We are thirsty. We are hungry. We have been beaten," one said and the chant was picked up.

"I am here because I spoke for peace. That is what all Vietnamese want. We only ask for peace," said another.

As we walked down the aisle above them, the prisoners pointed to sores on their bodies. One man showed us his hand. Three fingers were missing.

"They cut off my fingers when they arrested me," he said. Then he turned his head and showed us a big scar on the back of his head.

None of the men could stand up. Until a few days ago, they said they had been shackled to a bar that went across one end of the cage. The bars had just been removed (although the bars were still left in a few cages) but the slots to put them back in were still there.

"We will be shackled again in a few days," one said as he crawled around the cage using his hands to move himself.

One of the prisoners pointed to the scars on his useless legs and said, "We were shackled here for months. We are hungry, thirsty and sick. Please give us some water."

"I am a Buddhist monk and I spoke for peace in 1966. I am here for no reason except wanting peace. I have been beaten. I have been shackled. But I still speak out for peace."

Above each cell was a wooden bucket of lime.

"What is this for?" we asked Colonel Ve.

"The lime is to whitewash the walls," the colonel said.

"No! No!" the prisoners shouted. "It is thrown on us when we ask for food."

The floors of many of the cages were covered with lime.

"When it is thrown on us, we cough and spit blood. Many of us now have the disease of the lungs (T.B.) and it is so difficult to breathe when the lime is thrown on us."

"There are other cages. You must see them too," we were told. "There are cages with women. We hear them screaming and they are near. Right over there."

We climbed down the stairs and went to the adjacent building. Here was another double row of cages identical to the ones in the men's side. Every cage was filled with five women. The women ranged in age from fifteen years old to one old, blind lady who must have been nearly 70.

"Please give us some water. Please give us some food," they pleaded.

"We have been here seven months and have had a vegetable three times in these seven months."

"We are beaten and sick and yet we don't have any medicines."

Many of the women were obviously very sick. Some had T.B.; some had eye diseases; most had skin diseases. Those who were in the worst condition lay on the floor of the tiny cages while others fanned them with odd bits of cloth.

"How old are you?" I asked one beautiful young girl.

"Eighteen."

"Are you a student?"

"No, I am a laborer. I worked in a factory."

"Why were you arrested?"

"I was in a peace demonstration."

"Are you a Communist?"

At this, the young girl laughed at what seemed to her an irrelevant question.

"No, I am not a Communist. I am not concerned about politics. I am concerned about peace."

"Will you salute the flag?" the guard who was standing beside me demanded.

"No! No, I will not salute your flag which represents all the things you have done to me," she answered defiantly.

"Then you are a Communist and should be killed," the guard retorted in equally bitter tones.

Many of the girls were young students from Saigon's most prestigious schools like Gia Long, Madame Curie, etc.

"We can only wash every two or three days and then we have almost no water," they said. "During our menstruation period it is very hard because we cannot wash ourselves properly. That is not sanitary."

There are about 500 people in the tiger cages. They are hungry, thirsty and show obvious signs of having been beaten many times.

As we left the tiger cages, we were confronted once again by Frank Walton, head of the U.S. Public Safety Division.

"You have no right to interfere with Vietnamese affairs," he told us. "You have come here trying to stir up trouble. You are guests of Colonel Ve here. You aren't supposed to go poking your nose into doors that aren't your business."

"But this is our business," Congressman Hawkins explained. "The United States gives considerable aid to these prisons. We want to be sure our aid is used in a humane way. Several American boys are being held prisoner in North Viet Nam. I hope they are not being treated the same way as are the prisoners I have just seen being treated here."

"You are judging the whole prison of 10,000 inmates on how four or five hundred are being treated. This prison is equal to the standards of many of the prisons in our own country."

"These are very bad people," Colonel Ve told us. "They will not salute the flag. They will not even salute the American flag."

We then went back to the headquarters of the prison island where Colonel Ve apologized for not having lunch for us (it was now past one o'clock) and because he had still not received word from the Ministry of Interior about the Congressmen's request to see six specific prisoners.

"I am sorry I have no luncheon prepared," he said. "I thought you were leaving at eleven this morning."

"That's all right, Colonel," Representative Hawkins said. "But I would like to go to that curio shop. I'd like to get me one of those swagger sticks."

But the curio shop was closed.

The conditions we say at Con Son were very different from the "fact sheet" which had been passed out on our departure from Saigon that had stated:

"The inmates are kept busy with work projects and vocational tasks such as woodcutting, tile making, woodworking, animal husbandry, chicken and duck production and sewing. Inmates also attend classes in literacy training, and all grades of formal education. Rice, papayas, coconuts and vegetables grown on the prison farm and fish caught by the prisoners supplement the diet . . . In the opinion of Correction Advisers with lengthy U.S. penology experience, Con Son is not a 'Devil's Island,' but on the contrary is a correctional institution worthy of higher ratings than some prisons in the United States."

A better description is the last words we heard as we left the tiger cages:

"Please give us some water."

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce also a copy of a Fellowship publication which goes into the question of imprisonment and torture in South Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

IMPRISONMENT AND TORTURE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Pham Tam)

AN INTRODUCTORY WORD BY ALFRED HASSLER

This is the story of the scores of thousands of men and women, civilians, who clog the prisons of South Vietnam, charged with "political" offenses. It is a horror story, told in a low key, matter-of-fact style, and all the more horrifying for that reason. It is told by a Vietnamese journalist who spent four years as such a prisoner, shuttled back and forth between the crowded noisome holes that pass for prisons, but drawing also on others' intimate knowledge of the whole prison system.

No one knows how many political prisoners there are in the Republic of Vietnam. The lowest estimates, based on official figures, top 20,000; less biased observers tend to agree that the total is probably close to 200,000. They range from villagers charged with being accomplices of the Vietcong to some of the country's best-known political religious and intellectual leaders.

Discussions of their "guilt" are fruitless: in South Vietnam one is guilty if he favors peace, or calls for negotiations, or says that the country should be neutralized, or expresses opposition to the ruling clique of generals headed by President Thieu and Vice-President Ky. Where there are trials they are hasty, before military courts, with none of the safeguards of a free judiciary and with no right of appeal; but thousands of the victims are held without trial for months and years.

Many of the prisoners have confessed to whatever offenses were laid against them by their jailers, and many of them have implicated others who in turn have been arrested and jailed. The confessions and the implications are the consequence of the torture to which most political prisoners are subjected, ranging from the primitive brutality of beatings with rifle butts or heavy sticks to such "sophisticated" devices as the application of electric wires to the testicles of male prisoners and the forcing of bottles or live eels into the vaginas of the women.

None of this is the consequense of the accidental rise to power of a few pathological sadists. Rather it is the deliberate expression of the desperate determination of the Thieu-Ky government to stay in power by suppressing all dissent. Open opponents of the government are immobilized by being imprisoned themselves or by being frightened into exile by the fear of being imprisoned and undergoing the torture themselves. Some of them have taken refuge abroad; others have fled to the National Liberation Front, submerging whatever qualms they have about it in the desperation of seeing no other choice.

Even so, the dissent continues, the demands increase for the replacement of Thieu and Ky by a genuinely representative government that will bring the war to an end. Students, academics, Buddhist monks and Catholic priests confront the terror and insist on calling for peace.

It is this insistent, indefatigable body of the country's ablest and most respected citizens, not allied with the NLF but demanding a "government of peace," that Thieu and Ky and the American establishment in Saigon fear most. It is they, in their non-violent but unremitting opposition, who disclose the instability of the government even more than do the military attacks of the NLF and North Vietnamese.

Some Americans, reading this account, will take refuge in that ancient canard that has it that Orientals have somehow a lower regard for human life and suffering than do we more sensitive Westerners. Leaving aside the consideration that we sensitive Americans have been engaged in indiscriminate slaughter in Vietnam in a fashion that has revolted people throughout the world, the assertion itself is a lie. War evokes the worst in men and allows the most brutal of men to come to power. Vietnamese torture other Vietnamese; still others carry on a struggle without violence and with a sense of compassion not often matched in the West.

What Americans need to face is that these horrors are being perpetrated with American assent, by a government kept in power solely by American military might, by men paid for by American dollars, and in a system permeated throughout by American advisors. This is part of the black and spreading stain of shame that the Vietnam war has cast on this country's reputation. To win a war, or to end it "with honor"—honor, no less—we condone and finance a totalitarian government in the total suppression of individul rights, and in a pattern of imprisonment and torture that should be turning our stomachs with revulsion.

IMPRISONMENT AND TORTURE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The case of the five South Vietnamese peasants who found themselves entangled in a net lowered from an American helicopter and, thereafter, trapped in a web of arrest, examination and torture which, after a year, left them still liable to trial for "actions contrary to state security," is symbolic of the fate of millions of South Vietnamese people today. Almost everyone is subject to arrest at any time on an array of often vague and ill-formulated charges from draft evasion to "anti-patriotism," or simply and pragmatically for being unable to bribe the right official. Interrogation is all too often a euphemism for torture, and it may be carried on by one or several of the dozens of official and semi-official agencies and sub-agencies responsible for political security. Detention without trial is legal in South Vietnam for periods of six months to two years, after which prisoners may be re-examined and returned to detention. Trials are often summary. Imprisonment after trial generally means a continuation of the conditions of brutality under which the prisoner has been held during his interrogation.

The fact that thousands of South Vietnamese citizens are being held as political prisoners by the Saigon Government has, during the last year or so, become common knowledge in the United States. Not until recently, however, have we begun to read reports in our press and periodicals of the officially instigated torture and other mistreatment which accompany political imprisonment. This account, written from personal experience and observation, by a journalist who spent four years in South Vietnamese jails, gives a more complete and authoritative account of the system of surveillance, torture and imprisonment in South Vietnam than any that has heretofore been available. "Pham Tam" is, of course, a pseudonyn. For obvious reasons, the identity of the author must remain secret.—Ed.

I. THE WEB OF CONTROL: SAIGON AND THE CITIES

"Anyone with a gun can make arrests." This is not just a cynical Saigon remark. While such a law cannot be found in any body of legislation, it is part of an unwritten code that Vietnamese civil servants at all levels understand and apply.

The network arrest system in Saigon consists of six different agencies and their subagencies. In addition to the Official Police Headquarters of Saigon, there are five secretly functioning agencies, the Active Service Police or *Hoat Vu*, the Bureau of Military Security, the Central Intelligence Service, the American Special Forces, and the Secret Service.

(1) The Official Saigon Police Headquarters (*Nha Giam Doc Canh Sat Do Thanh*) is centered in one large station, with a branch station in each of the nine districts of Saigon. Each station, besides a large number of uniformed police, has a section of plainsclothesmen, who have unlimited powers of arrest and have also special rooms for the unofficial interrogation, torture and confinement of prisoners. The Official Saigon Police are said to make many arrests for purposes of personal revenge or blackmail, and to accept bribes to void the sentences of real criminals.

(2) The Active Service Police, or *Hoat Vu*, judging from their activities, are, in fact, the secret police. Theirs is the most important agency in the network arrest system, and its aim is to repress all popular movements struggling for peace and neutrality, all organizations whose policy is opposed to that of the Government, and to wipe out secret NLF bases within the capital.

Currently the *Hoat Vu* center directs more than twenty stations situated in the big towns (Dalat, Can Tho, Nha Trang, Qui Nhon, Hue, Danang). In the Saigon-Gia Dinh region alone there are eight such stations. These are set up in large villas, surrounded by high walls topped with barbed wire and often electric fencing, and are patrolled by

watch dogs and by guards in civilian clothes who carry carefully concealed pistols. Each of these eight Saigon-area stations has from 80 to 120 official employees, plus two or three hundred informers. There are two *Hoat Vu* stations in the Cholon area, one in Binh Dong, one in Thi Nghe, one in Khanh Hoi, one near the Tan Son Nhut Airport, one in Phu Lam, and another in Gia Dinh.

The *Hoat Vu* belongs to the Special Police Force (*Khoi Canh Sac Dac Biet*) within the National Police Force (*Tong Nha Canh Sat Quoc Gia*), and it receives orders directly from the Presidency, from the American Intelligence Service, from the Chiefs of Staff of the South Vietnamese Army, and in many cases, from the American Special Forces.

This Special Police Force operates the Central Bureau of Investigation (*Trung Tam Tham Van*) situated at the National Police Force headquarters. The Bureau is fully equipped with instruments of torture, and includes eight or ten smaller interrogation units, each one staffed by five persons. There are three detention centers, *Cau Luu Xa, A, B, and C*, and a communal prison, *Lao Xa Tong Nha*. All political prisoners from Saigon, as well as many of the more important prisoners from the provinces, must go through this Central Bureau of Investigation, where files are completed, fuller inquiries undertaken, and decisions made as to whether the prisoners will be tried, sent to detention camps, or some other disposition made of their cases.

(3) The Bureau of Military Security (*Cuc An Ninh Quan Doi*) is commonly called the "second bureau," a name that strikes terror into the hearts of the people of Saigon and has haunted them since the arrival of the French Army in Indo-China. Most of those arrested by the "second bureau" are beaten to death, maimed for life, or have to be hospitalized after their release. The Bureau is an agency of the Army Chiefs of Staff and is administered by a colonel. Secret agents of the Bureau are present and active within every army unit and have an organization parallel to that of the army. Their field of action, however, is not limited to the army; they have the power to arrest civilians and to search buildings in areas near army installations. There is close cooperation between the Bureau of Military Security and the other agencies in making arrests as well as for the exchange of documents and files. At the headquarters of the Bureau and in each sub-station there are detention centers and torture rooms.

In Saigon, apart from the Bureau of Military Security, there are also numbers of agents working in collaboration with the Military Police, among them men from all the army units in the Saigon-Cholon region. These "soldiers of safety" (*quan nhan cong an*) go around looting the cafes and the bars, the dance halls and the brothels. The bosses and prostitutes in these areas are exploited and subjected to blackmail. Many Military Police officers become pimps and owners of houses of prostitution. The regular police and even the *Hoat Vu* dare not penetrate the areas they control, and they settle many an acount by exploding a grenade. Politically speaking, the Military Police have the right to arrest journalists, professors and students who have written or spoken against the army. Arrested soldiers, along with civilians suspected of being their accomplices, are sent directly to a military tribunal. Other prisoners are handed to the Special Police at the Central Bureau of Investigation.

In addition to the Bureau of Military Security, there is also an intelligence bureau at army headquarters. It is endowed with the right to arrest arbitrarily, but its activities are more secret and confined than those of many of the other agencies.

(4) The Central Intelligence Service (*So Trung Uong Tinh Bao*) is also thought to be the American center for secret and double agents. The Central Intelligences Service makes arrests in great secrecy, gives orders and supplies information to both the *Hoat Vu* and to Bureau of Military Security, as well as to the Army Intelligence Bureau. Prisoners going to the Intelligence Center are sent blindfolded and are often made to travel at night. Since they can still hear, however, they have been able to testify that it is located on the Bach Dang Embankment near the *Nha Quan Phap* (military tribunal) and the naval headquarters.

(5) The American Special Forces (*Luc Luong Dac Biet My*) is said to have a headquarters some place in Saigon. A great number of prisoners sent to the Central Investigation Bureau relate that they were arrested and interrogated by the American Special Forces. Their files bear this out, but so far no one can testify as to the exact location of the headquarters.

(6) The Secret Service (*Mat Vu*) is composed of a large number of devoted officers who work under the direct orders of President Thieu. Their task consists essentially of kidnapping, assasinating, or otherwise eliminating officers and politicians who oppose Government policy. Their headquarters move constantly between three villas—from one on Cong Ly street (near Tan Son Nhut Airport) to another in the first district of Saigon, to a third in the third district. Each officer in the *Mat Vu* has under his direction from three to five young delinquents, whom he pays for each "job." These youths are provided with forged military papers, military identity cards, a quartermaster's card to give them valid reason for being loose on the town, and even a folder containing fake military records. The youths are quite likely to be suspected by the local police of avoiding the draft, and, as forged identity cards are common among civilians, many different documents have to be produced in order to allay suspicion. The special papers are valid for only two weeks, by which time the "job" must be completed.

II. THE WEB OF CONTROL: THE PROVINCES

Each province has a National Police station (*Ty Canh Sat Quoc Gia*) and a Special Police force (*Ty Can Sat Dac Biet*). In the large cities there is also an Active Service Police Station (*Hoat Vu*). These are the official agencies of control. Annexed to these are Military Security (*An Ninh Quan Doi*), and under the control of the American military forces are the Army Special Forces, the Provincial Reconnaissance Units of the CIA, the Coast Guard, and several other special groups. None of the latter, except for the South Vietnamese Military Security, has permanent headquarters. They accomplish their arrests and tortures in one day, then pass their more fortunate prisoners over to the Special Police force. (The less fortunate prisoners are either beaten to death or drowned on suspicion of being NLF agents). One of these groups, the *PRU* is the most savage in its methods of torture.

The Special Police forces in the provinces make arrests in the chief towns of the districts, but seldom go into the surrounding countryside except during times of military operations. In the country, ordinary soldiers have the right to arrest, interrogate and imprison citizens. As these soldiers are far removed from central authority, laws are virtually meaningless, and they are more or less at liberty to act as they choose. People in the provinces may also be arrested by the Civil Guards (*Dan Ve*), the village administrative bodies, the cadres of the Provincial Government Rural Reconstruction Program, as well as by the local militia when there are military operations under way in the area.

The arbitrary nature of many political arrests and their consequences are illustrated by the following story:

Among the prisoners sent from the South Vietnamese Army Headquarters to the Central Bureau of Investigation, there was once a group of five men, all over fifty years old, peasants who had been rounded up in the hamlet of Tan Sinh. Having received permission to go outside the hamlet one day, they were scything grass in the fields, when they were suddenly trapped in a net dropped from an American helicopter and then arrested on suspicion of belonging to the NLF. After subjecting them to interrogation and torture and finding them not to be NLF members, the Americans sent them on to the South Vietnamese Army Headquarters to be released and returned to Tan Sinh. They had, however, already been designated as "political prisoners" by the American army administration, and their files were stamped accordingly. They could not, therefore, be released until some determination had been made of the reasons for their arrest, so for six months they were sent from one military camp to another for examination and re-examination. Arriving finally at the Central Bureau of Investigation, they were informed that it would be another five months before officials had time to draw up the papers that would send them before a military court.

The end of the story of the five old men is not known, but other prisoners in similar situations have been charged with actions contrary to state security—most frequently with paying takes to the NLF. If found guilty, as they most often are, they are sentenced to three years' imprisonment, and the letters C.T.P. (*Chinh Tri Pham*: political prisoner) are stamped on their identification cards. Other peasants with as little evidence against them have been judged guilty of the graver crime of "anti-patriotism," which carries a minimum sentence of five years of forced labor on the prison island of Con Son.

All political cases brought officially to trial are handled by the military courts, of which there are two kinds, the Ordinary Military Court (*Tou An Quan Su Thuong*) and the Front Military Court (*Tou An Quan Su Mat Tran*), the latter established by Nguyen Van Thieu and Nguyen Cao Ky, to take the place of the infamous Special Military Tribunal, abolished after the *coup d'etat* of November 1963. The Special Military Tribunal had been created by Ngo Dinh Diem in 1959 to suppress all political opposition to his Government, and it moved about the country, carrying with it the guillotine, functioning both as judge and executioner of its victims. Except that the guillotine is no longer used, the Front Military Court acts in the same way and fulfills the same functions as the Special Military Tribunal. There is no appeal from its decisions except—when a death sentence has been imposed—to the mercy of President Thieu.

The Ordinary Military Court holds trials in the Palace of Justice in Saigon and at a special court in Ben Bach Dang. It examines the cases of army law violations by military men and political crimes attributed to civilians. It has six offices for preliminary investigations and takes care of about eighty per cent of all political offenses, handing down indictments from twenty days to one week before trial. As it is extremely slow in its procedures, it cannot respond as rapidly as the Front Military Court to the political strategy of the Government, which aims at the immediate suppression of all anti-war movements, and political opposition.

Both courts belong to the Department of National Defense; their judges and most of their officials are military men, and they have no connection with the judiciary branch of the civil government. Though the preliminary investigation offices of neither court are equipped with sophisticated torture devices, they are both supplied with clubs and other instruments for the administration of beatings.

III. ACCUSATION AND TORTURE

When he makes an arrest in the forest or out in the rice fields during military operations, the soldier seeks answers to four main questions: Where has the prisoner hidden his weapons? To what unit of the NLF does he belong? Where is the unit located, and where does it store its arms and provisions?

The response to these questions is the same, whether true or not: "I am not a VC," and "I do not know." Then begins the torture. The methods used in such situations are direct and unsophisticated. Prisoners are beaten, slugged with gun butts, strangled with leather belts or barbed wire, their heads plunged under water and held there, the flesh of their bodies sliced or stabbed, while threats are made to cut open their stomachs. This torture may last for hours. If the peasant is a member of the NLF, he can end the torture by one of two alternatives: confession or death. If he is not an NLF member, he has no choice but death. (This explains why the peasants, whether or not they belong to the NLF, must either take flight or hide when the U.S. armies and their allies arrive.) If by chance, the prisoner emerges alive from the torture, he is classed as an NLF member. Weapons found any place in the area of his arrest will likely be identified as his, and the man will be considered part of the last NLF unit to have passed that way, perhaps even its leader.

At the Central Bureau of Investigation, I once met a peasant who had been sent there from the South Vietnamese Army Headquarters. Cao (not, of course, his real name) was a strong, healthy young man, but rather slow, and could hardly read. In his files, which had been compiled with scrupulous care by the Army to note the minutest details of his arrest and supposed mission, he was identified under another name as the leader of a certain NLF battalion. A year later, I met him again at the Chi Hoa prison. He was wearing an identity plate which bore the initials C.T.T.A. (convicted political prisoner), and was about to be exiled to the island of Con Son, where the prison of Polo Condor is located, under a sentence of twenty years of forced labor. Soon after his departure, three political prisoners were brought in my My Tho. All were members of the NLF and had been taken to My Tho for hospitalization after being wounded and captured by the U.S. Army at the battle of Kien Phong. Among them was a man said to be the chief of the very same NLF battalion my friend Cao had been accused of leading, and he bore the same name that Army Headquarters had assigned to Cao. After seeing the warmth and respect with which the other prisoners welcomed him, I was convinced that he was the real battalion leader. What, then, of young Cao? Who was he? Probably he was merely a peasant, victim of vicious torture, the unwitting subject of the maneuvering of South Vietnamese soldiers to gain commendation from their superiors and their American advisors.

Even more feared than the soldiers by the peasants are the *Dan Ve*, or Civil Guards. The true meaning of the words, *Dan Ve*, is "organization of the people for self-protection," but its name cannot disguise the real character of the organization. Since the peasants feel very deeply that they have been displaced by the U.S.-created war machine, most of them refuse categorically to enlist in the *Dan Ve*, which is consequently composed of hoodlums who are attracted by the possibilities for exploitation that it offers. These Civil Guards receive half the salary of South Vietnamese soldiers, plus a supply of arms and grenades. During the day, they tour the villages searching for NLF members, while stealing pigs and poultry, molesting women, etc. At night they return to their quarters to drink and gamble; when they feel bored, they fire guns blindly and indiscriminately. They know very well which house has just sold a pig or some poultry, or which family has just taken a sampan of rice to the city. They force their way into these houses, denouncing their occupants as NLF collaborators. If their victims are not able or quick enough to offer them money, the *Dan Ve* take them to their quarters to be tortured so that evidence of crime can be manufactured.[1] In most cases, peasants who fail to invite the *Dan Ve* to family feasts are denounced as NLF members. One has only to read the Saigon newspapers to know that every day there are stories of murder, rape and torture of innocent victims, as well as arbitrary imprisonment of peasants by the Civil Guards.

The *Dan Ve* operate under the direction of a Province Chief. At every level, they have prisons and torture chambers of their own. After arresting and torturing their prisoners, they send them to the National Police (*Ty-Can Sat Quo Gia*) in the small towns or in the provincial capitals, so that their information may be further exploited.

The village administrators and the local police chiefs carry on the same kind of activities as the *Dan Ve*. People arrested by the National Police receive somewhat lighter tortures, since this is the most open and accessible of all governmental agencies. But every prisoner arrested by the National Police is sent on to the Security Police Bureau (*Cog An*) or to the *Hoat Vu* branch, so that all possible information may be drawn from him.

The typical prisoner who is taken in the cities or larger towns has to undergo three sessions of torture at the office of the police who have arrested him. During the first and worst session, the police attempt to discover the names of others who may have collaborated with him. Even if he is innocent, he may, under torture, find some names to say—perhaps those of friends or relatives. This is one of the reasons there are so many unjust arrests. The second session of torture is for the purpose of extracting information about activities of the enemy. The third session, for the purpose of recording the prisoner's confession, is less harsh than the other two, except when the prisoner tries to deny any parts of his earlier confessions. (If he does not deny what he has said, however, his eventual sentence is likely to be exceedingly severe.) No matter what he says, the record of the interview is really a creation of the interrogator, with all details arranged to illustrate the prisoner's crime. At the bottom of the record, there is always this notation: "After having listened to this recording, or these lines, three times, I acknowledge that everything in them is true, and I, therefore, sign my name together with [that of] the interrogator." The prisoner will be beaten every day until he agrees to sign.

Depending on whether the original arresting officer was in the provinces or in Saigon, the prisoner's record and his "confession" are then turned over to the appropriate provincial or Saigon supervisory bureau. Officials of this bureau have the right to interrogate and torture him again. Sometimes his records are sent to several bureaus, and he is subject to re-examination by as many as these agencies as are interested in him. It may be six months or more before he knows where or by whom he is to be tried, or, even if he is not tried, whether he will be released or detained[2] for a term in prison or whether further exploration of his case has been recommended. If the latter is true, he will have to start with interrogation and torture all over again, from the beginning.

The methods of torture by which the Army Intelligence Bureau, the *Hoat Vul* and the Security Police Bureau extract confessions from there prisoners are generally similar to each other. The officials who apply the tortures have had long experience in their jobs.

IV. METHODS OF TORTURE

Briefly, these are some common torture methods.

The prisoner's hands are placed, palm up, on a table and beaten, fifty times each, with a heavy wooden truncheon. This turns the hands black; the fingers swell up so much that the prisoner cannot hold a bowl of food in his hands for a week or more. Usually, during this process, the table shatters, so that the hands are also full of splinters.

The prisoner is made to lie on his stomach with his knees bent so that his feet are in the air. The soles of the feet are then beaten with heavy truncheons, so that he feels pain in three places—the feet, the knees and the heart, as the blood is forced up in his body.

The prisoner is positioned with his hands tied behind his back in such a way that his chest is taut and protruding. Then his chest is beaten with rubber truncheons. This causes him to spit blood and excrete, and those who endure this torture are usually left with permanent lung damage.

The prisoner is hung by a thin metal wire tied to his big toes and beaten like a punching bag by four men. This is the best known and most common method of torture; it is generally called "the plane ride."

The prisoner is placed inside a barrel with water up to his neck. The barrel is then beaten full force with cloth-covered wooden cudgels, producing great pressure on the body of the prisoner: the heart is shocked severely, the liver and kidneys swell, and the bladder bursts. This torture is the specialty of the Army Intelligence Bureau. The peasants call it *chen ve*—a slang term meaning "beneath the water or mud."

The prisoner is forced to cup his hands, and pins are thrust into the quick of his nails. Some prisoners endure ten pins in their fingers and yet say nothing because they are innocent and have no information to give. A more elaborate development of this torture is for a pin with a feather attached to be thrust in half its length. Then an electric fan is switched on, the air from which makes the feathered pin rotate violently in the wound.

The prisoner has nails driven into his kneecaps or into the bones of his heels or ankles. These are often left there for several days.

The prisoner is laid on a bench, with his hands tied by the wrists and his head tilted back. Very salty or soapy water is then forced into his nose and mouth, until he loses consciousness. Sometimes, when the water enters the lungs, the prisoner may die. They call this kind of torture "taking the submarine."

The prisoner receives an electric shock of twelve volts from a hand-operated generator. Wires from the machine are tied to his thumbs or to his toes and sometimes even to his sex organ if he is a male. If the prisoner is a woman, the wires are tied to the tips of her breasts. Those who have heart trouble may die at the first shock. All torture rooms are equipped with the same kind of generator, a machine that looks like a square pepper grinder.

The prisoner is made to stand naked on top of a small stool with light projectors

---

[1] One of the Civil Guards' favorite methods of torture is to hammer nails into the bones and flesh of their prisoners, and, as a consequence of this, the peasants in their trading and bargaining, are often heard to say, "Isn't this too low a price to pay for the nails of the *Dan Ve?*"

[2] Detention (to be distinguished from a sentence served as the result of a trial) is legal in South Vietnam for periods of up to two years, but may be prolonged indefinitely by a reexamination, or a series of reexaminations) after which the detention period is extended. In 1968, it was found that some political prisoners had already served nearly ten years in Polo Condor prison, and they are still there.

with 200- to 500-watt bulbs all around him, or he may be forced to stand facing the wall with a 500-watt bulb placed about fifteen inches behind his head. He must stand in this same position for many days, except for brief moments when he is allowed to relieve himself or when he is fed. There are prisoners who stand this way for as long as a week before they collapse. Recovery from this ordeal may take several weeks, and a number of its victims break down completely and never recover.

The prisoner is tied firmly to a chair. Above his head is placed a can of ice water which drops upon his head slowly, drop by drop. The effect of this is that after about three hours, the prisoner begins to feel each drop falling upon him as the stroke of a hammer.

There are special forms of torture for female prisoners. For example, bottles or eels may be introduced into their vaginas, causing hemmorrhages which may last for many weeks.

The forms of torture are limited only by the ingenuity of the torturer, but the foregoing are the most usual. They may even become an amusement for professional interrogators. There are those who become so attached to their instruments that they take care of them as knights used to care for their swords. Some interrogators have carpenters make them wooden clubs with strange images and with carved lettering that may say something like this: "If you confess, you may live, if you don't, you shall die." One end of such club is called the "life end," the other, the "death end." The "life end" is small, round and smooth, while the "death end" is bigger and knobbed. One interrogator at the Central Bureau of Investigation owns a club carved in the form of a penis. The club is called "the penis of Heaven," and the owner has been nicknamed *Than Ong Cac Troi*—Mr. Heavenly Penis-Stick. Strangely enough, this man seems happy with his nickname. There is another interrogator who has had all his instruments of torture covered with zinc. Even his handcuffs are covered with zinc, though they originally bore the trademark "Made in U.S.A." and were already considered beautiful.

Many times prisoners are tortured, not so much for interrogation as for punishment, and often for capricious reasons. For example, a prisoner may be punished for having a name like *Cao* (tall) when he is short, or *Tuoi Sang* (bright) when he has dark skin, or a name like *Hung Dung* (hero) when he is small and slender. He may be punished for not being able to laugh or cry at the order of an interrogator. Once I saw a young man being beaten on his head until his scalp split open for not agreeing to drink a cup of tea with live cockroaches in it. He was finally made to eat them. When he was asked whether they were good or not, he responded that they were not, so he was beaten again for his answer. When at last he said that they were good, he was beaten still a third time for lying.

There was another young man who was beaten so severely simply because he had a mustache, that he had to crawl back to his cell, although his guards knew as well as the prisoner that it is impossible to get a razor in prison. The young man was made to stand in front of his tormentors and to pull out his mustache, hair by hair, with his fingers. If by chance he took out two hairs at once, he would be beaten five strokes. During the period in which he removed half his mustache, he received 145 strokes. Next week, he was forced to pull out the other half of the mustache. Altogether he received more than 3,000 strokes during the five months he was in prison—all because of his mustache. Finally, after his parents sold their house and used the money to bribe an official in the Special Police force, the young man was judged innocent and released.

V. PRISONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

It is difficult to know how many prisons there are in South Vietnam, because—besides the official prisons—there are a multitude of secret prisons and semi-official prisons set up by the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam, by the local army, by the American army, by the intelligence services, secret services, security services, and by the different levels of administration of the local areas.

OFFICIAL PRISONS

The Minister of the Interior, who has jurisdiction over the official prisons, has created an administrative agency called the Department of General Administration of Rehabilitation Centers (*Nha Tong Quan Doc Cac Trung Tam Cai Huan*) to supervise these prisons throughout South Vietnam. Colonel Tran Van Tu heads this agency; its headquarters are located near the Chi Hoa prison at the end of Hoa Hung Street in Saigon.

Under Colonel Tran Van Tu's administration, there are 58 official prisons in 58 provinces and cities, plus five big prisons: Chi Hoa, Tan Hiep, Thu Duc, Phu Quoc and Con Dao (The Con Dao Polo Condor Prison on Con Son Island). There is also another smaller prison located at the Cho Quan hospital to house sick prisoners taken from the five large prisons.

The province chiefs, who are usually lieutenant colonels, supervise the administration of the prisons in the provinces, but do not directly run them. The five big prisons are run by officers in the Army of the Republic of Vietnam.

Four types of personnel are employed to take care of the prisons:

Local army men (*dia phuong quan*): These look after the military aspects of the prison area. Their major responsibility is the security of the prison walls. They concern themselves with the prisoners only in the event of a revolt.

Professional supervisors (*giam thi chuyen nghiep*): Each is in charge of a certain number of prisoners and has the responsibility of seeing that the cell doors are secure. They carry out the orders of the courts with regard to transferrals of prisoners, their release or exile.

Cadres for rehabilitation (*can bo cai huan*): They look after the education of ordinary prisoners, the political indoctrination of political prisoners. They can also make recommendations with regard to extension of a prisoner's detention.

Public security agents (*cong an*): These are sent directly from the Special Police Force (*Khoi Canh Stat Dac Biet*). They specialize in beating and torturing prisoners who have violated prison regulations. Their job is to prevent political action in the prison, and they try to suppress any movements aimed toward improvement of prison conditions.

In these official prisons, there are usually three kinds of inmates: political prisoners, ordinary prisoners, and military prisoners. The majority, however—from sixty to eighty per cent—are political prisoners.

1. The five big prisons

Chi Hoa: Thought of as the prison crossroads of South Vietnam, this institution houses from 6,000 to 8,000 prisoners and is located in Saigon. Prisoners are brought in from the Security Police Headquarters and from all the provinces. Many are in transition to Con Dao or Phu Quoc or they may have come from these prisons after having served a term there. In Chi Hoa they wait either to be released or to be transferred to Tan Hiep or some other prison in the provinces.

The Chi Hoa prison is built in the form of an octagon four stories high with a court in the center. The interior of each of the eight sections is divided into four parts. Each of the eight sections is given the name of a letter in the alphabet from A to H. Attached to side D, there is a square building which has been given the letter I, and which has four stories numbered from 0 to 3. Each story of the octagon itself can be divided into four parts by combining two adjoining sides, A and B to form AB, or A and H to form AH, etc. Each of these combinations has a special use. For example, section AB contains comfortable and spacious quarters and is used for officials imprisoned for corruption or on similar charges, or for rich merchants who have obtained these quarters through bribery. Section 1E of ED is reserved for military officials; Section 3B of BC is especially for prisoners awaiting execution; Section 1H of AH is for lodging the *cong vu* (prisoners who are doing office work), officers and clerks and for medical personnel; Section FG is for political prisoners, except for 1G which is reserved for prisoners who work in the kitchen. Except for OD, which is used as an infirmary, O is reserved for political prisoners who have not been observing the political regulations of the prison; the three stories of section D are composed of very small dark cells reserved for political prisoners who are considered dangerous. On the outside of Section E, there has been built a large one-story building called the Hall of Photography and Pictures (*Phong Dien Anh*), but it is, in reality, the headquarters of the prison's security service.

There are many kinds of torture instruments. From the walls near the floor protrude iron bars to which prisoners are shackled. The room also contains a number of very small closed cells, the size of lockers. In the sections of the octagon that have not been mentioned are two categories of rooms: small, individual rooms for political prisoners, and larger rooms for military and regular prisoners.[3]

Phu Quoc: This prison on Phu Quoc Island near the Cambodian sea border, houses about 30,000 prisoners from fifteen to sixty years old, who have been captured by American or Vietnamese soldiers during military operations, and who have been suspected of being NLF members. They are guarded by a number of ordinary prisoners who have committed acts of piracy or murder, etc. This prison is administered by a lieutenant colonel and other military officers.

Thu Duc: This prison houses from 3,000 to 4,000 prisoners and is located in the Thu Duc district of the Gia Dinh province. It is reserved for female prisoners who were arrested in the Saigon, Cholon or surrounding areas; or for other female prisoners from other provinces who have heavier sentences, or for those who have not been tried. The prison is administered by a commanding officer of the army.

Tan Hiep: This prison also houses from 3,000 to 4,000 prisoners and is located near the Bien Hoa airstrip on the old highway between Bien Hoa and Vung Tau. This is a detention place for political prisoners who have not had a trial and for those prisoners who have already served a prison term but who have not been released. It is now being moved to Vung Tau.

Con Dao Polo Condor (Con Son Island): This prison houses more than 15,000 prisoners. Con Dao is an island with a governmental administration comparable to that of a province. There is a town hall as well as a Provincial Security Service (*Ty Con An*) but there are no civilian residents—only soldiers, civil servants, supervisors and their families, and prisoners. Here there are two big prisons, "Prison House No. 1" and "Prison House No. 2," and another small prison at the Security Service headquarters. Also on

[3] The foregoing description of Chi Hoa can best be understood by visualizing a structure like the one diagrammed below, keeping in mind that the sections are combined differently on different floors.

the island are the dreaded "tiger cages" for important prisoners. Con Dao is administered by a lieutenant colonel, a security chief and a number of other military officers.

2. Official provincial prisons

Each one of the 58 provincial prisons usually houses from 500 to 1,000 prisoners, though there are some that are much larger, like the one in Gia Dinh province, located near the Gia Dinh Town Hall. The Gia Dinh prison holds from 1,500 to 2,500 persons and is used for the temporary confinement of prisoners being sent by the National Police to Tan Hiep and Con Dao. Other important prisons are Ben Tre and My Tho, each with from 1,000 to 1,500 and sometimes 2,000 prisoners; the Nha Trang, which keeps political prisoners who are waiting to be brought before military courts in the southern provinces, and has a capacity of between 2,000 and 3,000; Qui Nhon, Da Nang, and Hoi An, with an average capacity of 1,500. In Hue, there are two large prisons, Thua Phu and Mang Ca Nho. The Thua Phu prison takes military prisoners, political prisoners and ordinary prisoners who have been tried. In the Mang Ca Nho prison (as is also true of the Tan Hiep prison in the south), there are only prisoners being held in detention. Thua Phu and Mang Ca Nho each houses about 2,500 prisoners.

Secret and Semi-Official Prisons: Saigon

The list that follows accounts for only a part of the secret and semi-official prisons in South Vietnam. No one really knows how many there are, as secret prisons are hidden away in private villas, in public buildings, in army barracks, etc. In general, these prisons are administered by the officials who have arrested the people incarcerated in them.

In the general headquarters of the National Police Force (*Tong Nha Canh Sac Quoc Gia*) in Saigon, there are two prisons, each with a capacity of from 2,000 to 3,000 prisoners. One is located within the limits of the Central Bureau of Investigation and is called *Cau Luu Xa* (detention center); it has three rows of cells for political prisoners who are being investigated. About two hundreds meters from *Cau Luu Xa*, still within the grounds of the National Police Force Headquarters, there is a big L-shaped prison, two stories high, with six large rooms and more than ten cells. Among the prisoners here, only about ten percent are criminals; the rest are political prisoners who have been sent from other prisons for interrogation by the Central Bureau of Investigation, or who have fully served their sentences or detention terms, but are still held for indefinite terms in prison.

The *Hoat Vu* has eight secret prisons in villas scattered throughout the Saigon-Cholon-Gia Dinh area, with perhaps 100 to 200 prisoners held in each. (See reference in Part I). The District Police Headquarters in Saigon operates nine prisons, each housing from 50 to 100 prisoners. There is one prison at Official Police Headquarters with a capacity from 50 to 100, and the Bureau of Military Security (*Cuc An Ninh Quan Doi*) operates a prison near the Saigon Zoo in District 1, that can accommodate between 300 and 600 prisoners. The Secret Service of the Army Headquarters own a prison housing 300 to 500, located near the Tan Son Nhut Airport, and the Central Intelligence Service also has a prison located at Ben Bach Dang that holds from 200 to 500. (This number was furnished by a political prisoner who stayed in the Central Intelligence Service prison for about six months. He said that the figures may not be accurate, since the activities of the Central Intelligence Service are kept very secret.)

Secret and Semi-Official Prisons: The Provinces

The National Police, the Special Police, the *Hoat Vu*, the Military Security Forces, and the Local Army Forces each have one prison in the provinces, and there is one in each military barracks of the American and Allied Forces. Every one of these prisons houses an average of thirty to fifty prisoners.

In each district of every province there is one prison that holds the combined prisoners of the Security District Branch of the Special Police, the *Dan Ve*, the Cadres of the Provincial Government Rural Reconstruction Program, and those arrested by the district chief. Here and there in every district, wherever there is a barracks, no matter now big or small it is, there is always a small room that serves as a prison for the captives of the *Dan Ve* and of the village councils.

Finally, in each barracks in the district, there are one or more rooms reserved for the "night prisoners." These are peasants who have not violated the law but who are considered potential violators. They are in prison only from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. and are allowed to go home during the day.

The number of prisoners held in these provincial jails varies greatly, of course, depending on the political and military situation and on the mood of those who are in power.

VI. INSIDE THE PRISONS

Though conditions differ somewhat from one prison to another, they are bad enough in all to weaken or destroy the physical and mental health of most prisoners. Torture, filth, overcrowding, malnutrition—these are the common lot of the victims of South Vietnamese justice.

Chi Hoa

Chi Hoa in Saigon is considered the best of the prisons, and is, in fact, used as a showcase to obscure the horrors common to the rest of the prisons in South Vietnam, although visitors who are aware of its showcase status could scarcely feel sanguine about conditions elsewhere.

The quarters in Chi Hoa vary in quality from one section to another (See Part V), but the communal cells which house most of the political prisoners are occupied by sixty to eighty persons—thus providing a space of about fifty square decimeters (or approximately 5 square feet) for each prisoner. There is enough air to breathe in these rooms because one of the four walls in each is barred.

Prisoners in Chi Hoa receive two full meals each day, plus soup for breakfast. Each prisoner is allowed one and one-half kilos of cooked rice, 200 grams of vegetables, seventy grams of meat or fish, and twenty grams of sugar per day. These provisions are bought by a contractor who receives a commission and hands on the goods to regular prisoners (i.e., those convicted of crimes such as robbery) in charge of the prison kitchen. There are deals between the contractor and the prison administrators to take some of the food allowance for themselves, so that the prisoners rarely receive their just quota. The above amounts are the official quotas per prisoner, but not what they actually receive. Although rice is the staple diet of the prisoners, the quality of rice they are given is very low. It is of coarse grade and contains grit.

Saigon is extremely hot, especially in the summer, which lasts eight months of the year. The water supply in the prison is always low. At each corner of the octagon is a tank of water measuring about five cubic meters. This water must provide for all the needs of the 900 to 1,000 prisoners in the sixteen communal cells. Each receives a maximum of about five liters (1.8 gals) of water a day which must serve for cooking, drinking, bathing, washing, etc.

All political prisoners are required to pledge allegiance to the flag and to practice shouting patriotic slogans. At least five times a week, they must receive prison administrators or visitors to the prison, greeting them with these slogans. They are forbidden to discuss politics or any news coming from the outside, and they may not refer to Chi Hoa as a prison. They must call it a rehabilitation center. After curfew at seven or eight o'clock in the evening, they are not allowed to sit or stand or talk to one another but must lie down and go to sleep. In the non-curfew hours, they are not allowed to lie down. Those who violate any of these rules are sent into the Hall of Photography and Pictures (*Phong Dien Anh*), where they are tied up and beaten. Sometimes they are placed in solitary confinement for days on end in a dark room filled with mosquitoes. A considerable number of political prisoners refuse from the beginning to obey any of the regulations. After a week of punishment in the Hall of Photography and Pictures, these prisoners are shut up in individual windowless cells in the OB and OC sections of the octagon, and their diet is reduced to plain rice and salt. Every two weeks they are brought back to the Hall of Photography and Pictures for more punishment.

Prisoners who have not been tried may receive visitors and supplies only with the permission of the military court, and those who have violated prison rules are allowed no visitors or supplies. Usually prisoners may see their families and receive gifts from them once a month and, after they are sentenced, the visits may be increased to twice a month with the permission of the prison administration, but prisoners and their visitors must always sit far apart. They may not touch each other, and the visits last for only five minutes.

Censorship of mail is very strict. Often prisoners receive letters with everything deleted but the salutation and signature. Neither incoming nor outgoing letters may mention any personal problems; incoming letters must not be written on colored stationery, and may not be typed. All papers, magazines and books, except for small dictionaries, are forbidden.

There is a hospital at Chi Hoa run by a doctor, but his priority patients are military officers and administrative personnel and their families. Part of his job is to perform quick autopsies on dead prisoners and to sign their death certificates. Invariably he finds that any deaths in the prison occur as the result of disease, whereas, in fact, many result from the treatment inflicted in the Hall of Photography and Pictures. The hospital is in the ED section of the octagon, but a number of prisoners who suffer from leprosy, tuberculosis or mental illnesses are sent to a special prison in the Cho Quan hospital in Saigon.

Often during the night, one may hear tragic and desperate voices crying for help. "Sir! Sir!" someone may cry. "There is a man vomiting blood in room 2F!" or "Sir! Sir! There is someone in room OB who is dying!" Generally no one comes to help, although sometimes a nurse appears with a little powdered quinine. (This is used as a treatment for every disease and ailment, from colds and stomach ache to hemorrhages.) As often as not the prisoner ends his cry with the desperate shout, "That's that! The man has just died in room OB. Do you hear, Sir?"

Con Dao, Polo Condor

Often referred to as the Island of Con Son, Con Dao is called "hell" by persons confined there. Here are to be found the notorious "tiger cages," and it is here that murder by starvation is most commonly used as a punishment.

Many prisoners who have been sentenced to hard labor are sent to Con Dao, and many of these are put to work at the centers of Lo Voi or So Cui. At Lo Voi prisoners work in quarries, breaking and carrying stones for the construction of prison units, road repair, etc., and some are made to wade deep into the sea to gather shells for the lime kiln.

At So Cui, the prisoners must climb long distances over high mountains to gather half a cubic meter of wood each day. The forests

on the mountains have been exploited for years; trees are scarce, and it is forbidden to cut many of those that remain. At the end of the day, if it has not been possible to find the allotted amount of wood, the prisoners are beaten so severely that they must often crawl back to their cells. Yet the next day they are expected to go back to the mountains for more wood. What they gather is used to make furniture for the mainland homes of military officers and supervisors of the prison.

Three months after their arrival at Con Dao, prisoners who have a trade are selected to go to work at So Moc, the carpentry center, So Chan Nuoi, the livestock center, So Ray, the agricultural center, or So Luoi, the fishing center. The best produce from these centers is kept for the Province Chief, a lieutenant colonel, who is also the director of the rehabilitation center of the prison. Military officials are given the next best produce, and the rest is for supervisors and soldiers.

As in all other prisons, the prisoner's food in Con Dao is provided by a dealer and there is always an agreement between him and the administrators to keep some of the money that is supposed to be spent on food. Once a month, a supply ship comes from the mainland to the island, bringing rice of very low quality, dried fish, so poor and rotten that it would be used only as fertilizer outside prison, and some pigs and a number of cows. Military officials, supervisors, and soldiers are not anxious to share the rice or the fish, but are very willing to take the larger share of the pigs and the cows, leaving each prisoner with an average of about 10 grams of pork and beef per month.[4]

Because of the shortage of food, prisoners sent to work at So Ray and So Luoi, the agricultural and fishing centers, must steal whatever fish and vegetables they can, though if caught, they are sent to the "tiger cages." These tiger cages are housed in two long cement structures divided into thirty units each. The cages are too small for a man to lie full-length inside them; the barred top of each cage is so low that it can be reached with the hand. Over the bars is a catwalk for the guards, and over all is a roof or awning made of corrugated metal.

When a prisoner is consigned to a period of punishment in one of the tiger cages, his clothing is first removed and he is beaten into a state of unconsciousness. Then he is thrown into the cage. While he is there, he is not allowed to take a shower or even wash himself; his cage is his bathroom; his only food is bowls of rice lowered into the cage from above; the metal roof above the cage makes it very hot during the day and very cold at night; supervisors may suddenly pour down water from above or urinate onto the head of the prisoner. Sometimes they throw rocks or filthy excremental liquids. Their aim is to keep the prisoner in a state of constant fear, pain and despair.

Once or twice a week, guards and supervisors bring ordinary prisoners (those convicted for criminal offenses), armed with sticks to administer beatings to those within the cages. After the beatings, more water is poured down upon their heads. When I was at Chi Hoa, a supervisor from Con Dao told me that after having seen the liquid swilling around the cages, a mixture of water, blood, excrement and white rice vomited by prisoners after a beating, he was unable to eat for three days.

[4] Prisoners do their own cooking and combine the small portions of meat that come to them infrequently with rice in a common stew. Only certain prisoners who were formerly high grade civil servants, military officers, businessmen, or rich politicians are granted higher living standards. They manage this by bribing the administration or by using family influence within the Government circle.

Some prisoners are kept caged for several months; only about thirty percent of these survive.

Because there are not enough tiger cages for all the prisoners the administration wants to punish, hundreds of others are locked in dark cells with only a few air holes. They are not permitted to wash themselves, have no toilet facilities, and are fed only unsalted white rice, and their confinement may last for months. After the first twenty days, one out of every two hundred prisoners dies; after a month, two die, and so it goes on up to the point where from five to ten prisoners die every day. Their corpses are removed from the cells once every three days.

As time goes on, the prisoners' bodies darken gradually from the feet upward and there is no feeling in the parts of the body that have gone dark. Death is approaching slowly, minute by minute, and the prisoners are very well aware of this. When the death rate reaches fifty percent, the administrators open the cells and stop the punishment. Prisoners from Con Dao have told me that when the cell doors open, the survivors try desperately to crawl into the yard and eat the grass. These blades of grass are sufficient to postpone their deaths and to keep them alive for the next wave of punishment.

Tan Hiep

The number of political prisoners at Tan Hiep is increasing rapidly, the majority of them being sent there on suspicion. As the Government has not found enough evidence against them to bring them before a military court, they are being held in detention. Tan Hiep is the most crowded of the official prisons. In a large prison room, each prisoner may have a sleeping space of only 20 centimeters by 2 meters (about 8" x 80"). Prisoners are not allowed to lie facing each other because the administration fears any communication between political prisoners, even if it is only by movement of the lips or eyes. That is why one sees hundreds of prisoners all lying on the cement floor, facing the same direction. They can change the direction only with the permission of the night guard whom they elect themselves and who is approved by the prison administration.

During the night if they wish to go to the lavatory, they must raise their hands. The prisoner may have to wait for hours before he is allowed to go, since there is only one WC for each prison room and that is occupied night and day.

The list of regulations in this prison is very long, and the prisoners must learn it by heart during the first five days after their arrival. Those who do not resign themselves to the iron regulations here are punished by regular beatings before being sent to the tiger cages or the confinement cells of Con Dao.

Cau Luu Xa (The Detention Center) and the Prison of the General Headquarters

In both prisons, men are packed like sardines into the cells. There are rooms in the detention center where prisoners have to be divided into three groups, so that everyone can have a chance to sleep for a few hours during the night; one group sleeps lying down, one group sleeps sitting down, and one group clings to the iron bars to make room for the other two groups.

At the detention center, each prisoner is allowed to wash once a day, but at the Prison of the General Headquarters, there is not so much water. Every three days, each prisoner is given two liters (about two quarts) of water for washing clothes and bathing. Because of the lack of water, prisoners must use chemical toilets located inside the cell.

Many of the prisoners here have skin diseases and coughs. Every night there are prisoners who suffocate and lose consciousness, and there are a considerable number who contract tuberculosis.

The Prisons of the Hoat Vu

Because of the need for secrecy, the *Hoat Vu* cannot set up well-organized prisons, and must put prisoners into rooms wherever they can find them, often into servants' quarters in private villas. To prevent escape, they chain prisoners to iron bars, sometimes five or ten prisoners to each bar. Strong prisoners have their hands tied as well.

Most of those arrested and taken to the *Hoat Vu* jails consider suicide, for they know that they have no way to escape the tortures which await them. Even if they are innocent, even if they resist making confessions, even if they confess all or make false confessions—whatever they do, they will be submitted to torture and punishment.

A prisoner who attempts suicide or who is suspected of making a suicide attempt is punished by being bound hand and foot and by having a wooden cylinder placed between his jaws and tied with wires behind his head. He is fed on soup with the cylinder still in his mouth, and is sometimes left in this state for a week. Prisoners in this way cannot close their mouths for twenty-fours after the torture is ended and cannot chew food for at least a week.

The Cho Quan Hospital Prison

Cho Quan is a hospital for the treatment of mental illnesses and dangerous contagious diseases. In the compound of this hospital is a prison housing about 600 very ill prisoners. Both ordinary criminal prisoners and political prisoners are sent here from the five big prisons and the *Hoat Vu* and the Police Services in the Saigon-Cholon-Gia Dinh area. All these diseases are common: leprosy, tuberculosis, venereal disease, mental illness. Cho Quan is considered to be the dirtiest prison in South Vietnam. At least two or three prisoners die daily, mostly from tuberculosis. Each year several prisoners die of injuries received after they have attempted to climb into a very slippery sanitary toilet. Insane prisoners sometimes go beserk and murder others.

The principal medicines in use here are quinine, sulfa, phenobarbital, and camphor oil. They are used for treating all diseases.

Who are the political prisoners?

The easiest and best way to learn of the social position, political affiliation and religious tendencies of political prisoners in South Vietnam is to read the daily report made out by the administration of each prison. For example, the September 15, 1968, report[5] from the Chi Hoa Prison reads as follows:

Religious affiliation	Political prisoners	Ordinary prisoners	Military prisoners	Total
Catholic	163	29	24	216
Buddhist	1,315	42	51	1,408
Protestant	32	5	11	48
Cao Dai	31	1	4	36
Hao Hao	42	3	7	52
No religion	72	10	28	110
Total	1,665	90	125	1,870

According to the report, if one examines only the case of political prisoners one will see:

$$\text{Buddhists} = \frac{1315}{1655} \quad 79\%$$

$$\text{Christians} = \frac{163+32}{1655} \quad 12\%$$

Followers of other religions or nonreligious prisoners=9%

Apart from this report, there are 3 other kinds of reports: the number of prisoners per room (to calculate the food supply); the

[5] This report is chalked on the walls of the offices of 6 sections in the Chi Hoa prisons. The numbers are changed every day at 9 a.m.

number of prisoners accused of being communists; the social position of political prisoners.

The last two reports are secret, and are sent to *Van Phong Kiem Tra*, the head office of the Hall of Pictures and Photographs. They are also incorporated in the general daily report that is sent by the Chi Hoa prison administration to the General Director of Rehabilitation Centers. The two items that are most important in the report are the numbers of communists and peasants. When I took note of the report on section FG at Chi Hoa prison, the number of communists were 50 out of 1655 political prisoners. That is about 3.3% of the prisoners. The number of peasants was listed at 1062 (about 64%). What will people think if they look at the percentages in the report? Twelve per cent of the prisoners are Catholic, 79% are Buddhist, 3.3% are communists and 64% are peasants?

VII. AFTER SERVING THE TERM

Some years ago, prison administrators used to attempt to persuade prisoners to obey regulations by promising them shortened terms. These promises were never kept and administrators have stopped making them. Now they promise that if the prisoner behaves himself, he will be released after he has fully served his term.

This promise is meaningful, because of late years, most prisoners are not released at the end of their terms, but detained in prison for another six months to a year. Those in unofficial prisons are often kept indefinitely. Political prisoners with families in Saigon are released after serving their sentences, only if they produce a written guarantee signed by three relatives certifying that they will take responsibility for the future political actions of the prisoner.

Upon his release, the prisoner receives only a temporary resident card issued by the Chief of the Special Police. He must present himself once a week or once a fortnight thereafter to the police headquarters of his district and also to the Central Bureau of Investigation. Each time he goes, he must relate in minutest detail all of his activities, what he has done, whom he has seen and so on, and each time, he must take with him some clothes, a towel and a toothbrush in case he is rearrested. Where he goes, he is followed by an Active Intelligence Service agent, who sometimes comes directly into his house and demands a monthly payment for "protection."

The former prisoner now lives in a permanent state of anxiety, feeling that he has no real freedom, not daring to visit intimate friends because, if he did, he would have to mention their names at the Bureau of Investigation. Eventually he is either rearrested or finds himself obliged to escape the city and seek refuge with the NLF, as he feels that he cannot return to the terror of the torture room and the prison.

Mr. HAWKINS. I would like to introduce also a statement from the Fellowship of Reconciliation, which also conducted an investigation of prison conditions, in a letter to me under date of July 14.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION,
Nyack, N.Y., July 14, 1970.

Representative AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAWKINS: I am pleased to see your concern about the situation of political prisoners held in the "tiger cages" in the prison on Con Son Island, and particularly to see that moves are being made to extend the investigation to other of South Vietnamese prisons.

Cruelty and torture in prison are bad enough in themselves, but as the *Washington Star* observed the other day, what is particularly important here is who are held and why. Non-Communist opponents of the present regime in Saigon are the principal victims not only in Con Son, but in the nine "interrogation centers" in Saigon alone, plus others scattered through the country, at which systematic torture for the purpose of intimidation is the rule. All this reflects the fact that there is a very formidable peace movement in South Vietnam, largely nonviolent, oriented to the Buddhist Church and the student movement but including representatives of all segments of the society, which is totally opposed to the Thieu government and to continuation of the war.

I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of my recent book, *Saigon, U.S.A.*, in which I have tried to assemble the story and have included considerable documentation, including the full report of last year's U.S. Study Team on Religious and Political Freedom in Vietnam and excerpts from "Imprisonment and Torture in South Vietnam" by a noted South Vietnamese journalist who spent four years in that country's prisons.

Another "investigation," whether by the South Vietnamese or the United States government, will simply be a means of mollifying public opinion. No real accomplishment will be possible in connection with the mistreatment of tens of thousands of political prisoners in that country until it is openly recognized that their mistreatment is part of the calculated policy by which the Thieu government stays in power, and which is connived in, supported and financed by the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED HASSLER.

Mr. HAWKINS. I also introduce the statement by our colleague (Mr. ANDERSON) appearing in the RECORD of July 16, in which he enters a letter from a Dr. Marjorie Nelson, a competent medical authority. He describes also the filthy conditions, the neglect, and the fact that children are sometimes incarcerated along with their mothers with some of the prisoners in this compound.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement and letter are as follows:

QUANG NGAI PRISON

(By Hon. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON)

Mr. Speaker, under previous unanimous consent request, I submit for he RECORD a letter I received from Dr. Marjorie Nelson of Connecticut. I have discussed the letter at some length with Dr. Nelson by telephone. It is a most revealing letter, giving further explicit evidence of the outrageous treatment of political prisoners by the Saigon government. Dr. Nelson has advised me that the children of whom she speaks generally range from infants to youngsters of 10, crowded with their mother into 15-by-15 feet cells—as many as 50 in a cell. Are these children "Communist criminals"?

Dr. Nelson proved to my satisfaction that her reporting is objective by pointing out in our telephone conversation that the head of Quang Ngai Prison was a very humane, understanding, and helpful man, concerned about the conditions in the prison under his direction, but unable to alleviate conditions because of the lack of physical resources available to him.

JULY 8, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I have read with more than casual interest the accounts in the *New York Times*, July 7, and July 8, of your visit to Con Son Island prison in the first week of July. I worked as a doctor with the American Friends Service Committee Project in Quang Ngai from October, 1967, to Otcober 1969, as part of my work there, I made regular vists once or twice a week to the Quang Ngai civilian prison where I examined and treated prisoners. I would like to share my experiences with you as I feel it is directly related to your own brief visit.

The prison in Quang Ngai was built by the French to house approximately 500 prisoners. During the time I worked there, the prison population ranged from 800 to 1300—usually between 150–300 of them women. Many of these women had their children with them—40–120 children. Crowding was compounded by the fact that in August, 1967, the NLF troops attacked and overran the prison (releasing some 1000 prisoners) and damaged several buildings. At least two of these large buildings were still partially or completely roofless in the fall of 1969. I quote from a letter I sent to the American Friends Service Committee in Philadelphia in February, 1969, shortly after I had returned from a furlough to my work in Quang Ngai:

"In addition to the room I described to you in [a previous letter], I found the following: two small square rooms approximately 15x15 at most with only small slit windows at the top of three walls held respectively 50 and 40 women and children. No beds provided in either one. A large room approximately 45x15 with two-tiered wooden bunks filling the room leaving an aisle between housed 200 women. They sleep on the floor as well as on both tiers. Another room, slightly smaller, houses 75 women and 3 children, but contains only a couple tables and no beds. Two other small rooms, perhaps 12x30 housed a total of 74 women—also with no beds. These latter two rooms have now been emptied and another large building without a roof is now being occupied by an undetermined no. of women. Large tarpaulin tents have been spread over the rafters to provide a roof of sorts.

"My first visit after I returned, I found widespread colds and diarrhea among the patients, especially the children, which is to be expected when a lot of people get thrown together like this. The dispensary was completely out of all cough medicine and diarrhea preparations and had been for several days."

We were invited by the Prison Chief in the summer of 1968 to make regular medical visits to the prison because he had many sick prisoners. Successive Prison Chiefs were very helpful to us and eager for us to continue our work. We were given free access to the prison by day and cooperation from the prison Chief on several occasions when our work required it. We were informed both by prison officials and by prisoners that 80% or more of the inmates were "political prisoners." Personal conversations with prisoners seemed to indicate that in many cases their "political crime" was improper or incomplete papers, presence in an "unauthorized place," or, in the case of the women, inability to account for the whereabouts of their husbands who were therefore assumed to be NLF guerrillas. In addition, many prisoners paid bribes to gain their release and on several occasions the assertion was made to me that they had been arrested for the sole purpose of extorting money from them.

We were told by officials that this was a minimum security prison and no one was supposed to stay who had a sentence of more than four to six months. However, prisoners

never met their accusers (except in the Province Interrogation Center), never had a trial, and never knew the length of their sentences. I talked with several who were in for as long as a year.

It is my understanding that regulations provide for a nurse to be assigned to the province prison. However, the nurse assigned to Quang Ngai prison was an opium addict and I only met him in the dispensary once in my 13 months there. Prisoners themselves manned the dispensary using whatever knowledge had been passed on to them about administration of drugs and treatment of disease. In addition to crowding, there was neither running water nor latrines in any of the rooms where prisoners were confined from 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. and food and water were both provided in unsanitary if not contaminated condition.

In addition to treating the common ailments and the infectious diseases and malnutrition occasioned by these conditions, I also regularly examined and treated prisoners who had been tortured. This seems not to have occurred in the prison itself but in the Province Interrogation Center. I saw dozens of patients with bruises of varying severity. I also examined patients who had coughed up, vomited, or urinated blood after being beaten about the chest, back, and stomach. On at least two occasions I was able to document by x-rays fractures of bones following beatings. Prisoners also told me of being tortured by electricity with wires attached to ears, nipples, and genitalia; by being forced to drink concoctions containing powdered lime and other noxious substances, and by being tied up and suspended by ropes often upside down from the rafters for hours. On at least three occasions, patients seriously ill or injured and under my care were removed to the Province Interrogation Center without my knowledge for further interrogation.

In April, 1969, another team member and I presented this situation to the American Province Senior Advisor asking his advice as to how to seek to stop these practices. He shared our distress at this and promised to speak to the man in charge of the Province Interrogation Center—a project started by the U.S. to teach "enlightened intelligence and interrogation procedures." In a subsequent visit he informed us that the Province Interrogation Center was no longer under U.S. control but had been turned over to the Vietnamese and therefore he would encourage us to go directly to Colonel Khein, the Province Chief. On April 20, 1969, we spent approximately thirty-five minutes with Colonel Khein and I presented my experience and we expressed our conviction that this was self-defeating on political grounds as well as unacceptable on humanitarian grounds. He essentially acknowledged that some beating did take place and that he was aware of it; that some prisoners were "very hard" and refuse to talk and in such situations physical force was necessary and was employed to get information. However, he said, "there are limits." We suggested that he might need to intervene with the Province Interrogation Center authorities to see that this was adhered to, but my impression was that he was not willing or not able to substantially alter the practices.

In August, 1969, in my prenatal clinic in the prison, I examined a woman, seven months pregnant, who had been badly beaten the previous week. This was the worst example of the beatings which I continued to see so I again called on the American Province Senior Advisor and brought this latest case to his attention. He promised to raise it with the Province Chief again. He went on to say, due to a recent directive from Saigon to free prisoners who guilt was only suspected and the general pressure about the treatment of prisoners, that quite a few prisoners had been released (the census at that time was down slightly—about 1100). He also said that the Americans had been sending fewer people into the interrogation center. He seemed to imply that the Americans were largely responsible for sending detainees to the Province Interrogation Center although they did not control the center itself. There were very few going through it then compared to the one hundred per month previously, he stated. He said, "That means at least fewer people will be getting 'the treatment' and supposedly only those people most likely to be 'productive'." I replied that in my opinion even if that woman, for example, was a known NLF cadre, I didn't consider it acceptable to beat a pregnant woman.

Since returning to the United States I have shared my experience with a few Senators and Congressmen or their aides. My concern and that of the American Friends Service Committee has always been to alleviate the suffering of these prisoners. I urge you to do whatever you can to end these inhuman practices and I am ready to offer you any further help that I can.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE NELSON, M.D.

Mr. HAWKINS. I certainly want to indicate that I have tried to correct just a few of the mistakes of the gentleman from Illinois. There are many others. But I would not want to indulge further on the time of this body. I simply would like to say that we went to Vietnam as part of a select committee, that all of the members of this committee had great respect for each other. We differed politically, we differed ideologically, but we never questioned each other's integrity.

I include the following items:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 8, 1970]

SAIGON TORTURES THOSE WHO SEEK PEACE

(By Hon. DONALD M. FRASER)

Mr. Speaker, on May 30, the New York Times noted the occupation of the Veteran's Ministry in Saigon by 200 disabled South Vietnamese veterans. On the same day, thousands of students and Buddhist monks demonstrated at the state funeral for Phan Khac Suu, former South Vietnamese Chief of State. The Thieu-Ky government responded to the veteran's sit-in and the student demonstration with tear gas and clubs.

It has been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that students, disabled war veterans, Buddhist monks and laymen have been holding demonstrations in Saigon almost every day since mid-April. In addition to tear gas and clubs, many demonstrators have also been subjected to torture and imprisonment.

These demonstrations against the Thieu-Ky government and the continuation of the Indochina war have not been adequately reported in the American press.

The following statement from the Fellowship of Reconciliation and an article by Don Luce, former head of International Voluntary Services by Vietnam and coauthor of "Vietnam: The Unheard Voices," describe the brutal and repressive response of the South Vietnamese Government to these sincere demands for reform and peace.

I believe every Member of Congress should be aware of the repressive nature of the Thieu-Ky regime which claims to be our ally in the search for peace.

STUDENT PROTESTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

While the attention of the American public has been riveted on the protests and demonstrations of American students and other anti-war forces, a sequence of equally significant and far more hazardous actions in South Vietnam has gone almost entirely unreported and unnoticed.

For more than two months, protests against the war and the government of Generals Thieu, Ky and Khiem have occurred almost daily under the leadership of students, disabled war veterans, Buddhist monks and laymen, and Catholic priests, and have led to the beating, imprisonment and torture of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of their participants.

The Thieu government is facing a crisis comparable to that preceding the fall of President Ngo Dinh in 1963, and has reacted with predictably ferocious repression. Yet the demonstrations continue. When police surrounded the Cambodian embassy in Saigon that had been occupied by 400 students in protest against the Cambodian adventures, and refused to allow other students to pass through to bring them food, members of the House of Representatives carried the food to the students.

Important Saigon newspapers, including *tin sang, Dong nai* and *Duoc Nha Nam* have challenged the omnipresent censorship by carrying stories of these actions, with photographs, on their front pages. It is reported that, as a consequence, 40 of the last 48 issues of *tin sang* alone have been confiscated by the police.

All universities and high schools have been closed; arrests have multiplied, and the most brutal forms of torture inflicted on the protesting students. Repression has been characteristic of the Thieu government since its formation, but according to eyewitnesses, is worse now than ever.

Yet almost none of this has been reported in the American press. The U.S. embassy in Saigon refused even to see a delegation of American relief workers protesting American collusion in the repression.

We align ourselves with these students, and will seek every way possible to identify with them more directly. We call on the peace movement in the United States, and particularly the students, to find means to publicize and reinforce these actions by their Vietnamese counterparts.

We remonstrate with the American press for its failure to report and interpret these events to their American readers. Nothing so clearly reveals the nature of this war as the fact that the Thieu government is so strenuously opposed by these non-NLF, non-Communist people in their own country.

We plead with the officials of our own government, at every level, to withdraw support from this tyrannical puppet we have created, and take the burden of the war off the backs of the Vietnamese people.

TORTURE IN SAIGON

(By Don Luce)

It is now known beyond any doubt that the Saigon police are subjecting Vietnamese students to brutal torture in an attempt to stifle student dissent against the war and the government. On April 21, ten of these young people were released. Their condition was pitiable but not nearly as grave as that of some whom they left behind in prison.

Do Huu But lies in semi-shock in a laboratory at the College of Agriculture which has been converted into a dispensary for the ten released prisoners. His fingernails are blackened from having pins pushed underneath. He is nearly deaf from having had soapy water forced into his ears, after which they were beaten. Miss Que Huong, a philosophy teacher at Doan Thi Diem high school in Can Tho, forces a small smile when visitors come. Her knees are swollen three times their normal size, and black and blue welts cover her thin arms. She was completely undressed in front of several policemen who watched and drank whisky while she was beaten. Her fiance, Nguyen Ngoc Phong, was brought into the room to watch in an attempt to get him to sign confession papers.

After five weeks in jail, Luu Hoang Thao,

deputy chairman of the Van Hanh University student association, is one of the few students in good enough physical condition to give an extended interview:

"For the first three days, the police beat me continuously," he said. "They didn't ask me any questions or to sign anything. They just beat my knee caps and neck with billy clubs, then hit me with chair legs until I was unconscious. When I regained consciousness, they beat me again. Finally, after three days, they asked me to sign a paper that they had already written. I wouldn't sign it, so they beat me some more." Thao said he doesn't know why he was arrested or why he was released. Some observers believe that the government released the tortured students to frighten other students who have been demonstrating against government repression in large numbers in recent weeks. In any event, the torture of Luu Hoang Thao continued day after day, increasing in ferocity and variety. The details of what they did to him are sickening.

"Finally," he said, "they injected medicine into me and took my hand and signed a paper. It said that I had had liaison with the Communists."

Dr. Nguyen Dinh Mai, who is attending the ten students, said he did not yet know the full extent of their injuries.

"When they regain their strength, we will take them to one of the large hospitals for x-rays and thorough medical examinations," he said.

But the students are concerned about the many others who are still in jail. The condition of three of them, who were reported "too ill" to appear with other students for trial in Saigon April 20, was described by the newspaper *Tin Sang* (Morning News) on April 11. One lay near death from torture suffered for refusing to sign a statement that police had found weapons and explosives in his house. Two others were in grave condition with paralyzed legs in both cases and other serious injuries. While refusing to comment on its accuracy, a government spokesman, Nguyen Ngoc Huyen, called the article "objectionable" and had the paper confiscated—for the ninth time in less than a month.

Article 7 of the Constitution of South Vietnam specifically prohibits the use of torture or of confessions obtained by torture, threat or force. Yet signed statements obtained in this way are used extensively in the trials of political prisoners. In the case of the students, the government denies that it has tortured or manhandled them but will not comment on their obvious disfigurement when they appear in court.

The gravity of the situation has led several leading Vietnamese to come to the aid of the students. Father Nguyen Huy Lich, a respected Dominican priest, has investigated reports of torture and obtained substantiation from nurses and doctors who have the job of treating prisoners during the day in preparation for another night of torture. On March 31, Father Lich and seven other priests called upon the Saigon government to provide humane treatment of its prisoners. Others, like former Minister Vu Van Man, Vietnam's foremost legal authority, have joined the struggle against torture in the prisons.

On April 21, Leo Dorsey, a volunteer social worker with the Unitarian Universalist Committee in Vietnam, went to the U.S. Embassy to request a private interview with Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker for himself and a small group of American volunteers concerned with the fact that U.S. equipment is supporting the Saigon government's repression of its people. The tear gas grenades the police use, for example, are made by Federal Laboratories Inc. in Saltsburg, Pa., and are part of the U.S. assistance program to Vietnam. Mr. Dorsey's group was unable to meet with the ambassador or his deputy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 13, 1970]

VIET STUDENT TELLS OF 11 MONTHS IN TIGER CAGE AND TORTURE

(By Daniel Southerland)

SAIGON.—Cao Nguyen Loi is a thin, intense university student who recently spent 11 months in one of the so-called tiger cages at the prison island of Con Son.

He says he spent all but eight days of that time—seven of those days were holidays and one the day before he was released—shackled to the prison floor, with very little to eat or drink. He says he was beaten more times than he can count.

But the experience has not broken his spirit. If anything, it has straightened the 27-year-old student's opposition to the war and the American involvement in South Vietnam.

Released just six weeks ago, Mr. Loi looked healthy, but he complains of stomach and chest trouble resulting from his treatment.

PRISON RECRUITING GROUNDS

If only half of what Mr. Loi says about treatment at Con Son Island is true, and much of it rings true, then one can easily understand why the crowded prisons of South Vietnam have always been considered excellent recruiting centers for the Viet Cong.

In the French period, Con Son was known by some of its "graduates" as the "University of Ho Chi Minh."

Located in the South China Sea about 140 miles southeast of Saigon, Con Son is South Vietnam's largest civilian prison, with nearly 10,000 prisoners. About 400 of the prisoners are kept in the maximum-security block, the "tiger cages," where Mr. Loi spent most of his time on the island.

After having earlier denied the existence of the "tiger cages," the Saigon government now has issued a statement saying they are "separate quarters" for the disciplining of prisoners who "carried out instigations against the internal regulations" at Con Son.

Mr. Loi said he was shackled to an iron bar, along with four other prisoners, in a stone cell about 4½ feet wide and 10½ long. He said he was released from Con Son along with four other students about a year before his sentence was to end because of the protests of students in Saigon.

EXISTENCE DENIED

Last month Mr. Loi and the four other students submitted a report on conditions at Con Son to the South Vietnamese National Assembly. They later provided information on the location of the maximum-security block which enabled two United States congressmen, Augustus F. Hawkins (D) of California and William R. Anderson (D) of Tennessee, to get into the "tiger cage" area during a visit to Con Son on July 2.

Vietnamese authorities had told previous visitors to the island that these cells did not exist. U.S. officials had told this correspondent last year that the "tiger cages" had been done away with in 1968.

Mr. Loi was one of a number of Saigon university students arrested in mid-1968 for protesting the war and calling for a negotiated settlement. He and some of his colleagues, such as Nguyen Truong Con, editor of the student newspaper Sinh Vien (Student), opposed military conscription and the program of military training for students and blamed the U.S. for prolonging the war.

The Saigon government charged that the student newspaper had a "clear-cut pro-Communist tendency," and a military field court sentenced Mr. Con, the editor, to five years' imprisonment.

According to Mr. Loi, Mr. Con is still in prison at Con Son as is Mr. Loi's own younger brother.

TORTURE DESCRIBED

"We did not agree with President Thieu's policy of forcing people to go into the military service," said Mr. Loi.

"We saw that President Thieu's policy was a policy of war rather than peace," he said. "At a time when hopes for peace were rising, President Thieu forced more and more young people into the Army."

Following his arrest on July 6, 1968, Mr. Loi said he was beaten and tortured for two months at the national police headquarters in Saigon.

"They forced water into my stomach, beat on my chest, put my hands behind my back and hung me up by a rope, took electrodes and attached them to my sexual organs," he said.

"They beat me on the knees, shoulders, and the soles of my feet so that they became very swollen. After that they demanded that I sign a paper saying I was pro-Communist.

"At that time I had no derogatory papers on me except one paper from the student union asking for peace. I said I was not Communist or pro-Communist but only a student who wants peace.

CHARGES DENIED

"They replied that if you are a person who is for peace, then we will continue to beat you. So they beat me for two months. At that time I could not walk because of swollen feet.

He was given a three-year prison sentence based on a prepared statement—"forcibly signed after many beatings"—on charges of "disturbing national security."

He was transferred to the Chi Hoa prison in Saigon, where, he said, the prison director decided to send him and several other students on to Con Son Island for "hard labor."

Mr. Loi said he was sent to the "tiger cage" because he refused to admit to the charges made against him, refused to be trustee for the other prisoners or to do secretariat work, and "dared to protest" conditions in the prison.

Some of those confined to the "tiger cages" had refused to salute the South Vietnamese flag, he said.

U.S. RESPONSE

"If people accept the accusations made against them, they don't have to go to the tiger cases," he said. "But if they deny the charges and struggle for their basic rights, they are sent there."

The U.S. mission here replied to the charges of the two congressmen concerning the conditions they had observed in the maximum-security cells by issuing a statement saying responsibility for prison conditions in Vietnam rests with the Saigon government.

Mr. Loi does not agree.

"The American Government has to accept responsibility for this situation," he said, adding that it is the Americans who are responsible for the future.

"My only aspiration is to see the aspirations of the people fulfilled," he said, "and I am prepared to work against the injustices of the Americans and the present government."

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 10, 1970.

Ambassador BUI DIEM,
Embassy of Vietnam,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: We have received your letter of June 29, 1970 regarding the announced July 11, 1970 release of 62 North Vietnamese prisoners who have been held by your government, and also the decision to return to North Vietnam 24 North Vietnamese fishermen who were seized in 1965 and have been held prisoner ever since. We also have read accounts in the New York Times of the cruel treatment of prisoners on Con Son Island.

The New York Times reports that two U.S. Congressmen who were engaged in a fact-finding tour managed to gain entry to the notorious "tiger cages" area of Con Son where they found some 500 prisoners (both men and women) confined in 86 filthy concrete pits. The persons held in these claimed they were beaten, hungry, sick, without medicine and without sufficient water. The congressional fact-finders reported that while "it was high enough for the prisoners to stand up—none of the men did. They dragged themselves to the spot where they could look up and speak to us."

We have in mind the fact that possibly it may be claimed that some distinction must be made between "prisoners of war" and persons held on civil charges. We also have in mind that the line that separates "civil offenses" from participation in the armed struggle against your government and against the armed forces of the United States by Vietnamese is a very blurred line in South Vietnam today; this seems especially the case when one ponders the fact that the Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war provides among other things that:

1. An individual protected person detained as a spy or saboteur or under suspicion of activity hostile to the security of the occupying power shall be treated with humanity;

2. Protected persons shall at all times be humanely treated and no physical or moral coercion shall be used to obtain information from them.

However one may sort these matters out we are struck by your statement regarding the release of the 62 prisoners and the 24 fishermen in your June 29 letter that "we ask nothing in return from the Communists as we consider it a routine humanitarian act, common to any civilized nation of the world."

It has been our experience gained during our own efforts to engage in therapeutic and social service in Quang Ngai over a period of years that humanitarian standards are not observed as a matter of routine in South Vietnam when it comes to political prisoners, persons held in prison on suspicion of lending support or sympathy to the NLF forces, or persons accused of actively opposing the Thieu-Ky regime.

Medical staff connected with our Quang Ngai team have had direct, personal contact with civilian prisoners in the Quang Ngai jail who were routinely subjected to interrogation under torture at the Interrogation Center in Quang Ngai. Prisoners have told our medical staff members of having been taken from the jail to the Interrogation Center and there being beaten, tortured with electrodes, and otherwise subjected to cruel and inhumane treatment. Our medical and nursing staff have observed physical marks on the bodies of such prisoners (both men and women), and also psychological symptoms, which were corroborative of these reports of explicit and deliberate torture.

Our people have made complaints both to the local Vietnamese authorities and to the American authorities in Quang Ngai without any discernible effect.

So long as such conditions exist (and persistent rumors of similar conditions come from many parts of South Vietnam) it is idle for one to claim that treatment of prisoners in South Vietnam is humanitarian or civilized.

The American Friends Service Committee long has concerned itself with the plight of prisoners in Vietnam, both in South Vietnam and in the North, both American and Vietnamese. Over a period of months our representatives made a number of visits to North Vietnamese who were being held by the American authorities near Danang, inquiring about their needs and taking certain supplies to them. These visits continued until the release and repatriation of these prisoners about two years ago. Later one of our representatives while visiting in Phnom Penh made inquiries of representatives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and of the Provisional Revolutionary Government regarding possible services to others held in South Vietnam. In 1968 an AFSC staff member went to Hanoi and facilitated the repatriation of three American pilots released by the North Vietnamese authorities. At that time and subsequently AFSC representatives have carried packets of letters from relatives of Americans held in detention camps in North Vietnam and have returned with letters from the captured pilots to their relatives. One of our staff members in Quang Ngai, Dr. Majorie Nelson, was captured by Liberation Army forces in Hue during the 1968 Tet offensive and later, after 59 days was released unharmed. More recently two of our staff sent messages to North Vietnam officials expressing concern and hope for the early release of U.S. press correspondent Richard Dudman and his two colleagues who were captured in Cambodia and released unharmed after 41 days.

We mention these instances to indicate the intimacy and scope of our experience and concern as a service body for those held captive in this war. We would like to see the early release of all political prisoners and prisoners of war whether they be held in North or in the South in Vietnam. The release of even a small number is a step in the right direction.

But we are concerned also that such a step not be used, even inadvertantly, as an occasion to hide a wider and a more appalling condition of human cruelty and human suffering. While thousands are held under conditions of extreme harshness, as is now the case in South Vietnam, it is no time to congratulate either the government of the United States nor any of its allied government in South Vietnam. Much more must be done.

We enclose a letter written by our former staff colleague at Quang Ngai, Dr. Marjorie Nelson, who we mention above. Her letter is self-explanatory. If you would like to meet with Dr. Nelson and discuss her firsthand observations with respect to these matters, she has informed us that she would welcome the opportunity to meet with you.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS W. SCHNEIDER,
Associate Executive Secretary.

THE REHABILITATION SYSTEM OF VIETNAM

(By American Adviser Benson)

INTRODUCTION

OCTOBER 1, 1963.

In January 1961, PSD Rural Police Advisor William Benson was assigned additional duty as advisor to the Prison Rehabilitation system of Vietnam. He was directed to make a personal visit to each of the prisons throughout the entire country as a preliminary to a fuller understanding of the problems involved. In January 1962, he was assigned to full time duty as advisor to the Director of Prison Rehabilitation.

During the period from January 1961 to June 1963, Mr. Benson visited each of the 44 rehabilitation centers throughout Vietnam; several of them many times. These 44 centers are located in 36 of the 41 provinces of Vietnam. During this period, Mr. Benson traveled over 14,000 kilometers—10,000 by air (5,000 commercial and 5,000 USOM-chartered aircraft), 3,000 by road, 500 by water, 400 by rail and 100 by helicopter. Included in his visits were several trips to the "Devil's Island of the Pacific"—Poulo Condere, now named Con Son.

A major portion of this report was prepared by Mr. Benson with editing by PSD personnel; another portion was prepared by Mr. Raymond Landgren of PSD, while parts of it are translation of basic Vietnamese documents.

It is believed that the data gathered on this survey will be of value to various agencies for a number of purposes. Questions concerning this report will be most welcome at USOM/PSD Saigon headquarters.

FRANK E. WALTON,
Chief, Public Safety Division, USOM.

SAIGON, VIETNAM.

X. DISCIPLINE

Discipline in the centers is usually handled by the chief jailer in the most expeditious manner possible. There are some chiefs who, before they can punish any offender, must get the province chief's permission. Others only have to report that they did or are punishing some violator. In a few centers a committee of jailers and cadres handles all discipline cases. The cases are reviewed and approved by the province chief before any action can be started.

As a rule the minor or first violations are handled by the jailer or cadre who witnesses the act, but they may be brought to the attention of the chief jailer, who will reprimand the violator. In the case of serious or numerous violations, the chief jailer usually calls in the violator and the officer and discusses the case. As a rule the chief goes along with his staff and will then severely reprimand the individual, withdraw his privileges and/or confine him in a discipline cell, with or without constraints.

The loss of privileges is in itself a rather severe penalty, as one privilege is the weekly or bimonthly visit and gifts of food to supplement the center's rations. Other privileges that are often withdrawn are recreation periods, mail, hobbies or other money-making projects.

The confinement in a discipline cell may be from a few hours to several months, depending upon the center, the violation and the violator. For example in Con Son II, some of the hardcore communists keep preaching the "party" line, so these "Reds" are sent to the tiger cages in Con Son I where they are isolated from all others for months at a time.

This confinement may also include rice without salt and water—the U.S. prisons' equivalent of bread and water. It may include immobilization—the prisoner is bolted to the floor, handcuffed to a rod or bar, or legirons with the chain through an eyebolt, or around a bar or rod.

The discipline of staff members is much easier. They are either "slapped down" or transferred. The transfer is a rather severe punishment, as it goes against their record and the transferee must pay his own way. In some centers a staff member may be punished by assigning him additional duty. But this punishment is rather ineffective, as most jailers work excessively long hours.

The report I gave and that which was given by Mr. ANDERSON were given to all members of this select committee, and not one questioned our integrity. They might have a different interpretation, but they certainly did not question our integrity or the right we had to make our report.

I think it is unusual that a different report or a different version would come from someone who was not selected by the House, but who selected himself to make the trip and that a nonmember of the select committee has seen fit to say that we did not truthfully present what we actually reported to the full committee and to the House.

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

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say I have known the distinguished gentleman in the well for more than 30 years. I served with him in the California State Assembly 22 years ago, where he was the dean of that body. He has a legislative record in that State which I think has never been equaled.

The gentleman is a very thorough investigator and is far too experienced to expose himself to any possible error, especially on a matter as significant as this. My distinguished colleague has inspected many prisons as part of his duties during his long and distinguished legislative career. Some of the maximum detention facilities in California were very closely under his jurisdiction during his service. He knows the difference between a poorly run prison and a well-oiled public relations office.

If he—and only he—said conditions at Con Son Prison were deplorable, then that is a factual statement as far as I am concerned. But it is backed up by 26 color slides submitted to the subcommittee which I chair, plus the verbatim tapes taken at the residence of the Vietnamese colonel on Con Son and all through the tiger cages and back to the colonel's residence. At the moment, arrangements are being made to have a full translation made of those tapes, and they will be made available with the report of the subcommittee.

Second, I realize that when one wears rose-colored glasses, his view of what he sees may be somewhat different than what actually exists—and that seems to happen most frequently when one sees red. It is difficult to think of one's enemies as human beings who deserve the same type of humane treatment in prison that we expect and demand—at least we should certainly demand—for American prisoners of war.

I happen to have the honor of serving as chairman of the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. Our subcommittee is conducting the investigation into the economy and efficiency—yes, the effectiveness, if you like—of American assistance to the South Vietnamese national police force and penal system. The American taxpayer has invested more than $110 million in this type of assistance to Vietnam.

There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I am sorry to say, apparently, that is what has resulted from our aid to the Vietnamese for the national police and prison system. We had only good intentions and a plentiful supply of American dollars. But what we have accomplished is indeed a living hell.

We have helped to train a national police force which arrests Vietnamese citizens on the flimsiest of pretexts. I quote from testimony given the Foreign Operations Subcommittee by Mr. Robert H. Nooter, Assistant Administrator for Vietnam, Agency for International Development. He tells us:

> The information I have on that, Mr. Chairman, indicates that there are 6,112 who were tried, convicted, and sentenced by regular court processes. There were another 3,789, who were administratively sentenced by provincial security committees under wartime emergency detention procedures.

These are the detainees. They are there without any meaningful due process of law whatsoever.

I know that the North Vietnamese have just as efficient a system of railroading people into their prisons and they have been guilty of great cruelties, but I say, before God and all these witnesses here, that one wrong does not justify another.

I cannot believe this is what our men have been fighting and dying for.

There has been talk of blindness and deliberate misrepresentation on this issue. I, for one, find it difficult to stomach the contention that Con Son Prison is an island paradise down among the sheltering palms—somewhat similar to Hawaii. In reality, it is the Devil's Island of the Pacific and has been for the better part of a century.

Members may be interested to know that the original Devil's Island off the coast of French Guiana is also a tropical isle. Very much like Con Son, it too had tiger cages where human beings suffered. It too was a caged hell on earth.

I recall reading many years ago a book called "Dry Guillotine." I went back to refer to that book the other day, and in it were nearly exact duplicates of what ones sees in the 26 photographs that have been supplied the committee, some of which the gentleman showed in the well.

Let me point out here that in the statement prepared by Mr. Frank E. Walton, chief of AID's public safety program in Vietnam, and transmitted to the congressional party in advance of their visit, he made the assertion that Con Son Island Correction Center "has long held the reputation of being a 'Devil's Island.' This reputation still prevails in spite of an enlightened and modern administration of facility."

Yet a few days later, in another wire from the Department of State transmitting the responses of Mr. Walton in reaction to the visit of the distinguished gentleman from California and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee to the island he made this statement:

> Some of prisoners were questioned by Harkin and Luce. They claimed that when they were recalcitrant, powdered lime would be dumped on them. Colonel Ve denied this, stating that lime was used to whitewash walls—

This is the official message—

> However, from appearance of powdered lime on tops of iron grill work it appeared that it had been poured in in powdered form.

That is, on the prisoners in those cages.

We had testimony subsequently from Dr. Marjorie Nelson as to the effect that powdered lime would have upon the respiratory systems of people who had it poured in upon them.

Then, strangely enough, this model facility, this example of modern and enlightened prison administration, was described in an official statement from the Prime Minister of Vietnam in the following manner:

> Considering the fact that the disciplinary quarter at Con Son correctional institution was built since 1895 under the French, and that it no longer corresponds to the standards of a modern correctional institution, the government of the Republic of Vietnam has decided:
>
> 1. To put an end to the use of this disciplinary quarter from now on.
>
> 2. To order the immediate repair of disciplinary cells so that even undisciplined prisoners can enjoy better sanitary conditions and comfort.
>
> Finally, animated by the spirit of giving decent treatment to all prisoners, a policy which has been solemnly reaffirmed, the GVN now proceeds to a survey of its correctional institutions throughout the country and will make further improvements where this is found necessary and when the national budget allows.

Obviously the Government of Vietnam did not find this a model correctional facility.

When our committee called in officials from the Agency for International Development and the Department of Defense, I was hoping they would reassure us that all the statements made were just a bad dream. They did nothing of the sort. They could not deny a single charge about the inhumanity of the tiger cages at Con Son. They could only confirm those charges.

I sat there and watched a man I know to be a good man, a man of compassion, honesty, and integrity, admit that our great country had failed completely to accomplish the worthy objectives of what was supposed to be a program of humanizing and improving penal conditions. I must acknowledge that I felt the same anguish in my heart that he must have felt when he had to admit publicly his first knowledge of the tiger cages came when he read about them in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I for one never want to see that expression on the face of an official of our Government again—the look of undeniable shame.

I think if we look at this and attempt—those who want to attempt—to say there is some disloyalty in bringing out these facts, then we ought to examine deeply into our conscience the need to demonstrate humanity in the treatment of prisoners if we can expect world support in demanding humanity in the treatment of our prisoners in the hands of enemy forces. That is the kind of treatment I want our people to have and I want to give the North Vietnamese no excuse to give less than that.

I compliment the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Tennessee for doing what I regard as a tremendous public service.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. I have just one further statement.

I have here—and I will not put them in the RECORD—the official reports of the International Red Cross from Geneva. The last two reports were transmitted for the use of my subcommittee. They confirm the statement released by me and Mr. REID of New York as to the characterization given to those prisons by the International Red Cross.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding

I want to compliment the gentleman in the well and the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Moss, on setting the RECORD straight in this matter. There is nothing that has been said heretofore by the gentleman in the well or that has been said here this afternoon that I have not personally observed to be the absolute truth and that I have not entirely observed to be actually an admirable understatement of the situation rather than what he has been accused of saying, that is, to overstate the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to two or three points that have been brought out by the gentleman from Illinois. With regard to malnutrition, for example, I was told personally by a corpsman in the prison camp—and this was not in the presence of guards—that the most prevalent overall health problem of Con Son was that of malnutrition and vitamin deficiencies, which affected more than two-thirds of the prison population.

I was also told that the prevalence of tuberculosis was approximately 20 percent.

There is one public health sector on the entire island to care for more than 10,000 people. His attention is normally directed not to prisoners but to guards and staff personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up further time this afternoon except to reiterate what the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) has said. There are those who say that the bringing out of the truth is a disservice to this country. There are those who say that the bringing out of the truth in regard to Con Son will have an adverse impact upon our prisoners in the north. I would like to point out to the ladies and gentlemen of the House that the North Vietnamese have an incredible intelligence network operating throughout South Vietnam. They know full well and precisely how the system of justice operates in South Vietnam. They know fully about the conditions at Con Son and throughout the entire prison complex. Apparently just about everybody in the world knows about it except the citizens of the United States. If we cannot face up to the facts and show that our concern for humanity goes throughout the entire world, then indeed we do risk the lives and put in further jeopardy our boys in the north.

Mr. Speaker, I say this because I am positive that the North Vietnamese know chapter and verse of this situation at Con Son and every other prison in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman in the well and I want to say that he is a wonderful man with whom to make a trip. He does come back with the facts and you can depend upon what he says.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all our colleagues will give whatever assistance they can to the resolution which the gentleman in the well and I introduced over 2 weeks ago which endeavors to bring congressional attention to this matter, not only in relation to political prisoners in the south but also in relation to the treatment and the exchange of American POW's in the north.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for his remarks.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman now speaking has known the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) for 38 years. He has a distinguished record in the California Legislature since 1932. Over these 38 years that I have known him I have never known a challenge to be made to his integrity or to his character.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) has served with distinction and his reputation in California is one of the best. I am proud, as dean of the California delegation, to have him here as a member of the California delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) diligently carries out his duties as a responsible member on the committee on which he serves and on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express not only my own confidence but the confidence I am sure of all the members of the California delegation who have served with him in the California Legislature as well as Members who were not so fortunate as to have served with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from California has done a great service in bringing to the attention of the Nation these deplorable situations in the prisons of South Vietnam. I am hopeful that these prisons will be humanized for the benefit of the human beings who have been treated as these miserable people have been treated.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished dean of the California delegation for his support and for his statement.

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

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the statements which have been made by my other colleagues here as to the background and reputation of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) and his long history of integrity and of working for the benefit and for the best interests of America. I admire him and I appreciate the fact that he was able to pursue the facts and to get the information that he did and to bring it back from South Vietnam. I appreciate his courage in outlining what he saw there.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, it seems to me that the gentleman has done a great service for America to bring these things out so that we might appreciate and understand some of the real concerns which we should have in connection with our involvement in Southeast Asia.

I believe that it is unfortunate and certainly deplorable that individuals or any colleagues of ours or whomever it may be, find it necessary at times to come in with unfounded criticisms and, apparently, with misstatements of fact, whether they knowingly were guilty of it or had any part in creating it, because they are doing a disservice not only to the gentleman from California but to the country.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the gentleman in the well of taking the floor on this occasion and I want to again restate my support in a matter which he feels very strongly about and which we know he is dedicated in trying to correct.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank my distinguished colleague for those remarks.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the dean of our California delegation (Mr. HOLIFIELD) in adding my voice in the strongest possible terms in attesting to the qualifications, competency, and integrity of our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS).

Prior to coming to Congress, I was well aware of the reputation "GUS" HAWKINS enjoyed in California and, while I did not serve with him in the State legislature, I did have numerous opportunities to observe him in Sacramento. As a member of the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors, I was introduced to Mr. HAWKINS by our own Assemblyman Frank Belotti, while testifying on legislative matters before the legislature. "GUS" HAWKINS had a distinguished record of service to his constituency and an outstanding record of accomplishment in his district and in his committee activities. He was then, and remains today, an effective legislator who is admired and respected by Democrats and Republicans alike.

As such, I have always regarded him as a good friend and a distinguished fellow colleague, and I would never permit anyone to impugn the motives, the honesty, or the integrity of this distinguished gentleman from California. It is for this reason that I have asked the gentleman to yield, thereby permitting me to record my sentiments.

As has been the case with others who supported the measure, I have been questioned about voting to send the congressional investigating team to Southeast Asia to check into conditions there and report back to the Congress. However, I sincerely believe that Mr. HAWKINS and the other members of this investigating team have served a very constructive purpose and, with the revelation of this information concerning the so-called Con Son tiger cages, I am more convinced than ever that my vote was a proper one.

What has been largely overlooked, both in the press and in the colloquy here today, is the fact that the very existence of these tiger cages was developed and made public by Members of Congress. There has been no attempt made to cover up this incident by the committee or

here in the Congress, nor will there be. In my judgment, however, it is too bad that no one is giving credit where credit is due. Judging from recent reports coming out of Vietnam, changes are being made to correct these facilities and detention practices. This is what is most important.

As one who has joined a number of my colleagues in repeatedly demanding fair and humane treatment for our own prisoners of war in North Vietnam, I believe it is incumbent on us, in the key leadership role our country has assumed, to see that our fellow security alliance friends conform to the same standards, or at least those prescribed by the Geneva Convention on the Treatment and Handling of Prisoners. We must demand no less.

Certainly, there is enough suffering going on in Southeast Asia and in far too many other sections of the world, without this. While I am well aware of and deplore the indignities and degradation being imposed on the people of Southeast Asia and our men by the Vietcong and the NLF, man's inhumanity to man remains the No. 1 problem of our time.

America, in spite of its internal differences and human frailties, is still associated in the minds of people throughout the world as a country that cares about people and about human dignity both in war and in peace. This is the image America has held in the eyes of the world and, therefore, we must make it clear that those countries committed to building free institutions must conform to these same high standards of conduct, as they relate to morality and the treatment of human beings.

Again, I commend Mr. HAWKINS and the members of the committee for their forthright and balanced presentation of the facts in Vietnam, as they observed them.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the various gentlemen for the statements which they have made and I want to again say that I regret it was necessary to take the time of this body on the issue of Con Son because I honestly believe this is not the only issue. Certainly this is not the sole issue of our involvement in Southeast Asia. There are many other things that I think demand a lot more attention than just this. The issue is much broader and it concerns the truth in our foreign relations and whether or not our image is going to be damaged by not dealing in true statements and not dealing in the truth about things that are happening in that part of the world. I would hope that by combining truth and peace we can bring an end to this terrible conflict. I think all of the Members of this body should read all of the statements of the select committee. I think the thrust of those statements brings out the fact that this terrible conflict should be brought to an end as soon as possible.

I think that this concensus of the members of that committee has been lost somehow over the debate on Con Son, and I would hope that we will devote more serious attention to what is happening overseas, and report what the truth is to the American people so that they will know, and so that our country can with dignity get out of this conflict just as rapidly as possible.

If that is so, then I believe our select committee has done a great job.

I want to thank that select committee, particularly the chairman of that select committee, on the impartial way and the fairness with which he dealt with the members of that committee, and even for the way that he worked us almost to death to bring back a constructive report.

I have the greatest respect for the members of the select committee which you selected. I think the more the public becomes aware of the various reports of this committee, the more the American people will realize that this committee indeed was not a junket, but was a serious-minded committee, a committee which saw the things it was instructed to see, and reported the things that it saw as honestly as possible even though from individual viewpoints and honest differences.

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

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment the gentleman. I have not heard the entire statement that he has been making, but I would compliment the gentleman on what he has said just most recently about the impact of the total report of the special committee. I think the publicity that has been given to the one issue of Con Son has tended to overshadow the major purpose of the very good report of the special committee.

I think it is unfortunate that one of the employees of the committee saw fit not to work with the committee and with the gentleman in the well, and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) in presenting a balanced report. But this thing about the island has been sensationalized out of proportion because of the way it was handled by a staff member.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do compliment the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Tennessee for their balanced approach. And I would hope that not only Members in this body, but the press, and the people in the country, would give attention to the whole of the report of the committee.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I certainly agree with him.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman HAWKINS, for a lifetime of loyal and dedicated service to his community, his State, and to his Nation. He served with great ability and distinction in the California State Legislature for 28 years. While we were both members of that body I came to respect not only his ability, but also his integrity and dedication to democracy. Congressman HAWKINS has now served in the Congress for 8 years, and here, too, he has added to the distinction of this body. I am proud to have enjoyed the friendship of Congressman HAWKINS who is one of the finest men I know and who has been an able and effective colleague.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 236]

Alexander	Fallon	Pelly
Baring	Ford,	Pepper
Blackburn	William D.	Pollock
Blanton	Fraser	Powell
Brock	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Buchanan	Gray	Railsback
Burleson, Tex.	Green, Oreg.	Rarick
Burton, Utah	Griffiths	Reid, N.Y.
Bush	Halpern	Rooney, Pa.
Caffery	Holifield	Rostenkowski
Clark	Ichord	Roudebush
Clay	King	Ruppe
Cramer	Lloyd	Ryan
Crane	Long, La.	Sandman
Culver	McCarthy	Scheuer
Cunningham	McEwen	Sikes
Dawson	Mailliard	Smith, N.Y.
de la Garza	Meskill	Staggers
Diggs	Mink	Tunney
Donohue	Monagan	Watson
Dwyer	O'Neill, Mass.	Weicker
Edwards, La.	Ottinger	Wydler

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House on Thursday, July 23, 1970, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1328) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1328

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 29, 1970 (Public Law 91-294), is hereby amended by striking out "July 31, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 15, 1970".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution makes temporary appropriations to continue the operation of those functions and activities of Government for which the applicable annual appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1971 are not signed into law by July 31, the date the present continuing resolution expires.

The pending resolution would extend the existing continuing resolution to not later than October 15, 1970.

The House has passed all of the regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal 1971 with the exception of one, which is the Defense bill. That bill lacks legislative authorization.

The other body has passed six of the regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal 1971.

Three regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal 1971 have now cleared conference and readied for the President; one of the three has been signed by him.

In the circumstances, it is necessary that we pass an additional continuing resolution in order to permit the agencies of the Government and the Departments to continue to operate. There is nothing novel about this continuing resolution. It is a type of resolution we have passed many times before. We propose merely to extend the resolution under which virtually all of the Government has operated since July 1 last.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am including excerpts from the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying the joint resolution, which explains the resolution in more detail and contains pertinent statistics on the status of the appropriation bills:

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE RESOLUTION

* * * * *

The joint resolution would extend the provisions of the July continuing resolution (Public Law 91-294) to not later than October 15, 1970. That is, the ground rules for continuing the operations of government that generally obtained during July would continue after July 31 in respect to activities for which the regular bills are not, by that date, enacted into law. These ground rules are covered in some considerable detail in House Report No. 91-1220, of June 18, accompanying the joint resolution which became Public Law 91-294.

With the announced summer recess of the House extending from mid-August to September 9, and the certainty that several of the appropriation bills will not be finalized until after the recess, it was thought that the date of October 15, 1970, would not be an unreasonable date. The resolution constricts and ceases to apply to activities when and as Congress makes final disposition of their budgets in the normal course of events, and becomes wholly inoperative after the last bill for fiscal 1971 is approved, or October 15, whichever first occurs.

While the House has passed 13 of the 14 annual appropriation bills for the current fiscal year, and the other body has passed six of them, only three have cleared conference—the District of Columbia bill; the Interior bill; and the Education bill. Thus, prompt enactment of another resolution is essential to avoid interruption of authority and funds for on-going programs and activities pending final determinations on their budgets.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

The only regular bill for 1971 not yet reported to the House is the Defense appropriation bill. Hearings were completed several weeks ago, but reporting awaits progress on the legislative authorization now in the other body.

Of the seven bills still in committee in the other body, it is informally understood that some may be reported before mid-August and that hearings are either substantially completed or are underway on all except one.

The following is a tabulation of pertinent dates as to each of the bills:

THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

Bill	Reported in House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Enacted
1. Legislative	Apr. 9	Apr. 13	July 13	
2. Treasury-Post Office	do	do		
3. Education	do	Apr. 14	June 25	[1] July 28
4. Independent Offices-HUD	May 7	May 12	July 7	
5. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	May 12	May 14		
6. Interior	May 24	May 19	July 1	[1] July 22
7. Transportation	May 21	May 27		
8. District of Columbia	June 1	June 4	June 26	July 16
9. Foreign assistance	do	do		
10. Agriculture	June 4	June 9	July 9	
11. Military construction	June 8	June 11		
12. Public Works-AEC	June 18	June 24		
13. Labor-HEW	July 16	July 23		
14. Defense	(2)			

[1] Cleared conference.

[2] Awaiting legislative authorization.

TOTALS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

House

In the 13 general appropriation bills passed by the House in relation to budget requests for fiscal 1971 (that is, not counting any 1972 *advance* funding requests), the House considered budget requests for new budget (obligational) authority of $68,392,996,000; approved $67,820,836,000, including $347,027,000 of *net* floor additions; a net reduction of $572,160,000 from the requests.

Senate

In the six bills passed by the other body in relation to fiscal 1971 amounts, that body has considered budget requests of $31,553,880,000 for new budget (obligational) authority; approved $34,271,991,000; a *net* addition of $2,718,111,000 to the budget requests considered, and $3,238,862,000 above the amounts of the six bills as they passed the House.

Conference

In the three bills which have cleared conference, budget requests for new budget (obligational) authority relating to fiscal 1971 considered in those bills totaled $5,915,887,000; the total approved was $6,364,558,000; a *net* addition of $448,671,000 to the budget requests considered.

These summaries are shown in the following table by bills:

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, 1971

[As to fiscal year 1971 amounts only]

Bill	Budget requests considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (−)
IN THE HOUSE			
1. Legislative	$356,043,285	$346,649,230	−$9,394,055
2. Treasury-Post Office	3,044,755,000	2,971,702,000	−73,053,000
3. Education	3,807,524,000	4,127,114,000	+319,590,000
4. Independent Offices-HUD	17,216,823,500	17,390,212,300	+173,388,800
5. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	3,243,905,000	3,106,956,500	−136,948,500
6. Interior	1,610,757,600	1,610,026,700	−730,900
7. Transportation	2,465,814,937	2,429,579,937	−36,235,000
8. District of Columbia	109,088,000	108,938,000	−150,000
9. Foreign Assistance	2,876,539,000	2,220,961,000	−655,578,000
10. Agriculture	7,531,775,500	7,450,188,150	−81,587,350
11. Military Construction	2,134,800,000	1,997,037,000	−137,763,000
12. Public Works-AEC	5,263,433,000	5,236,808,000	−26,625,000
13. Labor-HEW	18,731,737,000	18,824,663,000	+92,926,000
14. Defense	(68,745,666,000)		
Total, House bills	68,392,995,822	67,820,835,817	−572,160,005
IN THE SENATE			
1. Legislative	$421,414,899	$413,889,653	−$7,525,246
2. Education	3,966,824,000	4,782,871,000	+816,047,000
3. Independent Offices-HUD	17,468,223,500	18,655,019,500	+1,186,796,000
4. Interior	1,839,974,600	1,835,337,500	−4,637,100
5. District of Columbia	109,088,000	108,938,000	−150,000
6. Agriculture	7,748,354,500	8,475,935,100	+727,580,600
Total, Senate bills	31,553,879,499	34,271,990,753	+2,718,111,254
CLEARED CONFERENCE			
1. Education	3,966,824,000	4,420,145,000	+453,321,000
2. Interior	1,839,974,600	1,835,474,700	−4,499,090
3. District of Columbia [1]	109,088,000	108,938,000	−150,000
Total, bills cleared Congress	5,915,886,600	6,364,557,700	+448,671,100

[1] Signed into law.

The foregoing table relates only to the traditional appropriation bills. And the amounts refer to "appropriations", or more precisely, "new budget (obligational) authority", which is the time-honored conceptual basis on which amounts in the bills are stated. The table does not deal in "expenditures", or more precisely, "budget outlays", nor does it encompass other types of bills carrying "backdoor" authority or mandatory-type spending authorizations or provisions.

For general reference purposes of Members and others, attention is called to the periodic budget "scorekeeping" reports issued by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. These reports are designed to keep tabs, currently, on what is happening in the legislative process to the budget recommendations of the President, both appropriation-wise and expenditure-wise, and on the revenue recommendations, and not only from actions in the revenue and appropriation bills but also in legislative bills that affect budget authority and expenditures (backdoor bills, bills that mandate expenditures, and so on).

Several such reports have been issued this year, and another is due shortly. The most recent one is published in the Record of July 16, at page E6734.

SUMMARY TOTALS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR THE SESSION

In addition to the appropriation bills and amounts relating to fiscal 1971, discussed in the immediately preceding section of this report, there was a general supplemental appropriation bill during the present session, relating to fiscal year 1970. And in two of the bills for 1971, budget requests for advance fiscal 1972 appropriations were dealt with.

The following summary cranks in all these items, relating to fiscals 1970, 1971, and 1972 at this session:

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, 91st CONG., 2D SESS., AS OF JULY 27, 1970 (BUT SUBSEQUENT TO MAR. 5)

[Does not include any "back-door" type budget authority; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority, under earlier or "permanent" law,[1] without further or annual action by the Congress]

	New budget (obligational) authority. (All figures are slightly rounded.)		
	Bills for fiscal 1970	Bills for fiscal 1971	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests considered	$5,918,073,000	$69,920,057,000	$75,838,130,000
2. Amounts approved by House	5,764,116,000	67,970,836,000	73,734,952,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests	−153,957,000	[2]−1,949,221,000	−2,103,178,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests considered	6,430,172,000	32,892,929,000	39,323,101,000
2. Amounts approved by Senate	6,702,375,000	34,271,991,000	40,974,366,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests	[3]+272,203,000	[3]+$1,379,062,000	+$1,651,265,000
4. Comparison with House amounts in same bills	+938,259,000	+3,238,862,000	+4,177,121,000
C. Cleared conference:			
1. Budget requests considered	6,430,172,000	7,254,937,000	13,685,109,000
2. Amounts enacted	6,021,535,000	6,364,558,000	12,386,093,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests	[4]−408,637,000	[5]−890,379,000	−1,299,016,000

[1] The budget for 1971, as submitted Feb. 2, tentatively estimated total new budget authority for 1971 at $234.8 billion ($218,000,000,000, net of certain budget presentation adjustments) of which $148,100,000,000 was for action by Congress and $86,700,000,000 would become available under permanent law.

[2] Consists of a net reduction of $572,160,000 in respect to amounts relating to fiscal 1971, and $1,377,061,000 advance fiscal 1972 requests that were disallowed.

[3] Consists of a net increase of $2,718,111,000 in respect to amounts relating to fiscal 1971, partially offset by $1,339,050 000 relating to an advance fiscal 1972 request in the education appropriation bill.

[4] Reflects cut of $275,000,000 for foreign military credit sales which may be reconsidered in the regular bill for fiscal year 1971.

[5] Consists of a net increase of $448,671,000 in respect to amounts relating to fiscal 1971, offset by $1,339,050 000 relating to advance fiscal 1972 request in the education appropriation bill.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, in urging the adoption of this resolution which will continue the operations of the Government until October 15.

The only appropiations bill left to be considered by the House is the defense bill. But I understand the other body has just started to consider the authorization bill, and may not complete action on it until the end of September.

In addition, I must also alert the House to the fact that some conference reports can be expected containing amounts that are way over the budget. We completed action on one of them today—independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development—that will be up before the House in the very near future. Some Members on our side were not able to sign this report because it contains amounts that are far in excess of the budget. So we may have a delay before final enactment of this bill, and possibly others. Therefore, in order to provide for the orderly process of government, it is necessary to have a continuing resolution.

I am sure the gentleman from Texas agrees that we wish it was not necessary to bring these resolutions before you. This is not good government. It is not good for the Congress or the executive branches of Government to have to operate under these continuing resolutions, but there is no other alternative except to close down the Government. I am sure no one wants to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

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

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if this is in any way a direction, or an invitation, for Congress to continue this session until October 15, in this election year of 1970?

Mr. MAHON. No; it is not in any way a direction, or even a suggestion, along that line. But in the absence of more expeditious action in finalizing the appropriation bills, it seems logical to adopt what seems to be a realistic date.

As has been pointed out, on appropriations bills in the House we have passed all the bills except the defense appropriation bill. Some matters are being held in the other body for more consideration and further inquiry.

So, until the other body authorizes the defense appropriations and there is agreement in conference, and until we are able to settle these pending measures, certainly from the standpoint of appropriations, we have to remain in session and also, of course, provide continuing funds and authority in the meantime. It is regrettable that we find it necessary to extend this resolution to October 15, but I think it is realistic to do so. Of course, if Congress finishes its appropriations business before then, as we should, then this resolution will have no force and effect. By its terms it fades away as each regular appropriation bill is enacted into law.

Mr. GROSS. Would it not have been at least a measure of direction to the other body if the date had been made October 1? It seems to me if we are going on until October 15, it is going to allow Members of the House very little time in which to campaign and report to their constituencies on the activities and record of the past months.

I am not being critical of the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this resolution to the House floor, but I just did not like this October 15 date because it seems to me there is implicit in it an invitation to the other body to prolong what is already going on.

I sometimes wonder why these resolutions—since it seems to me the other body is largely responsible for the necessity for them—do not originate in the other body. Why do they not at some time or other send resolutions over here rather than the House initiating them and sending them to the other body, which, as I have said, is prolonging this session of the Congress.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. An invitation for the other body to be very deliberate in its work is not, of course, required. We would not want a continuing resolution to originate in the other body because a continuing resolution is, in effect, an appropriation for a temporary period of

time. As the gentleman, of course, knows, all appropriation bills and resolutions originate in the House, so we must originate the continuing resolution in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that my main point is I do not like to do anything here today to encourage the other body in what they are already doing, and that is foot dragging.

However, there is probably no escape now from the situation we are in.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I would add that one of the reasons why the expiration date of the resolution was put at October 15 rather than October 1 was that the House has just recently voted to recess the House from the 14th of August until perhaps the 9th of September. That will preempt considerable time that could otherwise be devoted to appropriation conference business if the other body should pass several more of the bills.

But I hope we can move rapidly and get the appropriations business concluded. There are some problems, including the defense authorization delay.

I might add that in addition to the three bills that have cleared conference, the conference report will be filed tonight on the independent offices, HUD appropriation bill. And we have a conference scheduled for tomorrow on the legislative branch appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid we are going to be here until October 15 and I, for one, am not at all enthusiastic about that, and for the reason that it is not necessary to proper disposition of the business pending before Congress.

Mr. MAHON. I share the gentleman's concern over this unnecessary prolongation of this session.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17654) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 17654, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 118, ending on page 39, line 4, of the bill, and there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), and a substitute amendment for the Reuss amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

For what purpose does the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) rise?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I take this brief time to sum up a little bit of where we are in connection with this bill. Before I do so, I would like to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to the very excellent staff that your Subcommittee on Reorganization has had during the past 16 months. We have had the good fortune to have the use of the Rules Committee staff headed by Mr. Laurie C. Battle and Mr. Robert D. Hynes, Jr., along with Jonna Lynne Cullen. We have had very excellent advice, counsel, and aid from Mr. David B. Carper, assistant counsel, Office of the Legislative Counsel, and Mr. Walter Kravitz, senior specialist in American National Government, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

Your committee did not employ any special staff. We have borrowed staff here and there and used them. I did want to commend these people for their patience and their hard work, because in many cases they were here working nights and weekends trying to pull together the voluminous amount of material that was necessary for the committee to do its work.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should take stock of just where we are in connection with this bill as we reach this point in time.

There have been some amendments adopted, some that frankly I think have improved the bill because, as I said in the beginning, the committee did not possess all wisdom, but there have been also some amendments that, in my opinion, have not helped the bill, and I am afraid they tend to load it down. As we attempt to conclude this bill today and possibly later this week—because now I understand we may have some further time this week, and that I will leave up to the leadership to inform the Members about—I would hope and trust that all Members who seek a bill will move along.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the problems of Members in getting around to other work, but we would like to move along. I do not wish to take a great deal of time, but we should take an inventory, as I say. We have pending before us two amendments at the present time, that, in my opinion—and I am going to be quite frank—if adopted, probably are going to be enough weight to sink this bill.

This I am not saying as any threat or any warning or anything of that kind, but I think we should assess what we are doing and where we are going. We have a couple of amendments pending, one offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), and another by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), which get into areas of seniority.

I am not afraid to study and take a look at seniority. We have committees among the Democrats who are today looking at it, and I know there is a committee working among my friends on the Republican side on this question of seniority, but certainly so far as this subcommittee and the Committee on Rules are concerned, this is not the bill and not the time in which to get involved in this subject.

I can understand the desire of many of my colleagues to talk about this, if they would like, but I would hope that we would not unduly delay the progress of this reorganizational bill or reform bill, or call it what we will, by spending too much time in an area which, as I say quite frankly in my opinion, will create a load that this package simply cannot carry.

I would hope as we go along and as we consider, I am sure, many other amendments, certainly some of which are good and I am sure they are all well intentioned, that we will give the committee and the Committee of the Whole House an opportunity to look at those amendments, and I would hope we might proceed to see how far down the road we can get between now and 7 o'clock tonight, and then we hope that possibly we will get enough time some time later this week to bring this bill to a conclusion.

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

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well. I think he has conducted himself in the course of this debate with great patience and great wisdom.

I do think it appropriate that we move along as quickly as we can to the conclusion of this bill.

I associate myself also with the gentleman's remarks with respect to the Schwengel amendment. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) has done pioneering work in this area and he has an interesting idea, but it seems to me entirely appropriate to handle this issue on a party basis and not by changing the rules of the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, and in response to our distinguished colleague, I concur in the fine leadership the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) has provided on this bill during the course of this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I am among those who feel there may be no other time, that there may be no other bill with which to deal with this critical issue of seniority. I want to speak out in support of the proposal which has been offered in the amendment I cosponsored with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

While I appreciate the high purpose of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), it is my judgment our amendment is more

workable and less restrictive. It leaves the issue of chairman selection to the discretion of the majority caucus or policy committee. It does not narrow the choice of committee chairman to the three most senior members.

It leaves the method of chairman selection to a majority decision, at least theoretically permitting any Member to qualify for election. And this is as it should be. Under the Constitution and under the laws of this land every Congress is a new and separate entity, organizing itself, conducting its business, closing its life with adjournment. Every Member is or should be equal to every other. At least theoretically any Member should be eligible for the committee chairmanship.

It is conceivable that at some time a Member may be elected so heavily endowed with special skills and qualifications in a given field to be most suitable for chairman, and yet have only a short term to serve. Why should such a choice be denied?

Any member of any committee should be eligible to the chairmanship as an equal and eligible member under the Constitution and under the law.

The seniority system has produced good chairmen and it has produced some not quite as good as others. However, it is false to presume that seniority alone can produce the very best. Some men are bettered by time and experience, while others remain unchanged.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which we suggest would make the committee chairmen more aware of their reciprocal obligation to their committees. The power of the chairman would come from the membership of the House and not from his constituency or his political sources of power, or by the divine providence which brought him to the committee earlier than his fellow members.

A chairman so designated would be more likely to confer with his committee on positions or programs or the developing of the staff or making the staff available to the members of the committee, instead of using the entire staff as a personal and private facility.

Mr. Chairman, the harm of the seniority system is not what it may do to some chairmen who feel a sense of divine authority. The great harm that occurs is what it does to members who must grovel in its wake, who tremble at the chairman's awesome power.

Mr. Chairman, when confronted with seniority, a new member raises a question as to how it all comes about. The answer is that the power of the chairman comes only from the members. All that we seek to do with this amendment is to provide a qualification in addition to seniority, leaving it up to the majority to decide what ought to be done in the selection of the proper chairmen for the committees of the House.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I understand that the gentleman does not favor the proposal by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. VANIK. I believe the proposal made by the gentleman from Iowa would be too restrictive. It is a qualified or modified seniority rule. I believe it would be far better to take the original language of the proposal which I cosponsored with Mr. REUSS, and simply make it a rule of the House that seniority alone shall not be the determining factor.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with the gentleman. I feel the same way. I believe the the idea of the gentleman from Iowa may be worth considering, but not now.

I have somewhat the same problem with respect to the amendment the gentleman is speaking for, because it does not in fact do anything. I should like to see the seniority system changed, but since the amendment will not accomplish that I am not clear it is useful to pursue it at this point.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to speak again, having spoken a couple of times yesterday, but I feel impelled to speak on two amendments that are pending before the House.

I have been a critic of seniority as an unmodified system for a very long time. The other day in an interview in U.S. News & World Report the distinguished Speaker of the House reiterated something he had said earlier in a Democratic caucus. He pointed out the incontrovertible fact that if the Democrats were in the majority, that a majority of the Democratic caucus has the right to determine who will be the chairmen of the committees. This is a fact. That has been a fact for a very long time. If there is a desire to change the chairman of a committee and the Democrats are in power, the Democrats in caucus have the power to make that change.

I know of no argument against that. It has been a fact ever since the day the system changed and the then Speaker Cannon was stripped of his powers of appointment.

The problem of seniority when the Democrats are in the majority is the problem of the will of a majority of the Democrats. If they choose to modify seniority, they have the power to do so.

Now, I have recommendations on the two amendments. I would suggest that it makes no difference how a Member votes on the Reuss-Vanik amendment. It will accomplish nothing. It may become symbolic. It may have the effect of representing a vote for or against an idea, but it will change nothing. The present rules of the House provide—and everybody knows that it is a pro forma act—that the House will elect chairmen of committees. Obviously, if the House elects chairmen of committees, it can elect anybody it wants to as chairman. So the Reuss amendment, except in symbolism, adds nothing and subtracts nothing. I can see no harm in it. This is one of those rare cases when a Member could vote "present" and be performing a rational act.

Now, the Schwengel amendment is something else again. The Schwengel amendment demonstrates a well-intentioned complete misunderstanding of legislative institutions. There is no institution within the House of Representatives that acts. Only the House of Representatives, under the Constitution of the United States, can act. President Wilson has been misquoted. President Wilson has been misquoted to the effect that the only time Congress was at work, in effect, was when it was in committee. Well, a great deal of the preliminary work of the Congress is and must be done in committee, but the committees are the creatures of the House; they are not little separate legislative bodies. They represent the House in their performance, and to give to the committee the right of the institution as a whole to select chairmen is to state flatly that we are not a unified entity. Why should those who are Members of a small part of the institution select the Member who will have power in the whole institution? A chairman of a committee has power not only in his committee, but he has power in the House.

It seems to me absolutely clear that both these amendments should be defeated and we should proceed to face the problem of seniority in a reasonable, meaningful, and rational way in our two parties.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOGGS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat embarrassed to be talking again. However, we have debated this bill for 2 weeks and this is only the second time I have been on my feet. I do have some leadership responsibilities.

First, let me say that I concur completely with my old and dear friend from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) who has spent a great deal of his life studying the problems of this body as an institution. I would say that had he had the time he could have added a great deal to the discussion of this body as an institution because of his very profound study and knowledge of the subject.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of a statement attributed to the late, great Winston Churchill when commenting upon democracy. He is alleged to have said that it is the worst system on earth until you examine all the others.

Mr. Chairman, when I look at the question of seniority, I say to myself, what do you substitute therefor? Let us first remember the admonition of the gentleman from Missouri when he said that insofar as the Democratic Party is concerned we now have full power to name or not to name, to remove or not to remove, committee chairmen. That power exists in our caucuses today. We do not have the power for Members to elect committee chairmen within the committee. And, let me for a moment advise and consent with you and tell you what that might do.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I sit next to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) and I have sat there for many years. I admire and respect him.

But based upon the manner in which I read the amendment which has been offered by my distinguished friend, almost at any time I could call for a vote in the Ways and Means Committee and they could vote for either HALE BOGGS or WILBUR MILLS or the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WATTS), the three ranking members of that committee.

Now, let us be pragmatic for just a moment, if you will. The Ways and Means Committee handles tax legislation, it handles trade legislation, it handles welfare legislation, it handles debt management, and many other matters. Why, it is not inconceivable that one who was seeking the position as chairman would go out and make himself an arrangement with these various pressure groups and then it is not inconceivable that the chairman, whomever he may be, would make a better deal than the one that I could make.

Mr. Chairman, I saw sitting here a moment ago the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That committee regulates the FCC, the ICC, the Federal Trade Commission, and all of the regulatory agencies of the Government of the United States, involving the expenditure of billions and billions and billions of dollars.

So, let us take a look at what happens if we adopt this amendment—and God forbid that we should—but let us say we did. Let us say we have an unscrupulous man in either the second or third place. Think what deals he could make. Think of the corruption that would possibly come into being. You talk about problems, you talk about logrolling, you talk about corruption; it is possible that you would have it.

You know, sometimes in the name of reform, sometimes in the name of change, our institutions are ruined. There are those who would destroy the church because of a minister who was found to be dishonest. There are those who would destroy Congress because of a Congressman who is not true to his trust.

There are those who would wreck the free enterprise system because of dishonest businessmen. There are those who would wreck the labor movement because of dishonest labor leaders. I say to you that these amendments that we have here, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), and the amendment offered by my distinguished friend on the Republican side the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), strike at the heart of this institution.

Let me give you a few other examples. I remember just a few years ago in the first years of the late revered John F. Kennedy, we had a proposition here to create a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, and it was voted down. Do you know why it was voted down? Because it had been rumored that a Negro would head up that Department; that is why it was voted down.

The oldest Member of this body is a revered gentleman, our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, BILL DAWSON. I can assure my colleagues that there have been times in the history of this body that BILL DAWSON could not have been elected chairman of the committee he heads. And I could carry on.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I will be very happy to yield to our beloved Speaker.

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

The gentleman has referred to something that is near and dear to me, to our dear friend, Congressman BILL DAWSON.

I was on the Committee on Government Operations at the time. As a matter of fact, I was ahead of BILL DAWSON. I was coming back as majority leader. We Democrats had taken over the Congress. I served on the committee during, I think, the 80th to 83d Congresses, with BILL DAWSON, and we were coming back. I could have stayed as the chairman of the committee, but, of course, I did not think of that. I withdrew with pleasure, and as a result of which in accordance not with the rule, but the custom and practice, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) so eloquently referred to, BILL DAWSON became recommended by the committee on committees as chairman.

The committee could have refused to do so. The committee could have named another chairman, but they did not do so. So I know something about the "Dawson affair." I know, because I stepped aside, and as a result of which BILL DAWSON became chairman. But I also was proud to serve under him as chairman of the committee.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished Speaker. What greater veracity could I have than that of the beloved Speaker of this House?

Let me give you one other example. There is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the revered MANNY CELLER. He is 82 years of age, I believe. He happens to be a member of the Jewish faith, a minority faith. There was a time when, believe it or not, in the days of the know-nothings in this country, when a Jew, if he happened to be elected, could not have become a chairman of a committee.

So I say to my fellow reformers—and I consider myself one—that in these amendments you seek to tear down this institution, not to build it up. And I trust and I hope that these amendments will be resoundly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition. I know that there are more senior Members on our side of the aisle who also wish to be recognized, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), as well as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), who have proposed this amendment. And I want to commend them for their work and thought in offering this proposal.

There is talk about what is the heart of the congressional body here. I think we should speculate for a moment on how our Nation has been served in recent years by the system. Both the majority and the minority parties have, with few exceptions, let the seniority system control the succession to leadership. I think it is time for the House to reassert some responsibility for the election of its leaders.

I strongly support legislative reform and have voted for many of the amendments which have been offered in the House over the past few days.

Several of these amendments represent tremendous progress in modernizing our House and making it more responsive to our constituents. But none of them gets to the heart of the matter like the several proposals to do away with the seniority system.

I cannot accept the argument that the seniority system is the only way to assure the fair treatment of those of us who are members of ethnic or religious minorities. I cannot agree that Americans who serve in this body collectively lack the maturity to make choices based on individual merit. If this were so, democracy would be in a sorry state. Nor can I accept the argument that pressures by evil forces would so sway committee members that we must have a seniority system to protect them against themselves.

Whether we achieve reform through amendments of the rules of the House or by action in party caucus, I think it is vital that this bill be the vehicle to get us moving toward a revision of the seniority system of the House of Representatives.

Only dynamic and innovative committee leadership, which is not assured by the present system, can keep up with demands on a great legislature in 1970. American citizens are fully aware of the deep shortcomings in the seniority system. They know that the U.S. Congress is the only legislature in the free world, including the 50 States, to select its leaders under a strict seniority system.

The proposal before us would provide that the members of the majority would by secret ballot select committee chairmen. I am convinced that in many cases those who now serve as chairmen, whether they be black, Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant, would be reelected because they have demonstrated their qualifications of leadership.

But the question should be put to a vote. Those of us on both sides of the aisle who want very much a more progressive rule cannot reject this proposal out-of-hand. We should support this amendment because, as the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) stated yesterday, it is a first step.

Seniority studies being made on both sides of the aisle are not finalized. Further changes in the methods of selecting leaders will hopefully be forthcoming. This is a beginning, however, to break away from the seniority system, and will continue to grow into a strong wave to produce a legislative body with its leadership selected on the basic principles of democracy.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUDE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman yielding during his articulate speech.

Mr. Chairman, I take this moment of the gentleman's time to indicate that I am sympathetic to the point the gentleman is making but want to indicate my very strong opposition to both the Schwengel amendment and the Reuss amendment. I do so, may I say to the gentleman from Maryland, for two reasons. One, because I do not believe that a bill which relates to reform of the rules of the House of Representatives is a proper vehicle by which the seniority system ought to be attacked. I think it belongs in the party caucus. It does not belong in the rules and it is not there now. I concur with the gentleman that a modification in the present rigid system is needed but I believe such a change should be made in the party caucus.

Two, it seems to me, if any of us truly intend to work to pass an effective bill, one way to kill the bill is to add either of these amendments.

I intend to vote against the Schwengel amendment and I also intend to vote against the Reuss amendment, in large part may I say to the gentleman from Maryland if he will yield further, because it is ineffective and a charade.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the dean of the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I think it was Churchill who said that "if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find we have lost the future." The past gave us decades of the seniority system. Now, the young men among us presently quarrel with the past, and in that quarrel we bid fair to lose the future.

I contemplated long before I planned to speak on this controversial subject, I would run the risk of speaking in self-interest. I might be charged with having an ax to grind. I am a chairman.

Frankly, I do not fear the outcome of this debate. Whether the seniority rule prevails or is cast into limbo, I will not be unduly perturbed. As chairman or just an ordinary member of the Judiciary Committee, I shall continue to serve with all the vigor and intelligence of which I am possessed.

Lest any statement I make concerning the desirability of retaining the seniority system be viewed as self-serving, I do not wish to further belabor that point. I know of no plan which will result in a perfect system of naming committee chairmen.

Certainly the seniority system is not without its flaws. I maintain, however, that the rules of the House are sufficiently flexible—the present rules—so as to assure the working of the majority will of the committee if the members of the majority so wish it. The supposed unbreakable grip of a committee chairman is just a myth. I know whereof I speak. The majority of any committee can veto any action of any chairman. The majority can direct the chairman and the chairman cannot command the committee if its majority asserts its authority.

As the Members of the House know, many methods have been tried and many have failed. Nor is the seniority system as practiced today so rigid as to foreclose the deposing of a chairman.

It is a matter, one, of intraparty discipline, the most recent incident of which was the denial of the chairmanship of the Committee on Education and Labor to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL; and, two, the fact that a committee list is presented to the House and acted upon in pro forma fashion is not the fault of the seniority system; rather, it is the unwillingness of the Members to challenge the list.

Whether the election by a majority vote of a committee of a chairman will erase the flaws of the present system is indeed yet to be proven.

I note, too, that the so-called Schwengel amendment pays its respects to the seniority system by foreclosing choice beyond the three senior members. That indeed is a recognition of the seniority system.

One final word. The senior member, no matter what system is adopted, will carry with him the weight of his experience, the knowledgeability of the legislation before him, and the proven ability to manage a committee bill on the floor. It may thus be possible that the elected chairman would find such influence as the post brings with it diluted by the very presence and activities of the senior member deposed.

As I have said, many methods in our history have been tried and found wanting. They were abandoned. The seniority system has survived as least objectionable.

Victor Hugo once said:

> If we do not recognize the mistakes of the past, we shall only live those mistakes all over again.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I end as I began, by quoting Winston Churchill:

> No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms which have been tried from time to time.

Similarly the seniority system is not perfect, but its value lies in the inefficiency of all the substitutes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree that the fact that a member of a committee can oppose his chairman, the Speaker, or his colleagues knowing that this would not interfere with his ultimately becoming chairman creates the spirit of independence that makes the Congress the greatest deliberative body in the world?

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to revise the seniority system offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Bear in mind the gentleman's amendment just suggests that our seniority system be revised. The chairman would be elected by a majority of the majority side among the three most senior members. In the same way the ranking minority Member would be elected by the majority of the minority side, from the three most senior members.

Many people argue that our present seniority system is the best system that can be devised for the selection of committee chairmen, but they should bear something else also in mind.

The Democratic Party did not select the Speaker by the seniority system. They did not select the majority leader by the seniority system. They did not select their whip by the seniority system. The Republicans did not select our distinguished minority leader by the seniority system. We did not select our whip or the chairman of our conference by the seniority system. None of these choices, Mr. Chairman, was made in accordance with the seniority system. But I believe they were excellent choices.

Not longevity, but competence and leadership were the factors inherent in these election choices. Should we not allow ourselves the same opportunity when electing our own committee chairmen? What could be more important than the strong leadership in our legislative committees?

The proposal before us retains experience as a factor in the selection process, and I believe that this is good. As a practical matter, as has been said before, in most cases the number one senior member would probably be reelected. But it also puts a few committee chairmen or some committee chairmen who may be a bit careless or lackadaisical on notice or makes sure they put their best foot forward and do a good job, and within the rules it defines electability. At the same time, however, it allows committee members, themselves, who have observed each other working under unique committee conditions, to choose the chairman they believe possesses the best combination of ability and leadership characteristics.

Under the system provided by this amendment, the chairman would necessarily be more responsive to the committee as a whole, knowing that his actions and record would determine his tenure.

The very rare occasion of abuse would become even less likely under these circumstances.

Can we afford any longer to leave the control of this power to chance? Can we allow the selection of the chairman to be based solely on longevity? I think not.

The public at large, whether rightly or wrongly, has become increasingly concerned about the organization of the

Congress. And what are some of the factors they complain about most? On this I quote: "The antiquated seniority system" is high on the list of criticisms.

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

Mr. BELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, let me raise this question because I know of the gentleman's deep interest and commitment to bringing reform and change to the House. Supposing the majority of my colleagues on the Democratic side decided they wanted to change the chairman of a committee of the House.

We now have that power, through our caucus, to do so; that is true; is it not?

Mr. BELL of California. That is right.

Mr. FRASER. But if the proposal the gentleman is supporting is adopted, that power would be taken away from us; would it not?

Mr. BELL of California. The power to select?

Mr. FRASER. The power in the majority to make a decision would be stripped away from us and conferred upon a much smaller group.

Mr. BELL of California. It would be conferred upon the members of the committee itself.

Mr. FRASER. That is right; so the members of the caucus would lose control over the chairmanship.

Mr. BELL of California. The members of the caucus would, but who properly knows more about the workings of the committee, about the eligibility and the ability of the chairman and the potential leaders, than the people who are working with the committee chairman?

Mr. FRASER. If I may speak bluntly—and it might be unwise to do so—some of the chairmen of whom I believe there has been more criticism than others would surely be elected by their committees but might not be elected by the caucus. That is one aspect to be looked at. It is one reason why I have a question about the proposal.

Mr. BELL of California. I can also recall a considerable amount of bad publicity and trouble which the Congress received as a result of some mistakes made by a previous chairman. That helped to give the Congress such a bad image insofar as the public is concerned. Also why the American people are so critical of the seniority system.

What are some of the factors that they complain about most? The, and I quote "antiquated," seniority system is high on the list of criticisms. To say that Congress has not been adversely affected by such criticism is to put our head in the sand.

If we pass a Legislative Reorganization Act—without acting on the seniority system—the anger and disappointment felt by our citizens will be totally justified.

The amendment under consideration offers us an important choice.

We can go on record as taking a major step toward streamlining the committee system and making it more responsive to the public and to this House—or we can sustain the rigid structure under which we now operate.

This is not just a party matter.

Selection procedures of committee chairmen affect the entire Congress and reflect upon it and I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this in order to see if we can determine about how many Members would like to speak on this subject. A number have inquired about when we would like to vote.

I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, to limit the Members to a half minute or to 1 minute. If we can get an idea as to the number who would like to speak, perhaps we can figure out something like 3 or 4 minutes each.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we vote on this amendment no later than 4 o'clock.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, as I say, I have only a desire to try to see if we cannot get some understanding. I wonder if we could say 4:15? I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 4:15 on this amendment. I have no desire to cut off the Members.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have spent a lot of time on this. Many of us have. We feel deeply about this subject.

Yesterday when I spoke I had only 5 minutes, and much of that time was given over to a Member to whom I yielded.

I had hoped that I would be granted the courtesy of spending some extra time on this. Some things have been said here that had some implications about my attitude on racial matters and the like. I should like to have an opportunity to talk about this. This is quite important. I believe we ought to have more time.

We have had more time on amendments of lesser importance than this. Therefore I think we need more time on this important matter.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARSHA. How many times is a Member permitted to speak on his own amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio inquires as to how many times a Member may speak on his own amendment. The answer to that is he may speak one time to his amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. The author of the amendment is asking for additional time, and some of the rest of us have not had any time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request and yield back the remainder of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLIER. Is that rule not also applicable to any other Member of the House, once he has spoken on an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Am I not correct in stating that when the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) offered his amendment, he spoke on it; and am I not correct that when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) offered an amendment the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) offered a substitute. Would not the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) be allowed to speak for 5 minutes for or against the Reuss amendment, as well as in support of his own substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the Chairman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Under the rules of the House cannot a Member move to strike the last word and be considered on the same amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. And under those conditions a man could speak twice, could he not?

The CHAIRMAN. Possibly. If a Member were to speak one time in opposition to an amendment subsequently he could move to strike the last word and he would be entitled to be recognized.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If some time is set, does not that abrogate the time and a Member then could be allowed to speak again?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments. As has been pointed out by people who know more about the rules of the House than I do, caucuses have the power to overrule the selection of their various committees on committees as to who may be the chairmen and who may not be. Mr. SCHWENGEL's amendment restricts this to not even a majority of the majority, because he would be counting only among three people.

The distinguished majority whip pointed out some of the things that could happen if you started bargaining among members of committees for votes for election.

I happen to be the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, and I have no doubt that under Mr.

SCHWENGEL'S amendment I could be elected from that committee tomorrow by simply promising to divide amongst the other members the patronage of the chairman, the gentleman from Maryland.

I would not do that. I would not try to supersede him. I would not be a candidate. But there are some people who would. You could have this House and its committees taking away from the caucus, taking away from the majority, taking away from the minority the rights that they have to veto a chairman if he gets out of line. A horrible example was raised a little while ago of a chairman who did and he was vetoed by his committee and he had only the right to sit in the chair and nothing else.

So all of these horrible things are not necessarily as bad as some of those who are not chairmen but who would like to be would like to make us believe they are.

Now, let us be pragmatic and factual. There is a great hue and cry about the rules here. There is one rule here that I have seen violated repeatedly in the last 2 days and mostly violated by those who want reform; that is, rule 42, which blankets in Jefferson's Manual as the rules of the House. In Jefferson's Manual—I think it is on page 203—it says that a Member may not read anything that anybody else has written or anything that he has written to the House of Representatives. Now, I know sometimes, for purposes of accuracy, it is nice to have a printed text to read from, but if we are going to revise the rules wholesale, why do we not change that one, which is violated more times, it seems to me, than it is observed. I just mention that in passing.

I know that there are some things in the rules of the House that maybe ought to be changed. We have committees in both caucuses working on the seniority problem. The gentlewoman from Washington is chairman of the committee on our side, and that committee is working. She has it working and keeps it working, and she checks on you every day to see what you are doing if you are on a subcommittee. We have had a lot of suggestions, but when you get down to it, about the one thing that seems to be of the greatest concern to us—and I do not want to violate any secrets, because it will all be brought up in our caucus—is the fact that probably some people are chairmen of more subcommittees than they can actually physically handle because of the limitations of time, and we are trying to work out as best we can some recommendations to the caucus to spread that work around.

We are trying to work out as best we can some recommendation to the caucus to spread it around. I think that we can work out a practical solution which may alleviate some of the problems that some of the Members feel as very real problems in that they have a lot of time on their hands and not much to do with it. I am all for it. I am all for spreading the workload around. But I think if we adopt the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Iowa that we further shackle the democratic powers of the House in that we take it away from the great mass and we confine it merely to the members on both sides of a specific committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield to me at that point?

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is talking about taking the power away from the caucus. It would also be taking the power away from the House, the power to approve the committees.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is exactly right. We talk about taking it away from the caucus but we would, in fact, be taking that power away from the House.

So I suggest to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE), since the gentleman made a very eloquent speech on this, if these amendments do not pass and next year when the committee chairmen and the members of the various committees come up for approval that the gentleman stand up and tell us which chairman the gentleman does not want and make a motion that he not be elected.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I mentioned the gentleman's name and I want to be fair and give him a chance to answer.

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

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I am only suggesting to the gentleman that be it Republican or Democrat Party which is in the majority——

Mr. HAYS. Well, it will be the Democrats and the gentleman may proceed on that assumption.

Mr. GUDE. Then the caucus of the Democratic Party would be able to further revise the rules if they are unsatisfactory to them should the Schwengel amendment be adopted.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAYS. We will revise—I do not think we would, may I say if the Schwengel amendment is adopted—I do not think the caucus could take away and revise a law which has been passed by both Houses and signed by the President. The gentleman is in error.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Schwengel amendment, it perpetuates the seniority system but, further, it relegates that into a popularity contest, because the only qualifications for these three Members must be seniority or longevity. It says nothing about their expertise in the field in which the committee deals. It says nothing about their technical knowledge, nothing about their attention to committee work. It deals solely on a longevity or seniority basis. However, it relegates that selection to a popularity contest and you are invariably going to have a campaign by members of the committees for this particular position, because every pressure group, every special interest group interested in the work of that committee, may have a favorite among those three that they want to select or get into the position of ranking member or chairman of that committee. You invariably will have commitments between members. Bargaining for position if you will.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me right there?

Mr. HARSHA. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can you imagine the election of a chairman of the Ways and Means Committee from among the first three members with the big interests interested, what the pressure would be? Can you imagine the pressure to elect the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? Can you imagine the pressure which would be exerted in the election of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor? Can you imagine what the pressure would be on the election of the chairman of any number of other committees? Why, it would be tremendous.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has referred to a subject that is very important and I respect him for it and I appreciate the fact that he yielded to me to make my brief observation.

You could have the worst scandals in the world if an election from among the first three members of a committee happens to take place in this House. My mind is open, but this particular proposal would be dangerous—offered in good faith as it is—but it would be dangerous.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the distinguished Speaker. That was the point I was trying to make, and he has made it far more eloquently than I. But please let me point out that you should stop to realize that we are going to have coming before the House a highway bill for 1970 that will involve over $22 billion in the years ahead. When you stop to think of all the highway users' groups, all of the contracting groups, all of the oil people who are involved, every facet of American life that has anything to do with highway construction-interstate-development. Then think of all the river navigation projects, all of the public works projects, all over the country, the flood control projects, just think of the ramifications of that when we get into a bidding contest on who is going to be the ranking member and chairman of that committee.

What you are doing is laying the groundwork, if you adopt this amendment, laying the groundwork for the greatest wheeling and dealing operation that this body has ever seen in the history of the Congress.

Let me say one other word to you about this question of seniority before you want to destroy it all. Every single one of you—every single one of you has seniority over your opponent. Now, you can be attacked by your opponent on your voting record. He can attack you on a personality basis, he can hire a famous public

relations outfit to improve or project the image he thinks the voters would most likely be receptive to, he can spend a million dollars or a hundred thousand dollars to make his name a household word, he can attack you from every single angle but one, and that is seniority. And the first, or lowest Member in seniority in this House has seniority over his opponent. And when you give that up, then you lay yourself completely open to a successful attack by any opponent whom you might have in future elections.

I would hope that you would keep that in mind before you adopt such an amendment as this.

I will now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, relative to the popularity contest the gentleman mentioned, I might mention that the Speaker of the House is elected, the majority leader is elected, the minority leader is elected, and the conference leaders. Relative to the other matter with regard to dishonesty that might be involved because of having to make arrangements with these lobbyist groups, I might remind the gentleman that most of your State legislatures are formed not on the basis of seniority. And as far as seniority, I just had a very tough campaign in the primary campaign in which a lot of money was placed against me, and I mentioned seniority until it was coming out of my ears, and I got absolutely nowhere with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, in response to the gentleman from California, the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader are not selected from the top three men on a seniority basis, as it would be in the committee election amendment. Furthermore the gentleman won the primary contest he refers to and who is to say that his plea of seniority fell on deaf ears. As he says he used the issue of seniority and was successful—that speaks for itself.

I certainly do not suggest any dishonesty on the part of Members but the pressures will be there and they will be great, make no mistake about that. The opportunity for this type of maneuvering and trading is obvious. The ramifications of the ominous results of such an amendment far outweigh the deficiencies of the seniority system.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. That was the exact point that I wanted to make.

I would also like to make this additional observation that in that instance, in order to apply the same logic, the same argument, then you could not restrict it to three. You would have to go through the whole gamut, and open it up, if you are going to use this as the basic argument to everyone on the committee.

Mr. HARSHA. Every member on the committee would be eligible; that is right.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the one salient point which needs to be kept in mind in voting on this amendment, is the overriding objective of improving the operation of the House of Representatives as an institution.

If that is our objective, we do not achieve it by enlarging the isolation of the committee inverting it within itself—we do not provide a means by which three select men rather than one selected man maintains a small baronetcy against the interest of the entire body.

Our primary interest must be in the House of Representatives as an institution. We must be directing our interest toward the discipline of the parties over the conflicting body of ideas from which legislation must ultimately be devised.

Now if we go by the route of the Schwengel amendment, then we go in the opposite direction of that reform that I am talking about here.

I am against the Schwengel amendment and I believe I am against the Reuss amendment. The reason I say I believe I am against the Reuss amendment is that although the Reuss amendment merely affords guidance to a caucus, as I understand it, it seems to me that guidance adds no concrete basis upon which the caucus will gain increased power.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. Yes, the Reuss amendment does do something. It acts as a signal and a symbol to the caucus that they must take into account factors other than pure longevity of service. I point out to the gentleman from Texas that since 1952 on only two occasions—in 1965 and 1969—in those 18 years did the House Democratic caucus even look at the list of proposed chosen-by-seniority chairmen. They were whisked to the floor by the committee on committees with a great whoosh, and the Democratic caucus did not even look at them.

The passage of the Reuss amendment, therefore, would do something—it would signal the two-party caucuses that they must take into account the chairman's qualifications, not just his seniority—and that, it seems to me, is a worthy first step.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman. Insofar as he states that his amendment is for the purpose primarily of strengthening the caucus, his amendment, if it adds anything, is desirable in that respect, but I would respectfully state to the House that I believe that anything that is done in the rules themselves to widen the authority of the caucus implies the power of the House to restrict the authority of the caucus.

I speak for the power of the caucus. I think the caucus of the majority party, and its opposition on the minority side, is the ultimate basis of Anglo-American effectiveness in a legislative body.

Therefore, I would commend the purpose of the Reuss amendment. But I would not recommend to this body in making its rules that it restrict the caucus or direct it. It is for these reasons that I oppose both the Schwengel amendment and the Reuss amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to both amendments.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, RICHARD BOLLING, a short time ago gave the Members of the Committee of the Whole House one of the best lectures on the parliamentary procedures and methods of the Congress that it has ever been my privilege to hear. I sincerely hope that tomorrow when the RECORD comes out that each and everyone of you read it.

I realize that some of my colleagues are interested in changing the Rules of the House, particularly the rules with regard to seniority. I just looked over the list of the 21 standing committees of the House of Representatives.

The three ranking members, both Democrat and Republican, of the standing committees of the House are:

AGRICULTURE

Democrats

W. R. Poage, Tex.
John L. McMillan, S.C.
Thomas G. Abernethy, Miss.

Republicans

Page Belcher, Okla.
Charles M. Teague, Calif.
Catherine May, Wash.

APPROPRIATIONS

Democrats

George H. Mahon, Tex.
Jamie L. Whitten, Miss.
George W. Andrews, Ala.

Republicans

Frank T. Bow, Ohio.
Charles Raper Jonas, N.C.
Elford A. Cederberg, Mich.

ARMED SERVICES

Democrats

L. Mendel Rivers, S.C.
Philip J. Philbin, Miss.
F. Edward Hebert, La.

Republicans

Leslie C. Arends, Ill.
Alvin E. O'Konski, Wis.
William G. Bray, Ind.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

Democrats

Wright Patman, Tex.
William A. Barrett, Pa.
Leonor K. Sullivan, Mo.

Republicans

William B. Widnall, N.J.
Florence P. Dwyer, N.J.
Seymour Halpern, N.Y.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Democrats

John L. McMillan, S.C.
Thomas G. Abernethy, Miss.
William L. Dawson, Ill.

Republicans

Ancher Nelsen, Minn.
William L. Springer, Ill.
Alvin E. O'Konski, Wis.

EDUCATION AND LABOR

Democrats

Carl D. Perkins, Ky.
Edith Green, Oreg.
Frank Thompson, Jr., N.J.

Republicans

William H. Ayres, Ohio.
Albert H. Quie, Minn.
John M. Ashbrook, Ohio.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Democrats

Thomas E. Morgan, Pa.
Clement J. Zablocki, Wis.
Wayne L. Hays, Ohio.

Republicans

E. Ross Adair, Ind.
William S. Mailliard, Calif.
Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, N.J.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Democrats

William L. Dawson, Ill.
Chet Holifield, Calif.
Jack Brooks, Tex.

Republicans

Florence P. Dwyer, N.J.
Ogden R. Reid, N.Y.
Frank Horton, N.Y.

HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Democrats

Samuel N. Friedel, Md.
Wayne L. Hays, Ohio.
Frank Thompson, Jr., N.J.

Republicans

Samuel L. Devine, Ohio.
William L. Dickinson, Ala.
Cleveland, James C., N.H.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Democrats

Wayne N. Aspinall, Colo.
James A. Haley, Fla.
Ed Edmondson, Okla.

Republicans

John P. Saylor, Pa.
E. Y. Berry, S. Dak.
Craig Hosmer, Calif.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Democrats

Richard H. Ichord, Mo.
Claude Pepper, Fla.
Edwin W. Edwards, La.

Republicans

John M. Ashbrook, Ohio.
Richard L. Roudebush, Ind.
Albert W. Watson, S.C.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Democrats

Harley O. Staggers, W. Va.
Samuel N. Friedel, Md.
Torbert H. Macdonald, Mass.

Republicans

William L. Springer, Ill.
Samuel L. Devine, Ohio.
Ancher Nelsen, Minn.

JUDICIARY

Democrats

Emanuel Celler, N.Y.
Michael A. Feighan, Ohio.
Peter W. Rodino, Jr., N.J.

Republicans

William M. McCulloch, Ohio.
Richard H. Poff, Va.
Clark MacGregor, Minn.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Democrats

Edward A. Garmatz, Md.
Leonor K. Sullivan, Mo.
Frank M. Clark, Pa.

Republicans

William S. Mailliard, Calif.
Thomas M. Pelly, Wash.
Charles A. Mosher, Ohio.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Democrats

Thaddeus J. Dulski, N.Y.
David N. Henderson, N.C.
Arnold Olsen, Mont.

Republicans

Robert J. Corbett, Pa.
H. R. Gross, Iowa.
Glenn Cunningham, Nebr.

PUBLIC WORKS

Democrats

George H. Fallon, Md.
John A. Blatnik, Minn.
Robert E. Jones, Ala.

Republicans

William C. Cramer, Fla.
William H. Harsha, Ohio.
James R. Grover, Jr., N.Y.

RULES

Democrats

William M. Colmer, Miss.
Ray J. Madden, Ind.
James J. Delaney, N.Y.

Republicans

H. Allen Smith, Calif.
John B. Anderson, Ill.
Dave Martin, Nebr.

SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Democrats

George P. Miller, Calif.
Olin E. Teague, Tex.
Joseph E. Karth, Minn.

Republicans

James G. Fulton, Pa.
Charles A. Mosher, Ohio.
Richard L. Roudebush, Ind.

STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Democrats

Melvin Price, Ill.
Olin E. Teague, Tex.
Watkins M. Abbitt, Va.

Republicans

Jackson E. Betts, Ohio.
Robert T. Stafford, Vt.
James H. Quillen, Tenn.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Democrats

Olin E. Teague, Tex.
Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn, S.C.
James A. Haley, Fla.

Republicans

Charles M. Teague, Calif.
William H. Ayres, Ohio.
E. Ross Adair, Ind.

WAYS AND MEANS

Democrats

Wilbur D. Mills, Ark.
Hale Boggs, La.
John C. Watts, Ky.

Republicans

John W. Byrnes, Wis.
James B. Utt, Calif.
Jackson E. Betts, Ohio.

You know, it is a remarkable thing. No Member who qualifies for consideration as a chairman under any of these two amendments has spoken in favor of these amendments. It is only those who do not have seniority that want to do something about it.

By the way, as a Member of what has been described as the greatest legislative body in the world, I am sick and tired of hearing what they do in State legislatures. This is not a State legislature. Let everybody get that clear. This is the Congress of the United States. This is the House of Representatives, and we are not bound by what the legislature of any State does.

With the exception of the original 13 States, we have created the machinery that established all the State legislatures, and what they do is of little mind as far as this body is concerned. Most of the State legislators do not even have an office, let alone worry about the things that we have to worry about here in Congress.

Very frankly, if the seniority system is attacked and the attack is upheld by any of the amendments which have been proposed, the next step will be a direct follow-up of what Mr. BOLLING pointed out. Each little committee would then be authorized to pass a bill send it to the corresponding committee in the Senate—Work out the conference, have it engrossed and forwarded to the President to sign into law. That will be the next step that will come, and you will never see legislation come back to this body as intended by the Founding Fathers.

Every one of you who are elected as Members of this body have a right to get up and object when rules go through. It has been my privilege to serve in the Congress for almost 22 years; in that period of time I have seen only two Members who I felt were not qualified to be committee chairmen, and in each of those instances the committee itself took charge and, in a sense, removed the chairman or made him so sterile that he was absolutely ineffective.

The rules of the House as they exist now with regard to seniority are an integral part of the Democratic caucus and the Republican caucus, and if the Republican caucus and the Democratic caucus do not like the system, it is within their province to change it, but not by the rules changes that are now proposed.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) a short time ago made the statement that if the proposed legislation becomes law, it will be binding upon the caucus of each party, and we will not be permitted to change it. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that both amendments be defeated and, with all of its faults, I urge that we do not do anything to disturb the seniority system.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. The point the gentleman has made is a good one. The issue here is not really so much seniority as it is the proper place of seniority in this bill. It is properly a matter of party rule. As chairman of the task force on seniority for Republicans, I can tell the Members that we are seriously considering a possible modification of the seniority rule, and this is where it should be considered rather than in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Republican caucus, for the benefit of the Members on the

Democratic side, took some action on this matter some time ago. They said that no Member on the Republican side could be the ranking member of two standing committees of the House.

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

The Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schwengel amendment for many of the reasons that have been heretofore advanced, but primarily for those reasons involving a diminution of the power of the caucus if the Schwengel amendment is adopted. I think the caucus in matters of seniority and committee assignments should be absolute under our present system. I think also the Schwengel amendment enhances one of the difficulties I personally find with the system, and that is it makes even more isolated and remote from control the enclave that the committee now represents.

Personally, I find one of the most objectionable faults of the system as it presently is constituted is that power is too diffused from the Speaker and too concentrated in the respective committees.

I would go much further, I am sure, than most other Members of this House would go. I would permit the Speaker to appoint all committee chairman subject to the approval of the respective caucuses of each party without regard to seniority or without regard to any other factors than those he deems proper.

I would answer, in reply to the suggestion that this is no more than Speaker Cannon's system, that the era of America today is entirely different from the era that existed during the Cannon tenure when power was concentrated and abused by Speaker Cannon, because the ability, particularly of the communications media, to identify abuses and call attention to those abuses so that they would be redressed was much less then than it is today.

In addition, the power of the executive branch in the Cannon era vis-a-vis the legislative branch was considerably different and considerably less. The power of the executive branch is awesome today compared to the legislative branch.

One of the reasons why there is so much difference between these two branches is that we have diffused our power through the committee system and have not permitted the Speaker to exercise the power his office possesses—which is second in the land—and to exercise the power which should be wrapped up in the speakership. If we should permit the Speaker that power, subject to caucus veto, it would make this legislative branch a more important branch than it has been.

I would also suggest that the objections to selecting committee chairmen solely on the basis of seniority are apparent to all—or must be, because few have addressed themselves to the inexcusable situation that a man should assume the tremendous powers of the committee chairman just because he is reasonably healthy and has a tolerant constituency—that is so incomprehensible to explain to the public that no one on the floor defended it, and properly so. They defended seniority on two very strange bases. One was that historically the Congress was bigoted and prejudiced, and to avoid that bigotry and prejudice in the majority of the Congress, it was necessary to have a system that took out of the hands of individual Congressmen the right to make these selections, and the seniority system did that.

In recent days it has been defended by speaker after speaker because the individual Congressman—it adds up to—are irresponsible and weak and are unable to withstand the tremendous economic pressures of the lobbyists, and it is to protect the individual Congressmen from their own weaknesses that we must have this indefensible system.

One Member said that on his committee he could become chairman tomorrow. He perhaps knows his committee better than I, and he knows their weaknesses, but as he described them, if no one else knew who the members of that committee were, it would have to be assumed they were relatively spineless people and would select the committee chairman on the basis of favors he would give them. It is that demeaning process we engage in when we describe our colleagues by defending the seniority system—it is never assumed we are describing ourselves—and we seek to protect our colleagues by this peculiar system that is indefensible under any other terms than protecting our colleagues against their weaknesses which in the past were bigotry and prejudice and today consists of an inability to withstand the lobbyists.

Those are the types of descriptions of Members of the House that make the public very, very concerned about the House of Representatives.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to particularly address myself to the Schwengel amendment, but many thoughts have been going through my mind, after listening all afternoon to this debate on reorganization and reform.

There is a great concern many Members have had about this legislative proposal. How inclined we all are to make sure that the people back home think we are doing what they want us to do. How we want to tell them all the truth about what happens in the House of Representatives. This what we say we want to do; namely, tell them all.

I happened to count the House a minute ago, and, lo and behold, with this great measure we have before us, we had but 76 Members of the House present and listening to the debate. Perhaps we ought to tell the people about that fact.

I do not know how truly concerned we are about really wanting to do something about reorganizing the House.

Going back into history, referring to something that has been mentioned time and again, is talk about Uncle Joe Cannon. That is history being discussed today. I happened to read recently a book called "Tyrant from Illinois." It is about the legislative life of Uncle Joe Cannon.

I now am privileged to represent a part of his old district, due to the last redistricting in the State of Illinois.

It might be interesting for the Members, if they want to know the truth about what happened in those days, to read the book.

The truth is, Uncle Joe Cannon did not do anything except what the House gave him the power to do. He exercised those rights.

Then, lo and behold, the so-called liberals of those days took those powers away from Uncle Joe, and rightfully so.

The great difficulty at that particular era in history was that Uncle Joe Cannon not only was the Speaker of the House but also was the chairman of the Rules Committee. Whenever the Rules Committee proceeded to report out a rule that Uncle Joe wanted, or did not want, he would put it in his pocket and carry it around. Finally, if one wanted legislative action on the House floor, even if it were a request from the White House, one made inquiry of Uncle Joe Cannon, "What is going to happen to H.R. so and so?" The President might call the Speaker, by telephone, and he would say, "What about that bill?" And Speaker Cannon would reply, "I have it in my pocket." Then he would be asked, "What are you going to do about it? We would like to have you come down to talk it over with the President of the United States." And Uncle Joe would respond to the President of the United States, "Why do you not come up to talk to me about it?"

That is the ways things happened in those days, until the Congress saw fit, in its wisdom, to change the signals.

So whatever changes the Congress wants we can adapt to change. We all desire change and progress. We can, I repeat, adapt to change at any time the House wishes to take action. We can make rules and change them as we see fit.

As suggested this afternoon, by action of the majority party and by action of the minority party these matters can be taken care of. I repeat, it is the responsibility of the Members of the House of our two parties to do all the things for change that have to be done on this House floor. The House has such power and no one else.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that I come to the well of the House, in the time I have been here, but this is a matter which has been of grave concern to me for quite some time. I believe it is most important for us to realize it is not only a question of trying to update the rules and the procedures in this House so that the Congress can become a much more effective body but also, I believe, it is a question of the fact that the American people on many levels—different colors, different economic groups—are questioning some of the actions and some of the operations in this great body.

I do not believe we should close our eyes to some of the stark-naked truths which confront us as we attempt to leave the 1960's and move into the 1970's and try to come up with a legislative body that truly is more relevant to the needs of the people of the United States today.

It seems to me that always a large

number have to suffer for the mistakes of a few. There is no question in my mind about the fact that the seniority system based on longevity of tenure has built into it certain inherent weaknesses which many of us do not like to discuss openly because sooner or later many of us hope to become old and still be able to retain some of the capacities and abilities we have when we are young. Let us face it, gentlemen. The fact of the matter is this: our dynamic, changing society, which has to come up with answers to problems that have been collecting for a long period of time, no longer fulfills the need. It becomes very necessary to change some of the traditions and some of the rules that many of us who have been beneficiaries of the status quo find most difficult to accept in these changing and perilous times in which we are living.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to condemn the seniority system in and of itself. I think the important thing to recognize is that there are additional criteria that have to be considered in addition to longevity of service. I think we have to consider the fact that the reason why young people and other people are lashing out today in our country is that they are seeing by virtue of some of the things they hear some of the gentlemen here say, that we cannot really defend what we are doing. I also recognize, as I have heard some of the gentlemen here say, that we need change; we need change so desperately. However, we are so afraid to speak out even in the caucus because, those of us who have been in the political arena for any length of time, recognize the term "political reprisal." Therefore, even if gentlemen desire to say something in the caucus, and they have very deep feelings and very deep convictions about it, the caucus becomes relatively paralyzed because of their fear of what might happen after they dare to get up and speak out.

I am going to tell it like it is because many of us have been talking in the back rooms. Many of us have been talking about it with each other, but we dare not speak about it within our own caucus. How sad that is. Therefore, we have to recognize the very reason why we have to bring such a bill as this to the floor. It is because the caucus has been relatively powerless in terms of bringing about changes that are very necessary.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I support the Reuss amendment. The reason why I support that amendment is that the people of this country are not interested in excuses from us as their elected representatives as to why we are not functioning. We have a responsibility to carry out in this body in terms of electing the leaders of our committees and in terms of electing those persons who will be controlling the destiny of this Nation. Therefore, it seems to me in our caucuses all of us who are a part of this magnificent body should have the opportunity to make a selection, if you will, merely to have the right to do this, particularly with a closed ballot, because we know what will happen if we do it openly.

In conclusion, there is an element of fear that permeates so much of what we want to do here and so much of what we really should do in order to make this great institution relevant. Let all of us come out from behind our masks and do that which has to be done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose both of the pending amendments, and I do so for some strategic reasons. The reasons are those which were so very eloquently articulated by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

This reorganization bill we have been struggling with for many days now is to me like a vessel on the high seas. It is struggling already loaded with a very heavy cargo. I submit to my colleagues that if we add the additional cargo of seniority, the entire ship will sink. There are many of us who do not want to see this happen.

I am simply arguing that for those who want some meaningful reform and who want this body to effectively consider any changes in the seniority system, I would urge that if they want to go beyond that that they vote against it here. The proper place to accomplish it is in the respective caucuses of the parties. Being a member of the task force on our side, I know we are giving very deep consideration to this matter and I have confidence that we are going to do the right thing in this regard.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, I have listened avidly to the debate here, and for the most part it has been very good. I am glad we are debating this, because this is the first time this question has been debated on the floor of the House. This will result in a change that will result in a better and more effective Congress.

Now, whether or not my amendment passes is not so important as that we do something on this question of seniority.

I have been on 300 different college campuses in my political life, and I can say to my colleagues that there is a disenchantment there about the establishment, and we are it. The present seniority system is one of the principal criticisms that one hears.

I think we are going to be sensitive to this question and I think we are going to make a change; whether it is my amendment or not is not quite so important as that we do something about the seniority system, which I think is inherently bad in that it will not produce the best leadership nor the most effective leadership.

All of you know that I read history some, and I have read the biographies—and I stress biographies in my reading—of the Members of this House and the Senate. It is a tragedy that too few volumes have been written about our predecessors, but I have read enough on the history of this House and those who served here to believe, having now served here almost 14 years, that we have, and you and I are serving with colleagues on both sides of the aisle that measure highly from a sense of capacity, a sense of capability and a sense of dedication.

So all that I have desired to do, and that is my principal purpose for presenting this proposition, is to improve the House so that the capabilities and the capacities of this House to function as a legislative body will have a chance to come through, and to show itself at its best. It is not doing that now.

Now, how do we come to the conclusion that we want to do it this way? Well, I am a pragmatist. As a number of people have said, "Well, why do you not present a modified form?" And that is what this is, a modified change. I would just as soon eliminate the seniority question entirely, and just provide for the election of the chairmen by the committee members.

Now on that point people have gone on and spoken about what was going to happen if we did this. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I cannot believe that this House or the membership character of it will be less with this change than it is now.

This wheeling and dealing would not happen any more, with this change, than is happening today.

As it has been pointed out, our leaders are elected by secret ballot and ballot election is not a new idea at all. We do not need to be afraid of it.

Members of the committee would not be any more influenced than they now are by lobbyists. I know something about lobbying influences because I served in the Iowa Legislature and we do not elect chairmen out there by seniority.

I have not seen any evidence of the lobbyists running high, wide, and handsome over the Iowa Legislature. Although I think at times they do have too much influence. Always that influence is not bad either. I can remember when we were fighting for State aid for schools, when we had a pretty good bunch of lobbyists who turned out to be good lobbyists—they were lobbyists of the people and should the desires of the people come through, it is not going to be bad.

The distinguished gentlewoman from New York has spoken here and touched on a very important point, and that is the importance of our responding to the people's needs—not to the desire of the executive or the desire of the special interests. If I believed that my amendment or the Reuss amendment or any amendment that does something about the seniority system and which would change the seniority system would be a handicap—I would be against it.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request again to set a time certain to vote on the pending amendment and the substitute thereto.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Schwengel amendment and the Reuss amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to make a motion, but there are a number of people who are seeking a motion on this because they would like to know some time certain as to the close of debate on the pending amendments.

If I may make another unanimous consent request, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments, and all amendments thereto, close at 5:15 p.m.

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

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, once a Member has spoken on these amendments, can he under the limitation of time speak on the amendment again?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) that all Members standing would be recognized.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK)?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some humility that I speak to the members of the Committee this afternoon because I was chosen by the chairman of the Democratic caucus to preside over a committee which contains as much controversial material as could possibly be provided by any Democratic caucus.

However, I would like to say to the Members of this House who have discussed this problem of seniority today that, first, I oppose the Schwengel amendment—and I have no feeling for or against the Reuss amendment.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the very distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) who spoke earlier this afternoon, outlining the problems that are at stake in some of the basic proposals. I would like to say to the members of this committee that we have had an overwhelming response from Members on the subject of seniority and associated problems. Seniority is not the whole problem. Basically, we cannot have a more responsive kind of committee system unless the committees are made up of the most able people with the philosophies that we wish to see represented.

Therefore, associated with the problem of seniority is the composition of the committees themselves.

I urge that the Members of this House give the Republican caucus and the Democratic caucus an opportunity to bring before the House a recapitulation of some of the very thoughtful and thought-provoking ideas which have come from nearly all the Members of this House. Some of them deal with rules and how they are administered within the committees. Some of them deal with tenure of the committee chairmen: Shall they be rotated? How long shall a chairman serve? Shall the caucus be given an opportunity to vote on three or five selected people as chairman? You see the complexities of all the items before the committee.

Therefore, I do not propose to delegate the power of this House—my power or your power—to a committee which would name and select chairmen for us to approve and impose their will upon us.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. It is a rather anomalous situation that we have here when some of the very people who were yesterday saying that we have got to get rid of secrecy and we have to have a recorded teller vote are now saying we must have a secret ballot to elect chairmen, which election would not be subject to a review of the House and, therefore, no chance to get a record vote on.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

I will say to the Members again you will have a report on this subject. The distinguished gentlewoman from New York who spoke earlier is a member of that subcommittee. She will have a chance to voice her support for reform within the committee itself. So I would appreciate it if the Members remember that we are working to try to improve the system in the House so that it will be reflective of the changes that are occurring in this century, that we are trying to reflect all of your viewpoints and to reconcile them and to bring about some changes in the structure which will make a more relevant operation within the House.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, first let me make this observation. The gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), in justifying his position on the pending amendment, suggested that using the same logic, we should take the oldest citizen in each district or the oldest person to serve as chairman.

This in and of itself is not alone a totally specious argument, but it is void of any logical parallel to what we are talking about today, because every Member of this House has been elected by the constituents in his district. To attempt to draw such a parallel, I repeat, is void of any logic.

I would like to make one further observation, and that is the gracious gentlewoman from New York pointed out in her very eloquent address here today that one of the reasons the young people are unhappy today is because we are here in the House unable to defend our positions. I reserve the right of the gentlewoman to make this statement. I personally will not accept it, because I can justify and defend to the young people every position I take in this House. Whether they agree with me is something else, or whether I agree with them again is another issue.

We have debated this issue of seniority, and I would like to say this: I do not think there is a person on this floor or a Member of this House who does not understand this issue by now. If that is the case, that he or she does not understand it, then he or she does not belong here. We have spent long hours on it. Whether one or 30 more Members of this House speak on it, we all know almost every Member on the basis of every logical argument—logical or otherwise—presented on this issue will vote as he wants to vote.

While I understand the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) is making every effort, and perhaps properly so, not to limit debate, the sad fact of the matter is we are going to spend a great deal more time in repetition on a subject on which I am certain every Member has made a decision. I would hope, yielding back the balance of my time, that none of us would be so presumptuous at this point in the afternoon as to believe there is an argument that can be made that has not already been presented on either side, and that we would be prepared to vote on the amendment and on the substitute to the amendment which is before us.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

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

Let me just say I feel for good reasons the two parties would have different rules for seniority. I think we should attack this question, and I think we should make a reasoned judgment, and in the future the two parties may decide to follow different rules. This should be a matter for the two caucuses of the two different parties.

Therefore, it is my intention to vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), even though it approaches what I think the Republican Party should do, but I believe we should not bury it in the rules of the House, and we should keep it more flexible.

Mr. COLLIER. I agree with the gentleman. It is easy to criticize what we have, but I question whether what we offer as a substitute will be any better. In fact, I feel we would live to regret the action if we took it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, some 38 or 40 years ago, when I enjoyed the privilege of being a younger member of the elected party, I was very impatient about having to walk behind a man who walked a little slower, who talked a little slower, and, I often thought in those days, thought a little slower. But as the years rolled by and I stayed at the job of being a legislator, I found out that my own pace had slowed a little, and I had just behind me the same kind of eager beaver who just could not wait until his time had come.

Now maybe there is something wrong with this democratic fashion of electing individuals.

I understood the gentleman from New York had said we were not operating in a democratic fashion. I am elected by a secret ballot.

I assume that I have just as many people displeased with me as anyone else. After 38 years of being an elected official, I probably have more than some of these young fellows who still have them all fooled. I do not have them all fooled anymore.

Therefore, I do not see that we would gain anything, especially in the undemocratic fashion of selecting three at the top. How would we do it when we had five after the first two who were all with the same seniority? Would we put it in a democratic fashion of selecting them according to the alphabetical order, or would we have a drawing of straws, and have it fixed so that they were all long straws except when it came to one?

That is the worst thing that could happen to this body. I served for many years in a body that operated in that fashion. The worst thing is the arrangement by which one creates cliques. Clique government is the worst kind of government anyone will ever serve in.

Certainly, we have some old men around here, including myself. I cannot run a foot race with some others, but I do not believe I would be too much worried about having a brain race with them, because I have the great advantage of having lived a long time, of having seen a lot of dirty linen on the line, of having helped to wash some of it clean. I have lived long enough to know that there is much more in life than just being an eager beaver, trying to chase the professor out of the room because one knows more than he does. I can remember that I knew more than the teacher when I was in the fourth grade. Somehow or other, when I got to the eighth grade I did not know as much as I knew in the fourth grade, except that I thought I did.

There is not anything to get hot about. Just live long enough.

Where do you want to start the seniority? Do you want to start it in the first term? In the second term? In the tenth term? Do you want it to be for a Member of a certain subcommittee?

Why not elect a subcommittee by the same fashion, so that every year we would have new subcommittees?

It is bad enough now, with the complex problems of this large Government of ours, for certain Members serving on a committee 8 or 10 years, and sometimes eight or ten terms, to keep up with the changes in the field in which they become experts, rather than to have them come in every year as new Members because a certain clique enjoys the privilege of owning and controlling the votes on the committee.

Let me tell you one serious thing. This is more serious than anything. If you want to do anything about the system, then do something about some of the privileges that certain chairmen have assumed unto themselves. A chairman is nothing but a housekeeper. He has absolutely nothing to do except to see to it that the rules of the committee, selected and approved by the committee members, are obeyed. When he goes beyond that, then address yourselves to that point.

It does not take the hand of a 28-year-old to pound a gavel. I have seen some fellows who are 80 years of age who are able to lift a gavel and to hold the attention of the House and keep the House in silence and in decorum.

There is not any magic to being young, except that probably it is wasted on too many people.

Those of us who have lived were once young ourselves.

My grandchildren cannot wait for the day until they are 21. Then they will not be able to wait until the day they have entered that stage where they can make money, somewhere between 35 and 40. And they never get impatient, if they are normal human beings.

I have no desire to go back beyond my 62 years of age. I believe that that which has been given me has been given me by the rule of life to this day. Whatever the Lord has in store for me I will take it, with whatever he gives me, whether he gives me a chairmanship in this House or defeats me. Whatever it may be, I will leave that as it is.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close at 5:15 p.m.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to advise those Members standing that the Chair will recognize each Member for 1½ minutes.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SPRINGER yielded his time to Mr. CLEVELAND.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BELL of California yielded his time to Mr. MACGREGOR.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Schwengel substitute and then, if that is not adopted, I will certainly support the Reuss amendment.

Some of the speakers have raised a question that this matter of seniority strikes at the heart of our system and other speakers have mentioned the fact that, if we load this bill up with reforms in this area, we may sink it. I think it is important to remind the Members that the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) himself admitted earlier in this debate that the Reuss amendment was not any such blow at seniority that he could consider it something he would particularly oppose.

The Schwengel substitute, it is true, goes further; it is more specific; it definitely gives to the members of the committee the right to select their chairman and ranking minority member from the three senior members of each party, respectively. If somebody feels that the Democratic caucus or the Republican conference should have the power to name the chairmen, and there is merit in such a plan, they would probably oppose the Schwengel amendment.

It is regrettable that we do not all have the time to speak our full 5 minutes here. Had I been given my full time, I would have risked the wrath of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) and would have read from that great book on congressional reform, "We Propose: A Modern Congress," which I have referred to in earlier discussions during this debate. In its chapter on the seniority system, which was written by a former Member of this House, John Lindsay, now mayor of the city of New York, there were some remarks on the seniority system that I would have liked to have shared with the Members. Later on, under unanimous consent, when we get back into the House, I will ask that this chapter be printed, because I think the remarks are pertinent. In recognition of the fact there are two sides to the issue, I will also include a pro and con summary prepared by the Library of Congress.

A point I wish to make in the brief time allotted to me is this: If the seniority system is as good as people here today have said it is, then, why is it that not one State government or one modern parliamentary government anywhere in the world has adopted the seniority system?

It seems to me this definitely and emphatically puts the burden of proof upon those who would speak in favor of a rigid seniority system. As I have sat and worked in this body, it seems to me seniority has resulted in some instances—and I underline "in some instances"—in an unresponsive committee system that has not been fully responsive to the needs of the people. I think the criticisms of the seniority system are sufficiently valid that we should at least modify it. We should do so here and now, if we are truly to put our own house in order in response to the needs of the times.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, can the gentleman tell me how you can have an effective committee system operate under this proposed amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I regret my time has expired; the inserts I referred to follow:

THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

(By Hon. John V. Lindsay*)

There are three things you can do about the seniority system in Congress: you can attack it directly, you can gnaw at its edges, or you can leave it alone.

The most frustrating part of it is that the practice of elevating to the chairmanship and ranking minority positions the Members longest in point of service on each committee can be stopped at any time by both political parties, without a formal amendment of the rules!

Rule 10 of the Standing Rules of the House states:

"At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman the Member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman . . ."[1]

Although selection of committee chairmen by seniority is clearly implied in the language

Footnotes at end of article.

"the Member next in rank . . . as often as the case shall happen," there is no actual *rule* of seniority. The Standing Rules provide for election of committee chairmen by the House. The full House, according to the rules, "shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof . . ." Not necessarily the Member longest in service, but *one of the Members thereof.*

In actual practice, however, the House simply ratifies the decisions which have already been made on the basis of seniority. This is the way it works: Members are appointed to the standing committees by their party's committee on committees. These lists are then approved by the party's conference or caucus and submitted to the House. In the dullest of *pro forma* proceedings, the House "elects" as chairman of each standing committee the Member who was in fact *selected* by his party colleagues to serve as chairman. The sole determining factor in that selection, made in secret caucus was length of service, or seniority.

HOW OLD IS THE PRACTICE?

Dr. George Galloway, eminent historian of the House, marks the birth of seniority at 120 years ago in the Senate and 56 years ago in the House.[2] One of the most memorable speeches on the subject was delivered nearly a century ago, during protracted floor debate over committee assignments in the Senate in the 42nd Congress. The year was 1871, the speaker was Senator John Sherman of Ohio:

"It has been the custom since I have been a member of the Senate, now more than ten years, for each party to arrange the members of that party on the different committees constitution [sic.] the Senate of the United States. Before I became a member of the Senate it was the common courtesy of the Democratic Senators, then a majority of this body, to allow the minority to fill the places assigned to them on the committees. The division of members of a political party among the various committees was regarded as in the nature of a personal matter, appertaining solely to that party, and not to be controlled or affected by the wishes or desires of the opposing party. . . .That has always been the custom, and therefore time out of mind, at the beginning of every new Congress, a meeting of our political friends has been held and these assignments have been made." [3]

The irony in recalling Sherman's speech is that in only six years the Senator was to become a sorry victim of the very system he had so stoutly defended. Sherman entered the Senate in 1861 and in time became chairman of the Finance Committee. In 1877 he resigned his seat—and his chairmanship of the Finance Committee—to become Secretary of the Treasury in the cabinet of President Hayes. When he returned to the Senate in 1881, he was reassigned to the Finance Committee all right, but at the bottom rung of the ladder.

The seniority system is less entrenched in the House than in the Senate. Prior to 1910, the Speaker of the House generally appointed both members and chairmen of the standing and select committees. That business ended in the revolt against Joe Cannon, when the Speaker was unceremoniously stripped of much of his previous authority, including the authority to appoint members and chairmen of the committees. Unfortunately, the practice of selecting chairmen and ranking minority members on the basis of seniority developed quickly and firmly in the political caucuses of both parties.

HOW WIDESPREAD IS THE PRACTICE?

In response to a question put to it by Congressman Morris Udall, the Library of Congress found that "there is not a single State legislature or a free world parliament that operates under this system except the U.S. Congress."

"Rep. Udall: 'I asked the Library of Congress a couple of years ago to answer me one question, and the question was: How many of the parliaments of the free world, the American States, and the free world parliaments, use this indispensable system? The answer is none; none, except the U.S. Congress. Fifty State legislatures, the British, French, the Swedes, the Australians, no one else uses what we are told is an indispensable system to which we are told there is no alternative.' [4]"

If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the U.S. Congress is not exactly overwhelmed with compliments in the way she selects her leaders. Admittedly, "We're only Number Two" as living democracies go—but do we "try harder?"

In summary, we see that seniority (1) is *not* a written rule of the House but is instead a practice which developed in the political parties; (2) in the House, at least, is of relatively recent origin, and (3) as practiced in the U.S. Congress is a system unique among the world's parliaments and even among the legislatures of our own fifty States.

WHY IS THE SYSTEM BAD?

There are some people, of course, who maintain that it is not bad. The standard cliché among Members of Congress is: "The longer you're around here, the better you like seniority." No doubt.

Eighty years ago Woodrow Wilson characterized our federal apparatus as "government by the chairmen of the standing committees of Congress." [5] This was something of an exaggeration then and certainly misses the mark today. But there remains a strong element of truth in the phrase, as illustrated in the following compilation by *Congressional Quarterly* of a committee chairman's powers:

Meetings may be called on short notice, at times when certain members are known to be absent. Or, as a stalling tactic, a chairman can neglect to call meetings.

"In most committees, the chairman also controls the agenda. He can bring up a bill without notice, under circumstances in which his recommendation carries great weight because other members do not know what the bill does. . . . He can also refuse to place bills on the agenda.

"The chairman also appoints subcommittees and subcommittee chairmen.

"He either manages bills on the floor himself or appoints a floor manager. . . . He usually heads the conferees appointed to work out differences on legislation with the other chamber, or influences their appointment.

"The chairman has the major voice in hiring committee staff, and he controls the disbursal of authorized travel funds, saying which members may go on field trips. . . ." [6]

In America's continuing experiment in democracy, the seniority system operates to elevate men to positions of leadership in Congress without regard to any qualification except length of service. As presently practiced, the system is unsound, inflexible, undemocratic, and certainly discouraging to junior Members of Congress. Even the "law of the jungle" operates on a higher level than the "law" of seniority: the first at least works to assure survival of the fittest; the latter operates only to assure survival of the oldest.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF RETAINING THE SYSTEM

Let us now examine the arguments put forward to retain the seniority system. First, the argument of Experience: "New Members must learn their way around before they can qualify for chairmanships. There is no substitute for the time that this learning process requires." [7]

No one who has served in Congress will deny that experience is a valuable factor in considering the appointment of a committee chairman. It takes a year or more to unravel the legislative process; most freshman Members would shy away from the reins of a major committee even if they had the opportunity presented to them to grab hold. The fallacy in the Experience argument is that tenure is no guarantee of ability. As the late Estes Kefauver summed it up:

"This much can be said in favor of rule by seniority: the law of averages works in its favor. In many cases, because of knowledge and skill acquired during years of grappling with problems that regularly come before his committee, the man who is handed the chairmanship through seniority in most cases would be chosen for the post by any system of more democratic election that might be devised. But there is abundant evidence to prove that fitness and leadership are not based upon years in office alone." [8]

In the same vein, the argument of Committee Expertise:

"Long service on a committee develops a certain expertise on particular problems which is an essential qualification of the office of chairman. Ranking Members have acquired an acquaintance with most subjects likely to come before the committee and with the personalities and private interests with whom it has to deal. There is also the gain which comes from Members becoming acquainted with one another and learning how to work together. The committee becomes more of a unit as its membership becomes more stable." [9]

Unquestionably, any committee's efficiency would be impaired whose chairman lacked knowledge of its special problems and routine functions. But the point can be made that long service does not *necessarily* produce expertise. Natural ability, devoted interest, and applied study do. I suspect Kefauver was right in predicting that most committee chairmen would be re-elected on the basis of proved expertise whether the system of seniority prevailed or not. But to assume that the man longest in service on a committee is *therefore* the most expert in handling the business of that committee is to present an argument based on something other than hard logic. Expertise, harmony, and continuity from one Congress to the next are all desirable factors in determining leadership positions. However, as Professor Holcombe notes, party leaders

". . . are not necessarily the ablest members of the party. They may even be grotesquely unsuited for the chairmanship of the important committees on which they happen to serve. They may be out of sympathy with, or even bitterly opposed to, the measures favored by the majority of their fellow partisans. They may be suffering grievously from the infirmities of old age." [10]

Next, the argument that seniority prevents log-rolling and dissension within the political parties:

"Abolition of the rule (sic) would be followed by log-rolling, factional fights, and political trading on a grand scale. 'The danger,' writes Professor Chamberlain, 'that most committee places would go to those who were chosen with specific bills or policies in mind would be real and would be suspected even where it did not exist. The bitter personal feelings engendered by an open contest for committee places would complicate party management, and there would be delay in beginning work in each new Congress until personal and sectional quarrels could be smoothed out.' The rule provides a kind of automatic protocol, like one's place at table at a state dinner or the order of appearance of counsel before the Supreme Court, which settles harmoniously the problem of priority without dispute or controversy and without jeopardizing morale." [11]

Galloway effectively rebuts this argument by pointing out that, indeed,

"One of the greatest drawbacks of the seniority system is that it destroys party responsibility or prevents political parties from performing their campaign promises. For if the chairmen of committees owe their

Footnotes at end of article.

places not to their political parties but to the accident of tenure, then they can follow their own inclinations on legislative matters and disregard the platform pledges and legislative program of the party leaders." [12]

Griffith illustrates the point in even more glaring terms (although on balance Dr. Griffith is disposed to favor selection by seniority):

"If one is an advocate of responsible and disciplined party government, the seniority rule is certainly an obstacle. . . . To put the matter in concrete terms, if the Democrats are in control, about 60% of the committee chairmen are from the South, which is in general its conservative sector. If the Republicans control, about 60% of the chairmen are from the Middle West, which is usually more conservative. . . . If leadership is, as it should be, a reflection of the general will of the majority of a legislative body, then such overweighting is a sericus matter." [13]

As for seniority providing a "kind of automatic protocol," it is precisely the rigidity and complacency which any automatic method of selection imposes or conduces that we are trying to get away from. The problem of "jeopardizing morale," it should be noted, will remain as long as Congress refuses to deal with the conduct of its Members at least by establishing a code of ethics and grappling with the actual, not talked about, restructuring of its organization and procedures in keeping with the changing times.

The Insulation argument runs as follows:

"Committee chairmen are reelected to Congress because their constituents desire to retain the power and prestige of their office. Long and continued service in Congress and the local benefits derived therefrom would be discouraged by abolition of the seniority system." [14]

Proponents of this theory argue that because Members from so-called "safe" districts are in almost no danger of being removed from office, they are free to exercise judgment that will result in legislation in the national interest.

The argument would have some validity if we could accept the premise that Members representing non-marginal districts were insulated, also, from the pressures of important lobby groups and sectional bias. Unfortunately, Members are often removed from fear of reprisal at the polls only because they share the parochial prejudices of their constituents, which may or may not coincide with the national platform of the Member's party or reflect a national consensus. As Professor Dahl writes,

Such validity as this argument has must apply entirely to the question of rationality, not that of responsibility. For often enough, it may be the old and senior member who is most at odds with the bulk of his party and the platform on which that party was elected to govern the country. By erecting seniority into a principle, committees may be converted, in effect, into associations of members responsible only to their own constituents, not, in any meaningful sense, to the national electorate as a whole.[15]

A study by *Congressional Quarterly* of Urban-Suburban-Rural House Districts in 1963 showed the following distribution of House chairmanships and ranking minority positions in the second session of the 88th Congress:

Chairmen (Democrats):	
Urban	4
Suburban	1
Rural	17
Ranking minority (Republican):	
Urban	3
Suburban	4
Rural	15

Footnotes at end of article.

These statistics hardly reflect an equitable representation of the two Americans out of every three who live in and around the nation's cities!

From a compilation of roll call votes in the 87th Congress on which the President's position was ascertainable, *Congressional Quarterly* found that only three of the chairmen of the twenty standing committees of the House supported the leader of their party as often as 75% of the time.[16]

A thorough statistical analysis of the 85th Congress by George Goodwin elicited this less forceful yet still disconcerting conclusion:

"(My) statistical analysis does not make as clear a case against seniority as many of the critics of the system seem to claim. Chairmen are older on the average than their colleagues, and yet with luck a number of younger men are singled out for chairmanships. The districts which produce chairmen are not as stagnant as is often suggested, and the degree of party unity and presidential support among chairmen is not as low as many believe. The picture, however, is far from the ideal held by the proponents of majority rule." [17]

Occasionally, arguments by supporters of the seniority system attempt to justify it by pointing out that "It is no more than fair or just that Members who have been in Congress a long time should be rewarded with committee chairmanships." [18] As far as I am concerned, this argument has been demolished in one memorable sentence by Senator Gore:

"A rule by which a member for no reason except seniority automatically becomes chairman of a committee and so remains until death or defeat is indefensible in principle." [19]

As for the last-ditch cry that "The seniority rule is neither absolute nor invariable; on many occasions the House has ignored this rule and designated members of low committee rank as chairmen," Dr. Galloway was able to record in his authoritative book only one such deviation—and that occurred in 1921—since the practice of seniority took root in the House in 1910.[20]

Finally, it is argued that "Members with long service have greater prestige and influence than new members." To dispute this, Senate historian George Haynes has written:

"There is this much of logic in the seniority rule: it usually brings to the headship of the committee a man who has had many years of experience in handling the special problems in its domain. . . . (But) servile compliance with the seniority rule involves gamblers' chances. It is a limited appeal to the lot. It implies merely duration of service on the committee—not in the least does it guarantee superior ability or fitness for leadership." [21]

GNAWING AT THE EDGES

Testifying before a Senate committee during hearings 18 years ago to evaluate the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Senator Robert LaFollette, chairman of the joint committee from which the Act had come, plaintively told his colleagues:

"We were unable to get any substantial agreement on methods to improve the seniority system in the selection of committee chairmen. . . . The committee had a great many suggestions made to it . . . but frankly, I have never seen a solution which I thought was better than the disease.[22]

Unfortunately, the result of the 1946 Act was to treat the symptoms rather than the disease. This is illustrated in the following excerpts from testimony of George H. E. Smith, former staff director of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, in the course of these same hearings:

"Under the Reorganization Act . . . the power of the chairman is shared by the committee as a whole. He cannot appoint the staff without committee approval . . . He cannot work by proxies . . . He cannot report a measure unless a majority of the committee were actually present . . . He must conduct all hearings in public . . .

"In the light of these limitations on the power of committee chairmen and opportunities afforded to others regardless of seniority, the matter of seniority loses much of its former importance. At the same time, the usefulness of the seniority rule in solving conflicting claims is retained and no satisfactory substitute has been found." [23]

Smith's argument that "the matter of seniority loses much of its former importance . . . in the light of these limitations on the power of committee chairmen" holds only to the degree the limitations imposed *actually curtail* the authority of committee chairmen. In fact, the symptoms persist because the "disease" is still with us. For example, Rule 11 of the Standing Rules of the House provides that committee staff shall be appointed "by majority vote of the committee . . . without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office . . ."

In spite of this language, committee chairmen may and do appoint staff without approval of the full committee. Again, the Rules clearly state that

"No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present."

In spite of this language, committee chairmen may and do work by proxies. "The fault," Cassius reminded Brutus, "is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings."

Another form of gnawing at the edges is seen in the proposals to limit the number of terms a committee chairman may serve, or to force him to retire at a certain age. Again, as in the attempt to limit the chairman's powers, the attempt to limit his length of service attacks only the periphery of the problem. Granted, a limitation of terms or age does have merit, but *not* as a "solution" to the seniority problem.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

Postulating three basic prerequisites—"ability, which embraces knowledge, training, and experience; loyalty to the national interest rather than to local or sectional interest; and a sense of political responsibility to execute party covenants with the people" [24]—Galloway poses seven conceivable methods of selecting committee chairmen:

1. Automatic elevation by seniority.
2. Election from the floor.
3. Selection by a committee on committees.
4. Appointment by the Speaker of the House and the presiding officers of the Senate (or by the majority leaders in each chamber).
5. Automatic rotation in office at periodic intervals.
6. Secret election by committee members.
7. Secret election by party caucus.

We may eliminate the first three possibilities, as the system now in effect is a combination of this trio: committee chairmen are "elected" from the floor *after* the respective committees on committees have submitted their lists, which were dictated in party caucus by application of the "law" of seniority.

Appointment by the Speaker (No. 4) has flunked the test of history, as seen in the 1910 revolt against Speaker Cannon.

The rotation plan has a great deal of merit, notwithstanding its automatic feature. According to the Atomic Energy Act, the chairmanship of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy must alternate between House and Senate in succeeding Congresses. Three Senators and three Representatives have filled the post with distinction in the ten years of the committee's existence. Testifying before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress last year, present JCAE Chairman Chet Holifield noted:

"Each of my colleagues in the chairmanship has brought talents and ideas and resourcefulness to the job. Each has gained valuable experience in the chairmanship role. Each has been responsive to and considerate of other committee members' ideas and suggestions. The understanding that the chairman's tenure was alternating rather than continuous prevented the growth of complacency and inspired each chairman to excel in performance." [25]

This would be an acceptable alternative to selection by strict seniority.

Two other methods seem to me to present attractive alternatives to the seniority system: election of committee chairmen by secret ballot within the respective party caucuses, and election by secret ballot within each committee. The former has the advantage of strengthening the role of the parties in the legislative process, but it carries some dangers of potential factionalism and swapping of state delegations. However, this alternative has been advanced by the highly respected American Assembly of Columbia University, by many political scientists, and by some Members of Congress Certainly, it is vastly preferable to the strict application of seniority.

I am personally inclined to favor selection of committee chairmen by secret ballot of the members of each committee. Each of the standing committees of the House is a semi-autonomous body with its own unique problems and special norms. Committee members, by observing each other at close range in the daily operations of the committee, would seem to me to be in the best position to judge the qualifications necessary for their chairman, and they certainly are aware of intelligence or personality traits which are often important to a smooth-working relationship. Committees are the workshops of Congress; their members should determine who should be seated at the head of the worktable.

However, this warning applies to any and all methods of selecting committee chairmen: as long as Members of Congress agree among themselves to elevate their colleagues according to length of service, no amendment of House rules will abolish the rite. Neither will the problem be solved by such peripheral attacks as the attempt to establish uniform procedures for all committees or to force chairmen to retire at a certain age. As we have seen from the operation of the 1946 Act, the first cannot be enforced; the second, unfortunately, is directed at senility rather than seniority.

Speakers, majority leaders and minority leaders, have long been elected by the usual democratic process of casting a ballot, with each party electing its own. It is a tribute to the ability and integrity of the Members that highly qualified men have uniformly emerged in these positions of general leadership. It would seem that a similar system in the committee structure would serve to strengthen the operations of the legislative branch. A responsible legislative body must make every effort to avoid even the occasional disaster that is caused by the blind application of the seniority "rule." The contention has been made that perhaps ambitious and unscrupulous members would trade their votes for the next twenty years in exchange for votes to become chairman. That has never been the operation of the Congress as a whole in the election of minority and majority leaders or the Speaker, and there is absolutely no basis for believing that it would happen in the individual committees.

In closing, the words of Douglass Cater seem to me to present a most eloquent argument for abolishing the seniority system:

"Mostly the reporter comes to accept a certain amount of mystery about the way the House works. He observes the numerous impediments that have been placed in the way of majority rule and the cumbersome procedures for getting around these impediments. But he can never be sure when the seeming frustration of majority rule is simply the working of a silent majority within the membership. One thing is clear. More than in the Senate, raw power in the House is vested in a group of chieftains, a dozen or so, who are pretty much unknown to the public at large. Men of vast seniority, they mostly represent small rural districts where their seignioral rights are seldom challenged. They tend to view their power as a personal accomplishment . . ." [26]

It is a little difficult to say with pride that ours is a government of laws and not of men when power and prestige in Congress are not won, as they should be, through diligent, intelligent achievement, but are rather "awarded" to the winners of the continuing race against time.

FOOTNOTES

*Mr. Lindsay was first elected to Congress in 1958 from the 17th Congressional District of New York. He served on the House Judiciary Committee, resigning his seat in Congress in 1965 when he was elected Mayor of New York City.

[1] *Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives*, 89th Congress, 1st session. This provision was adopted April 5, 1911, and continued in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, 60 Stat. 812.

[2] Galloway, George B., *Congress at the Crossroads*, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1946. "Seniority in point of service has been the prevailing principle governing both committee assignments and the selection of Chairmen since 1846 in the Senate and 1910 in the House." p. 187.

[3] Quoted by Galloway in "History of Seniority System in the Senate," Legislative Reference Service, 1959, unpublished.

[4] U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Hearings, 89th Congress, 1st session, Part 1. For full testimony of Rep. Udall (D., Ariz.), see pp. 132–165.

[5] Wilson, Woodrow, *Congressional Government*. Originally published in 1885.

[6] *Congressional Quarterly*, Special Report on "Congressional Reform: An Examination of the Structure, Operation, Rules and Customs of Congress, and Proposals for Revision," revised April 1, 1964.

[7] From a compilation by Frederick L. Scott, Legislative Reference Service, "Seniority as the Basis for the Selection of Committee Chairmen." 1954, unpublished.

[8] Kefauver, Estes, and Dr. Jack Levin, *A Twentieth-Century Congress*, New York, Duell, Sloan, & Pearce, Inc., 1947.

[9] *Congressional Digest*, August-September, 1945. From a compilation of arguments in favor of retention of the seniority system by the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association.

[10] Holcombe, Arthur M., *Our More Perfect Union*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1950.

[11] *Congressional Digest, op. cit.*

[12] Galloway, *op. cit.*

[13] Griffith, Ernest S., *Congress: Its Contemporary Role*, New York, New York University Press, third ed., 1961.

[14] *Congressional Digest, op. cit.*

[15] Dahl, Robert A., *Congress and Foreign Policy*, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950.

[16] *Congressional Quarterly* Special Report, *op. cit.*

[17] Goodwin, George, Jr. "The Seniority System in Congress," *The American Political Science Review*, June 1959. For the 85th Congress, Goodwin found that "the 109 most urban districts produced 21 per cent of the House chairmen, the 108 next most urban produced 5 per cent, the 110 next most urban 16 per cent, and the 108 least urban 58 per cent."

[18] Scott compilation, L.R.S., *op. cit.*

[19] Rep. Albert Gore, in testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 1945.

[20] Galloway, George B., *History of the U.S. House of Representatives*, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 3rd printing, 1962.

[21] Haynes, George Henry, *The Senate of the United States: Its History and Practice*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1938.

[22] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Hearings, 80th Congress, 2nd session (1948).

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] Galloway, *op. cit.* In summary, Galloway states: "Of the seven possible methods listed above, the only ones that seem most likely to result in the selection of chairmen of ability, public interest, and party accountability are selection by party caucus, by the committee on committees, or by the presiding officer or majority leader. Men of undoubted ability and devotion to the public interest might be chosen by the other methods, but they fail to satisfy the important test of party responsibility. Major importance is attached to this test because, unless political parties can be held responsible for fidelity to their campaign pledges, then party platforms are a snare and a delusion and public confidence in the party system will wither away."

[25] U.S. Congress, Senate. Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Part 2, May 17, 1965.

[26] Cater, Douglass, "Spotlight on the House," *The Reporter*, September 28, 1961.

SENIORITY AS A BASIS FOR SELECTING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN: PROS AND CONS

Presented below are the arguments often raised by those who favor or oppose the operation of the seniority system in Congress.

PRO

1. Service to constituents

(a) "Long service on committees brings members in contact with the personnel of the several departments and helps them to be of service in many little and some big ways to their constituents back home." (George Galloway, *The Legislative Process in Congress*)

(b) "Committee chairmen are sometimes reelected to Congress because their constituents desire to retain the power and prestige of their office. Long and continued service in Congress would be discouraged by abolition of the seniority system." (Hearings, Joint Committee, 1945)

2. Promotes legislative harmony

(a) "The most telling argument of the proponents of seniority is that the system promotes legislative harmony. It prevents hurt feelings on the part of those passed over in the struggle for appointment, and incidentally, it keeps pressure groups out of the struggle. As a result it helps to create groups out of the struggle. As a result it helps to create a more cooperative atmosphere, both in the legislative body as a whole, and on the various committees. Committees can act as more of a unit, and in a more non-partisan manner." (George Goodwin, *The Seniority System in Congress*)

(b) "The adjustment of rival claims must precede the adjustment of major conflicts without being permitted to divert attention for long from the larger task at hand. Some harmony within the legislature—including agreement on the location of internal authority—must exist before the legislature can itself promote harmony between conflicting groups." (Roland Young, *The American Congress*)

"Fundamentally, the seniority system avoids the waste implicit in instability of committee composition and management. It

invokes the presumption that, other things being equal, the man or woman with the greatest experience in a particular job is best fitted to participate in and lead in its performance." (Emanual Celler, The *Seniority Rule in Congress*)

(c) "It has often been suggested that chairmen of committees be elected by the committees. In that event the element of personalities and favoritism would come into play, and there would be log-rolling and electioneering for the votes of the committee members by those who wanted to be chairmen. If the Senate should adopt that method I doubt very much that it would adhere to it very long, because it would result in a very unsatisfactory situation. Jealousies, ambitions, and all the frailities of human nature would crop out in the electioneering methods of men who wanted to be chairmen of committees." (Senator Alben Barkley, *Congressional Record*)

3. Experience and expertise

(a) "This much can be said in favor of rule by seniority: the law of averages works in its favor. In many cases, because of knowledge and skill acquired during years of grappling with problems that regularly come before his committee, the man who is handed the chairmanship through seniority in most cases would be chosen for the post by any system of more democratic election that might be devised." (Estes Kefauver and Jack Levin, *A Twentieth Century Congress*)

(b) "Long service on a committee develops a certain expertness on particular problems. The older members have acquired an acquaintance with most subjects likely to come before the committee and with the personalities and private interests with whom it has to deal. There is also the gain which comes from members becoming acquainted with one another and learning how to work together. The committee becomes more of a unit as its membership becomes more stable, and it is easier to develop a nonpartisan attitude toward legislative projects." (George Galloway, *Congress at the Crossroads*)

"Of course, seniority does have its beneficial side. It cannot and should not be discarded. One needs experience in being a United States Representative, just as physicians or computer-data analysts do. Knowledge presumably generates competence and special skills. (Richard Bolling, *Power in the House*)

(c) "The committee chairman is always the most experienced majority party committee member if not always the most expert. Committees consider bills, not policy in the round, and this places a premium on detailed and highly technical knowledge of earlier statutes, the legislative history of similar bills, relevant administrative rulings on court decisions, and the like. Congress rarely considers an entirely new issue. Years of service on the same committee is a liberal education in the politics of a particular field." (Donald Matthews, *U.S. Senators and Their World*)

4. Serves to protect legislators

(a) "The seniority system acts to protect a person who might be in some danger of being discriminated against for any extraneous reason. This, of course, includes protection of the deviate from the norm of party doctrine, or the majority view among a party. It has protection for the unusual guy." (Randall Ripley, *Power in the Senate*)

(b) "The seniority system also has the virtue of not being arbitrary. To a notable extent it is predictable and definite. Every member after a period of service knows where he stands and what should be his line of progression. He can devote energy and study to the field, secure in the knowledge that as long as he remains in Congress the time spent in developing his committee specialty will not be wasted by the arbitrary decision of some one person or group of persons." (Joe Evins, *Understanding Congress*)

"The seniority rule has the added virtue of being objective. It automatically eliminates the intrigues, deals, and compromises that characterize election campaigns." (Emanuel Celler, *The Seniority Rule in Congress*)

5. Proposed changes likely to create more problems

(a) "If the present more or less automatic system of appointment and preferment were to be abandoned, the judgment of fitness would have to be placed in the hands of some one man or group of men. Does it seem likely that such a system would produce well-balanced committees? I think not, and most members hold a similar view on this subject." (Joe Evins, *Understanding Congress*)

(b) "I would like to make the observation at this time that personally I have listened with a great deal of interest to all these people who want to limit terms or substitute something else for seniority. I am about as junior a Member as you can get and certainly I am the most junior member of this special committee, certainly as far as service in the Congress is concerned, but I am impressed with the fact that the one thing that everybody who is opposed to the seniority system fails to come up with is a better solution. We have a list of five suggestions here the other day just ticked off like that about the seniority system but mostly in a critical vein and certainly there are areas where it does not function, perhaps, even to the majority's satisfaction. But the lack of a better method or substitution therefore is impressing me more and more as we go on with these hearings." (Representative Durward Hall, Joint Committee, 1965)

6. Maintains congressional integrity

(a) "The seniority system is the only way to prevent committees from becoming a rubber stamp for the speaker and the White House. Congressional committees can be free to amend, refine and improve bills only if they are not made too responsive to strong leadership controls." (Washington Post, March 16, 1970)

(b) "Seniority helps to insulate the Congress from encroachments by the White House and other quarters. At present, a President will not seek dismissal of a committee chairman who does not support his program since such an effort would be futile. However, nonautomatic chairmanships would open the door to interference in Congressional affairs by the Chief Executive, especially where he is a member of the majority party." (DSG Study, *Congressional Record*)

(c) "There is no need of outside control over committee chairmen because committee members themselves can spur or veto an unresponsive or obstructionist chairman." (DSG Study, *Congressional Record*)

CON

1. Obstacle to party responsibility

(a) "One of the greatest drawbacks of the seniority system is that it destroys party responsibility or prevents political parties from performing their campaign promises. For if the chairmen of committees owe their places not to their political parties but to the accident of tenure, then they can follow their own inclinations on legislative matters and disregard the platform pledges and legislative program of the party leaders." (George Galloway, *Congress at the Crossroads*)

(b) "One major consequence of the seniority rule, then, is to distribute committee chairmanships to members who may, and do on certain issues (but not all), reflect a minority position of the party caucus." (Louis Froman, *The Congressional Process*)

(c) "The seniority system produces a large number of chairmen who are representative of only one element of the party, and that, generally, a minority element. They represent "stagnant" districts made safe by restrictions on voting, by a one-party monopoly, by the ascendancy of a major interest group, or by an effective rural or urban political machine. Thus, the leaders of Congress, produced by the seniority system, are almost guaranteed to oppose the President, regardless of party, and a new non-constitutional dimension is added to our constitutional system of separation of powers." (George Goodwin, The Seniority System in Congress)

(d) "The seniority system has fragmented and diffused power in the House, thereby crippling effective leadership and making it impossible to present and pursue a coherent legislative program. (DSG Study, *Congressional Record*)

2. Undemocratic

(a) "In America's continuing experiment in democracy, the seniority system operates to elevate men to positions of leadership in Congress without regard to any qualification except length of service. As presently practiced, the system is unsound, inflexible, undemocratic, and certainly discouraging to junior Members of Congress. Even the law of the jungle operates on a higher level than the 'law' of seniority: the first at least works to assure survival of the fittest; the latter operates only to assure survival of the oldest." (John Lindsay in *We Propose: A Modern Congress*)

(b) "The system denies competent younger men a chance to exercise their leadership talents at the time in life when they are most able to meet the rigors of the job. It is therefore wasteful and inefficient." (DSG Study, *Congressional Record*)

3. No correlation with competency

(a) "The seniority rule often gives power to the weak enfeebled members of Congress instead of those who are young and healthy. In addition, the rule has several times advanced to chairmanships men who were later proved totally unfit for public office." (Daniel Berman, *In Congress Assembled*)

(B) "The seniority system is no guarantee that chairmen will be well qualified. A hardy constitution and the ability to get reelected in the home district do not necessarily fit a man to preside over committee meetings or to defend committee reports on the floor. If the system puts so much emphasis on experience, why, ask the critics, is a man who leaves to take an administrative post, but who returns later to Congress, given little or no credit for his previous experience?" (George Goodwin, *The Seniority System in Congress*).

4. Produces chairmen unrepresentative of and unresponsive to the public interest

(a) "At a time when other American institutions are turning over the reins of leadership to younger men, the leaders of Congress have been getting older. Thus the system aggravates the tensions and strains in the society at large, especially when it produces powerful chairmen who are hostile to change and dedicated to protecting and preserving the status quo." (DSG Study, *Congressional Record*)

(b) "These old men have got everything so tied down you can't do anything. I never realized how few people ran things back here. There are 435 members but about 40 call all the shots and they're nearly all around 70 or 80. They're the committee chairmen and the ranking members. Don't misunderstand me. These men have been damn good Congressmen and served their people and their country well. But it's time for them to get out." (Representative Everett Burkhalter, *Washington Post*, April 3, 1964)

5. Deters recruitment of legislators

(a) "It is charged by some that the emphasis on seniority deters good men from

seeking congressional careers because they do not relish what a legislator once called 'the humble and unrewarding roles of freshmen.' (Daniel Berman, *In Congress Assembled*). Senator Richard Neuberger has written that this factor was to blame for the decisions of two former presidential candidates—Thomas E. Dewey and Adlai E. Stevenson—not to run for the Senate. (Richard Neuberger, *A Senator's Case Against Seniority*)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to express my admiration for the gentleman managing the bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK). He deserves great credit from all of us for permitting this debate to continue without making a motion to close debate as he was being urged to do by some Members. An afternoon was surely not too much time to spend on an issue of this importance. The debate has been a good one. Many good speeches have been made and some nonsensical ones.

I agree with much of what has been said about the irrationability of the system whereby length of service is the sole criterion by which committee chairmen are selected. Surely this system is one of the main reasons why the American people, especially young people, have little respect for the Congress.

The problem, of course, is what to do about it.

The proposal which has been made by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) whereby the majority members of each committee would select the chairman from the top senior members, is a thoughtful one, but I do not think it should be accepted, mainly because it would interfere with the role and responsibility of the majority caucus.

I do support the Reuss amendment. At first, I thought this amendment was not very significant, but I support it now with enthusiasm after hearing some of the attacks made upon it by those who regard the seniority system as sacrosanct. Surely it would make sense to include in our rules the language proposed by the Reuss amendment that seniority should not be the sole consideration in electing committee chairmen. This would not detract from the responsibility of the majority party in selecting committee chairmen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, the story is told of a lawyer who revealed the greatest lawsuit he ever tried. He said it took 6 weeks to put in the evidence and 2 days for the closing arguments and the jury was out for 2 weeks. The fellow who was being told the story said "Well, what happened to the defendant?"

The lawyer said, "Oh, him? Well, they hanged him, but it was the greatest lawsuit I ever tried."

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me most of this debate has been about the prerogatives of the caucuses and the prerogatives of the institution. They did away with the institution of slavery. It is the institution of seniority that we should be discussing here today.

I find it most difficult to go home and tell a high school civics student or the parents of that student who undertake to help him with his homework, that the seniority system is better than democracy.

I might say to the distinguished and esteemed chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) who referred to the late Winston Churchill and quoted him as saying that democracy is a poor form of government, and it is a shame the rest of them are so much worse. Mr. Churchill did not say democracy is worse than seniority. He said all other systems, including seniority, are worse.

I have a suggestion to the Congress on the subject of seniority. I believe if seniority is a good thing for the Congress, it is a good thing for the country, and therefore, Members of Congress should be selected from the various districts of the United States on the basis of the longest living individual citizen in each congressional district, thus saving the cost of holding an election. Or, if there are some diehards who still believe it is a good idea to elect public officials, I suggest that we continue electing Members of Congress from their respective districts and then also elect the chairmen of the committees. Members would be surprised how many chairmen would remain right where they are by secret ballot. Quite a few of them would. But I think that it would be good to provide, in the alternative, either to have all Americans participate in the blessings of the seniority system, or have the American people and the Congress participate in the blessings of democracy, by abolishing the silly system of seniority here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR).

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Throughout each of our States, when there is a sampling of public opinion, the answer is "We think highly of our Congressman, or Congresswoman, but we have a low opinion of the House of Representatives as a whole." And when the latter portion of that response is probed further for reasons, one hears charges of corruption, prejudice, bigotry, undue influence, wheeling and dealing. When you and I are confronted with those charges against the House of Representatives, we rise to defend this body and its occupants, and its practices. We know that such charges are untrue with respect to the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body, without regard to party affiliation or, may I say, without regard to the length of service of any sitting Member in this body.

I was more surprised today, I think, than I have been at any time in 9½ years to hear within this Chamber from senior Members of this body the suggestion that the adoption of one or more of the pending amendments might well lead to corruption, could induce or encourage racial prejuice and bigotry, or would open the door to undue influence or wheeling and dealing.

So a great disservice has been done this by some senior Members who have argued in opposition to these amendments.

For those of us who sponsor these modest vehicles for change in the inflexible rigidity of the seniority system, let me say all we are asking is give merit a chance.

Now, we all know that you are not going to see this amended rule used very much even if it is adopted. Neither the Schwengel nor the Reuss amendment would result in the most senior Member failing to be elected committee chairman except in the highly unusual situation of gross incompetence or arrogance in the exercise of the chairman's prerogatives. But the mere presence of either of these amendments in our rules would result in more democratic committee procedures.

The people elect us; we in turn elect our Speaker. In party caucus or conference each side here elects floor leaders and other officers of the House. What sensible reason can there be for not electing those who wield great power from their positions as chairmen of our legislative committees?

We know that these committees are the workshops of Congress. The Members should decide who sits at the head of the workbench.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is the wrong forum, and the wrong time to discuss this particular issue. There is nothing in the rules to prevent the complete abolishing of the so-called seniority system, but to maintain viable political parties we should leave it to the caucuses of those parties to determine which of their members will be nominated for chairmanships, and those nominations confirmed by this House.

Remember, this body elects the members of the committees and the chairmen of the committees.

The thing we are talking about is how the nominations are offered—and they should come out of the caucus.

I do not defend the selection of one because of longevity, but I do ardently defend the right and the need to maintain the individual integrity of each party and to hold it accountable to the people who elected its members and gave them the power to control this House and the responsibility for carrying out the legislative duties of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) for 1½ minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, it becomes very clear, after enduring or listening to the rhetortic and invective which we have endured and listened to, that the proponents of both of these measures are not only sincere but are convinced that this thing must be charged—"this thing" being the seniority system.

It is equally clear that the end result of the adoption of either of these amendments would lead to a cosmetic covering of the scab and the sore, if there is one.

It is clear that the rhetoric of such gentlemen as the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) is best reserved

for the caucus where if there is an injustice, it should be removed.

On this side, those who would support change should do it within the Republican conference.

It is clear that there is room for courage in changing the seniority system. But it is clear too that it must not be done by a cosmetic vote here and now in support of either of these measures because that would be less than honest to those who expect a change.

The change must come from within the caucus otherwise you do yourself and your constituents great dishonor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, first I too would like to compliment the gentleman from California, the subcommittee chairman, for his patience, fairness, his excellent work on this bill.

It is difficult to make a case in a minute and one-half. There is a need to change the seniority system itself because it does not work well.

We have a mandatory retirement age in the executive branch of 70. Yet, here in the House today we have seven committee chairmen in their seventies and three in their eighties. I know of no other institution, not a single one in our society, which selects its leadership in this way. If the oldest man on the committee is the best man, he ought to be the chairman; but the oldest surviving member, on the basis of service, should not automatically become the committee chairman.

So the seniority system tends to keep men here too long. It is hard to blame them for staying, because that is the only way they can finally come to exercise committee leadership. A man literally has to outlive his colleagues in order to serve as committee chairman.

With Members staying here for that purpose into their late seventies and eighties, how in the world can we encourage good men and women who care about our society to run for Congress if they know they cannot advance on the basis of ability, but only on the basis of age?

Just think about it. If a man comes here at the age of 35 and spends 20 years here, at age 55 he can be the most effective person on that committee in terms of background, experience, judgment, ability and all the rest—and is the man who ought to be committee chairman. But that person may have to wait another 22 years until he is 77 years old to become the committee chairman. That just does not make sense.

I cannot believe that we are so devoid of imagination that we cannot correct this seniority system without bringing the whole body down into a morass of deal cutting.

Please do not misunderstand, I am not saying that those of us who are 32 years old should be committee chairmen or that I ought to be a committee chairman. I do not say that. I know that after 4 years in this body, that I do not yet feel prepared to serve as a committee chairman.

But what about the Members here who are 45, 55, and 65 years of age who are now ready to serve as committee chairmen? Why should they have to wait another 10, 15, or 20 years before they have a chance to serve?

This just is not right and it does not make sense.

Also the seniority system has tended to produce regional domination of the Congress. Today, for example, many of our most important committees come from one region of the country. The reason we assign congressional districts proportionally based on population, is to provide for national equality in terms of congressional representation. Regional domination—stemming from one-party areas of the country—works to erode and destroy proportional representation in the operation and conduct of the House.

The argument that we should be fearful of electing committee chairmen because of deal-cutting, falls flat. First, I have more faith in my colleagues than that, and believe they would vote for candidates for committee chairmen based on merit. We do not select the Speaker of the House on the basis of seniority—and he is the most powerful figure in the House—in fact the man third in succession to the Presidency. If we feel that we can safely elect the Speaker of the House—why can't we safely elect the committee chairmen? We can, and we should.

The perpetuation of the blind, unthinking seniority system is slowly but steadily destroying the effectiveness of the House of Representatives. If we cannot find an appropriate remedy, I believe the legislative branch will continue to lose relevance and meaning.

Unless we can find immediate ways to substantially improve the operation of this people's branch of government—we, in all likelihood, will do more to handicap and destroy effective self-government than any other force in our society. At times we face this fact—and respond accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) for 1½ minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a position similar to that of the speaker before me.

I am not interested at all in assuming a greater degree of leadership by virtue of the time spent here and the maturity and wisdom that will come with it.

It seems to me that if one looks a century ago and sees that the average committee chairman serving here had 6 years longevity and was of age 49, and then if one looks at our present situation where the average committee chairman has been here 28 years and is near age 70, we find that we have been thwarting in a regular and hard way over the last two generations the theory behind the House of Representatives in this country.

When you tell me as a newly added member of the Committee on Banking and Currency that to prosper and survive in this system I must regularly hold to the position for the next 20 or 30 years in order to achieve power, narrowing my perspective in other areas when the times require broad national perspective in terms of leadership, it makes no sense to me at all. It does not seem to me rational, nor does it enable us to go to the people to demonstrate our concern with the relevance of the institution and our power.

I come here this afternoon to endorse the theory that we should be able at least to consider before this body and before the caucus on both sides of the aisle the question of how we will pick our leaders. We have been noticeably reticent in discussing that question in the short time I have been here. This does afford us an opportunity to give serious attention to a needed change in the system.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as the Member who is about 430 in seniority in the House I have more than a little interest in providing alternatives to the seniority system. But it seems to me as one who has served some 7 years in a State legislature before I came here, the Schwengel amendment would be an extremely debilitating amendment to adopt today. If anything is wrong with this House, it is not that we have too much centralization. I think, if anything, we have too little. The last thing we need around here is to establish and strengthen independent fiefdoms, and that is precisely what the Schwengel amendment will do.

We must keep in mind that central to the success of the democratic process is the idea of accountability. We do not get accountability by placing more and more power in the hands of a few men sitting in committees. The welfare of this House, the welfare of the country rests in the last analysis upon responsible partisanship and upon the ability of the two parties to fulfill their own goals in their own ways.

It seems to me the only place where you can get that kind of system, where you can establish that kind of system and make it function is in the caucus, not in the committee. I firmly believe, therefore, that the Schwengel amendment to the Reuss amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) which would amend rule X of the House regarding selection of committee chairmen.

Although there is no rule requiring the Speaker to nominate the member with the longest consecutive service to the chairmanship of a committee, such has been the longstanding practice. How-

ever, as we ourselves change over the years, so must the rules.

The original custom has evolved from the overbearing power Speaker Joe Cannon exercised in assigning committee chairmen during the early part of this century. His abuse of his duly assigned power led to reorganization of the Speaker's Office and reassessment of the appointment of chairmen.

Now, however, such a threat of power abuse is no longer present, and the rules of the House should reflect a more sensible approach to appointing the chairmen of committees. This amendment would not, by itself, change the practice under the rule. Rather it would serve as an expression of the will of the whole House that seniority should not be the sole criteria in the selection of committee chairmen.

This reform would permit the majority party in its caucus to select committee chairmen based on criteria other than seniority alone. Thus it would also answer the objections of those who say there is a possibility that a senile individual would be elected to a committee chairmanship solely because of his seniority.

The time has come for this and many of the other reforms that have been offered here today and during the past several days of debate. If we are to remain a responsive, relevant, and democratic body, we must make the necessary changes in our operating procedures. The people of this Nation are growing impatient with a Congress whose rules and customs slow its operations to less than a snail's pace. Let us keep them waiting no longer.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate for a long time. I might say that I came here at the ripe old age of 29. Now, after 15 years of service in this body, I am a good deal younger than most of the sponsors of this particular amendment. I shall not pretend that I am smarter, but I think there is a certain amount of appreciation of this body that has come to me rather earlier than it has come to my friends who are sponsoring these amendments.

I think it should be plain to everyone here that the committee system functions, the seniority system functions, and the House of Representatives functions well, and that men who are running the committees of this body are capable and, in most instances, if elections were held in the committees, they would be the men who would be elected to serve in that capacity.

It is alleged that a bunch of tired, old men are repressing the Congress and keeping the Congress from functioning. Nothing is farther from the truth. The fact of the matter is that there is a way whereby the committee system can be circumvented if it refuses to function and the chairmen do not permit it to function. Chairmen who are not willing to function within the committees can be disciplined by the committees.

I can cite to you the names of committee upon committee which has disciplined its chairman for failing to be responsive to the needs of the committee and the wishes of the membership.

In addition, within the rules there is provision for circumventing the committees and for taking legislation from the committees and putting it on the floor. There is the discharge petition, Calendar Wednesday, and an abundance of other devices.

If that is not sufficient, let us just remember that the caucuses and the House of Representatives have full capacity to discipline the chairmen. I have observed over the years that committee chairmen have been removed from their chairmanship. So I urge that the amendments be rejected.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I approach the impending vote on the Reuss amendment with calm and detachment.

If it passes, I will have the small satisfaction of having helped erect a signal to the parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, that they must start choosing as their committee chairmen the ablest and best, rather than always those who happen to have been around the longest. And we will have erected a symbol that this House belongs to the people of the United States, not merely to the political parties.

If, on the other hand, the Reuss amendment should fail, I would console myself with the realization that I have 16 years of service, eight uninterrupted terms, and I can probably make out under the seniority system, if that is going to be the way it is going to be from here on out.

So the issue boils down to simply this: if we think the seniority system is the finest method of selecting committee chairman that has ever been struck off by the mind of man, if we think, as it has been suggested earlier, that it is indeed an edifice, a gothic cathedral which cannot be improved by change, then vote down the Reuss amendment.

If, on the other hand, we think, as I do, that the times are changing and that the House of Representatives must change with the times, then vote the Reuss amendment up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

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

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed amendment to remove seniority as the sole qualification in the selection of committee chairmen.

At the present time the House applies only one criterion in its choice of committee chairmen. It selects, without deliberation, the member who has the longest continuous service on the committee. Under the provisions of rule X of the House, we need not select the most senior member of the committee as its chairman, but tradition has established that this be done—and it is done without exception.

As one who is over 30 and under 40, I share the views of neither the young Members who object to the seniority system solely on the basis of the age of the chairmen, nor do I share the views of more senior Members who would retain the seniority system without modification.

In my judgment, age should not be the major factor in the selection of chairmen. Age, or seniority, is not nearly as important as ability, experience, responsiveness, and judgment.

Many chairmen of House committees have vast powers in scheduling hearings, inviting testimony from witnesses, determining the legislative schedule and, in effect, controlling the speed and direction of the committee. Committees have become such great influences in the conduct of our legislative business that an unresponsive committee chairman can have a great and unwarranted effect on actions taken by the House.

For these reasons, I urge this body to adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) which provides that committee chairmen be selected by members of the committee from among the three most senior Members of the majority party on the committee.

This proposal has two important facets. First, it recognizes the need for experience. It combines the need for experience with the need for responsiveness. Second, the requirement that chairmen be elected by the Members of the committee makes it mandatory that candidates for the chairmanship become more cognizant of the problems and needs of their colleagues on the committee.

If we are able to replace seniority with elected committee chairmen I am confident that the abilities of our chairmen will be considerably improved and the output of the congressional process considerably enhanced.

I prefer the Schwengel amendment in this regard but if it is not adopted I shall support the amendment of my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), which also is far superior to the existing situation of complete reliance on the seniority system.

If we are unable to successfully amend the legislative reorganization bill on the floor today, I am hopeful that we can continue our efforts by working toward adoption of the Schwengel amendment by the Republican conference. This would mean that at least the ranking Republican would be selected on the basis of merit rather than seniority. I am hopeful that the House will repudiate complete reliance on seniority.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Schwengel substitute. I do so with some reservations, of course, central among which are the arguments raised that if there is to be some changes in the seniority system, it should come about by virtue of change in party rules rather than by change of House rules. Those who raise this question may well be right in their position but, if that argument carries, then I simply hope that this attempt and this debate will, at least, have had the effect of accelerating

and assuring subsequent, separate party action.

However, if there is to be some reform of the seniority system eventually arrived at by that route, I suspect that in its final form it will follow, in concept if not in detail, the Schwengel proposal. Since I would expect to support such action when and if it takes place within the Republican conference, I see no valid reason why I should not support it now, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both the substitute amendment and the amendment. In the present language of the rules of the House, paragraph 3 of rule X, it states:

> At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof * * *

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the present rules about seniority, not one word is said about seniority. Nor is there any requirement that chairmen be selected by seniority. I submit both the substitute and the amendment in fact for the first time inject into these rules the principle of seniority.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), would add the words "who need not be the Member with the longest consecutive service in the committee." They are, in fact, doing with these amendments the very thing they profess they want to eliminate for it is the proponents who inject seniority into the rules for the first time by injecting into the rules the principle of seniority, which is not there now.

I believe we should make clear here that the House can always work its will whenever the majority so desires. The highest institution of this House is the discharge petition. Nobody proved that better than the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) when she got enough signatures to a discharge petition to bring to the floor the equal rights for women amendment. So this House can always work its will. There is no Member of this House big enough to frustrate the will of the majority of this House whenever the majority feels compelled to move on an issue, so I hope both the amendment and the substitute will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that many, if not most, of our committee chairmen are doing an outstanding job. But if there is one committee chairman anywhere among our committees who is doing less than an outstanding job, if there is a single committee chairman who is held in minimum high regard by a consensus of his colleagues, then this House ought to have a more convenient and appropriate procedure to elect another Member the chairman of that committee, than the agonizingly painful and embarrassing procedures that we on the Committee on Education and Labor have had to employ in the past few years, first to reduce somewhat the freedom, flexibility and power of the chairman, and second, through the power of the caucus, actually to change the committee chairman. That is not a pleasant or felicitous arrangement, and there has to be an easier way of getting on with the work of the Congress.

Last, in addition to all of the reasons of relevance, in addition to responding to the clear expression across the country of how we ought better to provide the leadership to meet the needs and demands of the times, there is the simple matter of utilizing to the maximum our manpower, utilizing the enormously talented men in this Congress, not all of them in the positions of leadership to which they would be gladly elected by their colleagues, were there an acceptable procedure for doing so.

I repeat the words of the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN). No business could operate this way. No university, no hospital, no executive branch agency, no institution of any kind selects for its top leadership, for its top decision-makers, men solely on the criterion of length and duration of service.

I say, therefore, simply as a matter of elevating to deserved leadership roles the enormous talent which is in this body we should use the criterion of who among us we judge the best fitted to serve in our most demanding, our most taxing, our most honored roles.

I support the Reuss amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California yielded his time to Mr. HAYS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this subject again.

The gentleman from New Hampshire mentioned my name, and then interjected very shortly thereafter the name of the unfunny man from fun city, Mr. Lindsay, and said he was going to read, if I would not object, something Mr. Lindsay wrote into the RECORD.

Well, I surely would object, because I served here with him and I will tell the Members one thing. He could not have stayed here long enough to accumulate enough seniority that I ever would have thought he would have made much of a contribution.

I just want to tell you Republicans, furthermore, so far as I am concerned you are not going to get away with foisting him off on the Democratic Party except over my dead body. You have got him. You are stuck with him. I want you to keep him.

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

Mr. HAYS. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Iowa. He has not made a contribution for a couple of days.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know that the real Republicans were being consulted about that.

Mr. HAYS. I think it is a Republican plot, myself. We surely do not want him. At least, I do not know of any Democrat who does. If there is anyone, I would like for him to stand up and say so.

We have heard a lot of talk around here, as I said earlier, about secrecy in voting. I am going to address myself to the Schwengel amendment because, as said before, I do not believe the so-called Reuss-Vanik amendment changes anything one way or the other. There is nothing in the rules which says we have to follow seniority. The caucus is the determining agent. That is the way I would like to see it.

So far as the Schwengel amendment is concerned, it says we shall elect from the top three by a secret ballot. As I said earlier, not only is this not the rule of the majority, but it could be the rule of the minority of the committee. I cannot think of anything more undemocratic and more restrictive.

We spent all day yesterday, and a part of some days before, in getting rid of the secrecy in the voting on the teller vote. Let us not put more secrecy in by this amendment.

Now, if the people's right to know is important—and I think it is important—then I think the people's right to know or at least for an individual Member to have the right if he wants to ask for a rollcall on the committee chairman is just as important as the opening up of the secrecy on the teller votes. That is the reason why I think that the Schwengel amendment is retrogressive. I think it compounds the injury, if there is any. I think it is a step backward, and I would not like to see us take it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this has been a historic debate. For the first time, the seniority system, whose limitations are clearly recognized throughout the Nation, is under serious attack within the Halls of Congress. The seniority system is crumbling. I do not believe it will fall today, or tomorrow, but eventually the undemocratic system perpetuated by seniority will collapse before the onslaught.

I believe in clear and strong party responsibility. Under the seniority system, which places in positions of power those Congressmen from safe districts, the committee chairmen frequently are out of sympathy with the elected leadership of the House as well as the national party policies of the majority party. This results in delay, uncertainty, irresponsible action, inability to center responsibility, and great confusion among the general public interested in affixing responsibility for action or inaction.

The passage of either the Schwengel substitute or the Reuss amendment would be steps forward. And I am confident that eventually the undemocratic system of seniority, like other undemocratic institutions throughout the Nation which are being altered or abandoned, will be done away with.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia yielded the remainder of his time to Mr .LOWENSTEIN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose both the substitute and the amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. SMITH of California.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, in response to inquiries from my own congressional district, I have advocated for a long time that we should compromise the seniority system with the political cauldron which would result if it were to be abolished. I have studied very carefully the provisions of the Schwengel amendment and I have told the gentleman that I support his amendment. However, long ago, as a youngster, I learned that it was the last breath of air which burst the balloon and the last 10 pounds of weight which capsized the boat. I now know that it is the last well-meaning amendment that kills the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have made tremendous progress in the last few days toward a meaningful congressional reform. I honestly believe that if this amendment is adopted, it will kill the bill. I do not want to see that reform lost.

I, therefore, even though I favor it in principle and not as a practical matter, I shall vote against the amendment and the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Reuss amendment which provides that length of service shall not be the sole criteria by which committee chairmen are selected. The people of this country need to know that wisdom, leadership and ability as well as age shall be considered in the selection of men to positions of great power in the Congress.

The American people want the best in positions of leadership in Congress to help run the country. We should all vote to provide the clear intent in our rules to make this possible.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, although I have 22 years of seniority here, which I guess is a good deal of seniority, I think the seniority system does definitely require some change. I am not sure exactly what change it requires. I have suggested to the committee that is studying the matter that some kind of modest program of rotation might be a good thing. However, I do not have a deep conviction about any particular formula of reform.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the Schwengel amendment, if adopted, would have little effect, except it would make it difficult to pass this bill. I think this bill is going to have difficulty anyway when it gets over to the Senate, not because of the provisions pertaining to the Senate which would be involved; but I think there are so many people here who do not want to see this bill passed at all that their influence might be felt in the Senate and that the Senate might not ever get to enactment of the bill.

I am, therefore, against the Schwengel amendment and for the further reason that I feel it does solidify into law the seniority system, which I greatly question as a wise direction to take.

I greatly question the present seniority system. I do not have a better solution, but I just do not believe we ought to put it in the law that it has to be there. Right now this law does not require it.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope we will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL). I do hope the matter will be studied further, and that we can bring about improvement in this area at an early date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS). I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), and its supporters, is well-intentioned, but I think it does write into law something that we do not need.

I would have hoped that every younger Member of this House would have been here on the floor to participate very vigorously in this debate. In the 8 years that I have been in the Congress, this is the first time we have had an opportunity to express ourselves in opposition to the seniority system.

How does it work? We all take our position on these committees, we may have some mobility between committees in our first few years in the House, but then the only way we can move upward is for either the men more senior to us on the committee to die—which we do not like to see—or to be defeated. And it makes a very, very rigorous, depressing, poor system under which we operate.

We can talk about the fact we can elect people in caucuses, but we cannot get a quorum in a caucus to conduct an election many, many times, or to conduct a referendum on this particular issue.

Of the top 25 senior men——

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) for one-half of a minute.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, of the top 25 senior men in the House of Representatives only three of them are on the Republican side. This proves that power does one thing: it perpetuates Members in power. Also I think we should experiment with democracy on the floor of the House. If the one-man, one-vote is good for the people, it should not stop at the door of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) for 3 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken on these amendments.

I have tried to help to get as much time for everybody as possible so that they could have an opportunity to express their feelings.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the seniority system is perfect. But I do not know of any system that is any better. If there is some system that might be better, I would give some thought to it. But I think it is the best system we have so far as I know.

The majority party, which happens to be the Democratic Party, has the power, the responsibility, and the duty to select the chairmen of committees. How they do it is for them to decide.

As to the minority party, it is our responsibility to select the ranking minority Members—and how we do it is for us to decide.

I hope that we take over so that we will have a chance to select the chairmen of committees. This problem should be decided by our respective parties in our caucuses.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to both amendments and to any amendment which will attempt to change the seniority system of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) for 1½ minutes to close debate.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Members of the House. I think they have done an excellent job. So far as I know this is the most extensive debate, at least in the Committee of the Whole, on the subject of seniority in the 16 years that I have been here.

I want to commend the Members for the attitudes they have displayed and I would like to urge Members to vote against the Schwengel amendment and also against the Reuss amendment. I think the reasons for such a vote have been discussed at great length. So at this time I would urge Members to defeat these two amendments and move ahead with further consideration of the legislation pending before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SCHWENGEL and Mr. SISK.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 28, noes 196.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. REUSS and Mr. SISK.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 160.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF ARIZONA

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Arizona: On page 39, immediately below line 4, insert the following:

"DEBATE TIME ON MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT WITH INSTRUCTIONS

"SEC. 121. Clause 4 of rule XVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'It shall not be in order to close debate on any such motion to recommit with instructions for ten minutes, one-half of such time to be given to debate by the proponent, and one-half to debate in opposition to the motion.'"

And make the appropriate technical changes in section numbers and references.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. MEEDS and I have the opportunity of offering the names of the 70 other sponsors of this amendment, to appear in the RECORD at this time, if that is in order.

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

There was no objection.

LIST OF SPONSORS

Mr. Meeds, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Brown of California.

Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Clay, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Crane, Mr. Culver, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Dellenback, Mr. Dennis, Mr. Eckhardt, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Evans of Colorado, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Fascell.

Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Howard, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Koch, Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. MacGregor, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Melcher, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Minish, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Patten, Mr. Podell, Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Roth, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Van Deerlin, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Whalen, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Wright.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I want to make very clear, is not going to dramatically alter the fabric of the House. It is not going to tear away the veil of secrecy, or do away with the anachronism of seniority, or give immediate equal representation to all the people, or do all the good things we would all like to see accomplished. This is not going to add appreciably to the justice or injustice which might occur on this floor.

It is really an amendment which I believe is probably in accord with the will of everyone here, regardless of his philosophy. What it says, simply, is that when there is a motion to recommit with instructions there shall be permitted 10 minutes of debate. The purpose of the amendment is that, with respect to recommital motions with instructions, said instructions never having been heard before, this will give the Members an opportunity to learn what it is exactly they are voting for when they vote for a motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. Chairman, the practice has been, as you and the Members well know, to take time in the Committee of the Whole to announce a motion to recommit with instructions.

Again the practice is now, as you all know, to take advantage of the time in the Committee of the Whole to rise and strike the requisite number of words and explain the motion to recommit that you are going to offer. It is also very obvious to many of you that there are those who are not present in that session of the Committee of the Whole who, when they are called upon to vote on the motion to recommit with instructions, either have to depend on the advice or the voting of a friend or simply vote in the dark. This amendment will do no more than clarify the operation of a procedural matter. There is some jeopardy with regard to political advantage. I have been advised this may give an advantage to the majority, since the minority has the option of having the motion to recommit. I submit there is some jeopardy in this, because then it will give the majority the closing arguments on the matter if they so desire. It is my personal judgment that the jeopardy involved is not such as to mitigate the value of knowing what it is we are voting on. I submit that that is of greater value than whatever political jeopardy there may be in the procedural matter of dividing the time between the proponents and opponents.

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I am happy to yield to the distinguished ranking member from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. The gentleman uses the term "one-half of such time to be given in debate by the proponents." To whom does he refer?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. The proponent in this language, to respond to the gentleman, would be that person or those persons who favor the language in the motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. SMITH of California. Should not that better be the mover of the motion? Would he not be the one who should control the 5 minutes rather than the proponent?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. If the gentleman would prefer that, I yield to the gentleman's superior legislative knowledge. To me they mean the same thing. If that is the purpose and intent of the gentleman, I will stipulate that.

Mr. SMITH of California. If there is more than one proponent, I think it should be either the maker or the mover of the motion, one of the two. If he or she is going to handle the motion to recommit, then that individual should have 5 minutes to explain it.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. The gentleman has clarity, logic, and silver-tongued persuasiveness.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "proponent" be changed to read "by the maker of the motion."

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think if we refer to either Roberts Rules of Order or Jefferson's Manual, somewhere in there we will find that it is not proper to say "I make a motion." The proper terminology is "I move." So I think what the unanimous-consent request ought to be is that the mover—or I do not see anything really wrong with the "proponent." Certainly "the maker of the motion" is grammatically incorrect.

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the gentleman from Ohio. My language that I suggested was the mover of the motion, and that would be, in my opinion, the correct language to identify the proponent.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Arizona: On page 39, immediately below line 4, insert the following:

"DEBATE TIME ON MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT WITH INSTRUCTIONS

"SEC. 121. Clause 4 of rule XVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'It shall not be in order to close debate on any such motion to recommit with instructions for ten minutes, one-half of such time to be given to debate by the mover of the motion, and one-half to debate in opposition to the motion.'"

And make the appropriate technical changes in section numbers and references.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I would point out that this might be the time to quote an illustrious Member of this House who said that the jackals may bay but the caravan will move ever on.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I agree with the gentleman.

Of course, in his remarks on his amendment he referred to the majority. But I notice in his amendment he said one-half of the debate in opposition to the motion. Would it not be possible un-

der the gentleman's amendment, since the minority has reserved the right to make the motion to recommit, that 5 minutes could come from both the proponents and the opposition on the minority side? I do not believe the gentleman intended it to be so construed.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. If I did not make myself clear, the jeopardy I spoke of is the fact that the minority has the right to offer the motion to recommit and it does follow that most of the time under this precedent they would offer the motion to recommit with instructions and they would, therefore, have the first 5 minutes. This would be the normal course of events. It is not mandatory. It is true that the Members of the minority could either oppose or defend the motion to recommit. I was pointing out the procedural jeopardy that would follow most of the time so as to alert my colleagues on this side of the aisle particularly since the minority has a right to offer the motion to recommit and they would have the first 5 minutes and those opposed would have the last 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the point I am making, the 5 minutes for the proponents and the 5 minutes for the opposition could conceivably come on the minority side of the aisle. I do not think that is what the gentleman said in his comments. He is talking about reserving 5 minutes to the minority——

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. I would simply like to clarify exactly what we can expect to happen under this proposal. I am inclined not to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman, provided we have an understanding of what will occur upon the offering of a motion to recommit with instructions.

Now, at the present time we proceed under the rules of the House, under the precedents of the House, and also certain customs. In connection with the questions already raised here I would pose a hypothetical one to the gentleman. If a motion to recommit with instructions is offered by a Member of the minority on, let us say, this particular bill which we are here debating, and at the time we go back into the House which is the proper time to offer such a motion, that then he would be recognized for 5 minutes to explain his motion to recommit and what the instructions were and what the effect would be; is that right?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Then, the Speaker, I would assume, would be expected to follow normal custom and, let us say, recognize the Member on this side of the aisle managing the bill who would probably be considered to be the opposition; is that the assumption, generally, the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. That is exactly the assumption. Of course, I understand that it will limit in the unlikely event, for example, that the manager of the bill would not be opposed to the motion to recommit with instructions, but there was another Member who was opposed, he would then be recognized if he chose to do so.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am seeking the attention of the gentleman from Arizona, or someone else who is a proponent of this amendment.

Our only desire here is to seek clarification. I said I have no great opposition. I know there are times when motions are made or a motion is made to recommit a matter with instructions where, frankly, there is not very much information available. So I have certain sympathies with what the gentleman proposes.

Now, as we explore the language needed here, it does seem to fit properly. If the gentleman has before him the rules of the House, rule XVI, clause 4, that he attempts to amend——

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, could he give me the page number?

Mr. SISK. That would be found on page 397 of Jefferson's Manual, at the top of the page, reading:

> After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution, one motion to recommit shall be in order.

And of course the point I am making here is that the previous question ends debate at that point.

Now, the only question I have, and I am not trying to confuse the amendment, but I am wondering if there should not be some additional language "except as provided herein," because, as the gentleman understands by the Rules of the House once the previous question is ordered, debate has been closed.

I will gladly yield to the gentleman for a comment on that.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would defer to the gentleman from Washington, Mr. MEEDS.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, actually this amendment would not prevent the Committee on Rules from adopting a rule as they have in the past, which makes the previous question in order, and which follows through the practice of the House, then, true, the question of the previous question is then voted and debate is then cut off. What this amendment really does is to signal the attention of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives that we want a minimum of 10 minutes to debate a motion to recommit with instructions, 5 minutes of that time to be given to the mover of the motion, and 5 minutes of the time to be given the opponents.

Now, the Committee on Rules could come in with a rule, and someone could move the previous question even with the adoption of this amendment, and they could be cut off.

Mr. SISK. I think I understand very clearly what is sought to be accomplished, and again I have no particular opposition, but it seems to me that the language does not make it entirely clear.

In connection with the words here on about the fifth line of the gentleman's amendment, where it starts: "It shall not be in order, —", I am wondering whether that "provided that it shall not be in order to close debate," would not make the language more properly fit into the language here being amended. That is the only question that I am attempting to clarify, for the purpose of keeping the record clear for possible future interpretation.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have no objection myself, if there is no objection from the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) that it include the words "Provided," and so forth. As far as the language which is in the rule, I feel it is appropriate following the words joint resolution in rule IV, I think it is clearly applicable there.

The intention of the language I will say again, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) has explained, is to provide for 10 minutes of debate on a motion to recommit with instructions. That is the sole purpose of the language.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman. I do believe if he would ask unanimous consent, at least according to my best experts here, to put in the words "provided further"—that it shall not be in order to close debate on any such motion. That would seem to us to be in better form. As I say, I have no basic objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, as one member of the Committee on Rules, I have a lot of sympathy with the objective sought here by this rule. I have not had the opportunity to study it and I am just going to make this gratuitous suggestion, if the gentleman would withdraw his amendment or ask unanimous consent to withdraw it, and then work it out here with the staff as to what he really wants to do and get it in proper order—I think he may have his amendment adopted. I just make that suggestion to clarify the situation.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the unanimous-consent request to be permitted to withdraw the amendment, as stated, and work it out with the staff, with the understanding that it would possibly be offered and accepted at some future date.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona that the amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if I understand the gentleman's unanimous-consent request properly, he is asking unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment, rewrite it with the help of the staff, with the understanding that the House will accept it at a later date.

Let me say to the gentleman, I tend to favor his amendment but I do not think he can properly make such a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from Ohio that the request made by the gentleman from Arizona was that the amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. HAYS. If that is it, then, Mr. Chairman, I have no further objection.

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think, in discussing the matter with the Committee on Rules that we do have the language which will carry out the intent and the purpose of this amendment and we should consider it now and it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER)?

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed be further amended by inserting before the words "It shall not be in order" the words "Provided further,".

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, "Providing further that"——

Mr. MEEDS. "Provided further that."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I thought we had already granted unanimous consent for the amendment to be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) that objection was made to that request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HAYS. Reserving the right to object further, I would like to ask Mr. SISK, the manager of the bill, if, in his opinion or in the opinion of his staff, the requested modification would cure the problem with the amendment.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield under his reservation, of course, this is one of the problems that we have with a variety of amendments which we have not had an opportunity to see. In fairness, the amendment before the House was presented, but there have been many others also. It is the understanding of our people, as we have checked, that putting in the words "Provided further, that it shall not be in order to close debate," and so forth, will make it read properly in connection with the material included in the present rule.

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

Mr. HAYS. Further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to make an observation. It was reported in the press, perhaps inaccurately, some months ago that the gentleman from Arizona, the author of this amendment, said that most of the Members of this body did not have sense enough to push a wheelbarrow. I would just like to observe that sometimes things get more complicated around here than pushing a wheelbarrow.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Further reserving the right to object, the staff on my side of the aisle states that this is the first proviso in this rule, and the language in setting forth the first proviso is always "Provided that," and if there are further provisos, the language is, "It is further provided that." So it should be, in my opinion, "Provided that," and the "Further" should not be used until there is a second proviso. I submit that to the gentleman for his consideration.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, after that explanation I think it is time that we close for the evening.

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

Mr. COLMER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I am still not clear on this matter. If this rule is going to be adopted, and, I repeat, I favor the objectives, then it should be properly and correctly written. I made what I thought was a reasonable request, that the gentleman withdraw his amendment until the staff could be assured that it was in proper shape. The Parliamentarian should be consulted. I hope that the gentleman will agree to that suggestion so that we could then have the amendment offered and agreed to.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield under his reservation?

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment. We will then protect the gentleman in his right to offer it at a later time. We have some entirely new language which the staff, who deal with the rules, feels is a good deal better. But I would like to consult with the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Washington about it. I wonder if we can get unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment in order further to perfect it.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this amendment could also be made to language on page 47 and would be in proper order at that place?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman from Mississippi will yield to me, it would be the understanding of this Member that we could do that. A parliamentary inquiry might clarify it, but it would be my understanding that the amendment would be in order at the end of title I prior to the taking up of title II. But I would suggest a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair on that question.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the simplest way to cure this would be for the gentleman to ask for unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment for the purpose of perfecting it with the understanding that it would be in order to offer it at a subsequent time, leaving the time indefinite. If the House agrees with that, the gentleman is protected.

Mr. COLMER. That is all I asked, and I hope the gentleman will pursue that course.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the proposed amendment be in order on page 47 after line 5?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from Washington that a germane amendment would be in order at that point.

The question before the Committee is the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Washington to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I have not made it yet, but I will.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has the floor under a reservation.

Mr. COLMER. I think it is pretty well agreed that this amendment needs a little further study, and if the gentleman does not withdraw his request, I am going to be compelled to object to it, and I do not want to do that.

Mr. MEEDS. If I still have the floor, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind advice. It was my intention to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment with the understanding that it could be offered at a later time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. May I have a ruling on the unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his request again, please.

Mr. MEEDS. My unanimous-consent request is to withdraw the amendment with the understanding that it could be offered at a further point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state to the gentleman from Washington that the request can be made at this time that the amendment be withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, for clarification, I would like to know if we are now talking about the Meeds amendment to the Steiger of Arizona amend-

ment, or the Steiger of Arizona amendment and the Meeds amendment to the Steiger of Arizona amendment, and if so, who has the right to withdraw?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from California that the only amendment before the committee is the Steiger of Arizona amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But there have been some subsequent changes in it, and the gentleman from Washington suggested some language that the Steiger of Arizona amendment would correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the gentleman from Washington has the floor and has made a unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEED) has expired.

(On request of Mr. COLMER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MEEDS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

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

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, remembering how Washington got his troops across the fence, I was wondering if it would be in order to make a unanimous-consent request to go back just before the time the gentleman from Arizona offered his amendment and start all over.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) and amended by unanimous consent, be withdrawn with the understanding that it will be offered later.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from Washington that he has the right to make the request that the amendment be withdrawn.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, due to the utter confusion on the House floor at this time I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington that the amendment be withdrawn?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: On page 39, immediately below line 4, insert the following:

"Expeditious conduct of calls of the House, (a) clause 2, rule XV of the rules of the House of Repersentatives is amended by adding immediately after the numeral '2' and '(a)' and clause 2 of rule XV is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: '(b) When a call of the House in the absence of a quorum is ordered, the Speaker of the House or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, as the case may be, at his discretion may order the Clerk of the House to lay out tally sheets on which the presence of the Members shall be recorded by the Clerk or the respective Member. When a quorum has been recorded, which in the Committee of the Whole House shall be one hundred Members, the Clerk shall advise the Speaker or Chairman of this fact, after which it shall be in order to entertain a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call, and business of the House or the Committee of the Whole shall then resume; however, for a period of thirty minutes from the commencement of said quorum call Members who are present before the expiration of said thirty minutes may have their presence recorded on said tally sheets. Absent Members shall be recorded in the Journal of the House.'

"(b) Clause 2 of rule XXIII of the rules of the House of Representatives is amended as follows:

"'2. Unless the Chairman invokes the procedure for the procedure for the call of the roll under rule XV(b), whenever a Committee of the Whole House or of the Whole House on the State of the Union finds itself without a quorum, which shall consist of one hundred Members, the Chairman shall cause the roll to be called, and thereupon the Committee shall rise, and the Chairman shall report the names of the absentees to the House, which shall be entered on the Journal; but if on such call a quorum shall appear, the committee shall thereupon resume its sitting without further order of the House.'"

And make the necessary conforming and technical changes in the table of contents, section numbers and references, and other technical changes in the bill.

Mr. WHITE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

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

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I see certain merit in connection with the gentleman's amendment. Again, as our staff people have looked at this amendment, we find a good deal of difficulty with some of the language in the amendment. I should simply like to call to the attention of the gentleman that it is our strong feeling, if the amendment is to be adopted, it should be rewritten. This is no criticism of whoever may have written it, but there are some changes that do need to be made. I shall be glad to explain to the gentleman the principles involved.

Mr. WHITE. Would the gentleman like to suggest what some of those changes are? I have gone over this with some of the staff before.

Mr. SISK. There is a change in the system here that the staff feels would be more apropos with the language that follows. If the gentleman wishes to go ahead and discuss the merits and demerits of it, I will see if we can come up with something on it.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is coauthorized by Mr. BIESTER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. TAFT, and a copy of this amendment is on the majority and minority desks.

This amendment is designed to save time and money.

The time saved is ours and our constituents'. The money is that of our constituents, and the taxpayer.

How much time of the House is wasted while the business of the House awaits the calling of the quorum?

How many times in a week does a committee suspend its business for one-half hour while its members answer a quorum call?

How many times in a week do we leave a constituent, to stand around waiting for our name at a quorum call?

How many telephone calls have we deferred while we waited for our name to be called?

How much time in a week or a year do we waste waiting for our name? Those whose names are the last one-third of the alphabet must wait up to 10 minutes.

Do you realize that each quorum now consumes 26 to 31 minutes? The general worktime of the house is from 12 noon to 6 p.m., or 6 hours; with an average of two quorum calls per day, one-sixth of the time of the House is consumed by merely calling the roll for a quorum.

If there are four quorum calls, one-third of our time is consumed by unproductive quorum calls.

I submit that much of this wasted time could be avoided by this amendment. Further, assuming 350 Members are present, two quorum calls per day costs approximately 350 man-hours of the membership, or over 43 8-hour days.

In money value, this amounts to over $7,082 worth of man-hours alone, plus all the other costs of the House diverted to the quorum call.

What I propose by this amendment is not a displacement of the existing rule, but merely an option for an alternative.

If it works—as I know it will—it will become the standard practice of the House.

If this does not fulfill all its expectation, then it will remain dormant this session and be dropped in the rules of the House for the 92d Congress.

So we have a chance today for real progress, without relinquishing any of our existing procedures.

Before I talk about the amendment itself, let me mention that this does not conflict with the McClory amendment which was passed earlier. That amend-

ment amended section XV which has to do with the House itself. This amendment not only is an alternative to the House action but also touches on the Committee of the Whole House, which was not touched on by the McClory amendment regarding the electronic system. The Committee of the Whole House is covered by section XXIII.

Going on to the merits of the amendment, the amendment merely says that the Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House at his discretion on an expeditious call of the quorum may order the Clerk to lay out tally sheets on which the presence of the Members shall be recorded by the Clerk or the respective Member.

There are several procedures that could be used effectively under this language. The fastest and most orderly would be for the Clerk to recognize and call the names of those Members standing whenever they are in the House or as they come forward; or the Members could sign in and be recorded present, or the roll could still be called.

The great saving of time is provided by the second part of the amendment where it says:

> When a quorum has been recorded, the Clerk shall advise the Speaker or the Chairman of this fact, after which a motion may be entertained to dispense with further proceedings under the call, and the business of the House or the Committee of the Whole shall then resume.

In effect, a quorum then can be established and the business of the House will probably be resumed within 10 minutes of the beginning of the quorum call, thus saving the House 20 minutes of time for each quorum.

When there are only 100 Members needed for a quorum, as in the Committee of the Whole House, it is possible that a quorum could be established in less than 10 minutes.

However, the amendment further provides that for a period of 30 minutes from the commencement of the quorum and though the business of the House has resumed, Members can still come in and be recorded as present. In practice this could be done either by signing the tally sheets or by being recognized and recorded at the desk by the Clerk, which would be faster.

Absent Members would still be recorded in the Journal. Thus, the quorum call is expedited and business can recommence earlier and all Members present within the same time now required for a quorum would be recorded.

A Member could regulate his business more quickly and with greater certainty and the Members would be more likely to stay on the floor as business resumes more quickly and contains their attention. There would be less chance of error since the tally would be made either by signature or by eye recognition and voice rather than by voice alone in a noisy hall.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I point out that whenever there is a motion in the House, there can be a rollcall demanded on that and if a quorum is not present under your amendment, there can be a demand for a rollcall made. So then you will have a rollcall on top of having a quorum call, and that takes more time than the quorum call.

Mr. WHITE. No; it does not work that way, because once the Chair takes notice that a quorum is present and the committee is still proceeding on business, the Speaker will take notice that a quorum is present and they would not consider a point of order made that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. BIESTER. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What will cause the Members to sign these tally sheets; what is the compulsion on them to do so?

Mr. BIESTER. The same compulsion that requires them to answer to the quorum call orally. They will be recorded as absent if they do not sign in.

Mr. GROSS. If they did not sign in, you would have to go to the present method of a quorum call. Is that not correct?

Mr. BIESTER. No. We are talking about an alternative method to the present method. We would not dispose of the present method, but if we tried this method alternatively, if a quorum had been arrived at of 218 Members, then a further call orally would be dispensed with, but Members could sign in for the additional period of time called for in the rule. And if one signs in one is recorded as present under the quorum call. So, the sanction is if not signing in they would be recorded as absent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how much discretion or power do you want to give the Speaker or to give to any Speaker of the House?

Mr. BIESTER. All we want to do is to make it possible for the House to experiment with this alternate method and find a way to save one-half of the time which is now wasted in quorum calls, and not at the expense of doing something that we cannot change at the discretion of the Chairman or the Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with my colleague from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) that you will just consume more time with this kind of an arrangement.

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

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

Mr. BELCHER. What I do not understand is once you get 218 Members and then we start business and 200 more Members come in and sign a slip, how are you going to conduct business when you have 200 people in line signing them in less than 30 minutes?

Mr. BIESTER. First of all, I would not assume that there would be only one tally sheet but would assume that there would be several tally sheets available in an unobtrusive place where the signing could be done over at the sides of the Clerk's desk, for instance. At least, we would save, perhaps, 15 or 20 minutes of time which is now wasted. So the chance of being able to do that is worth voting on and approving today. If we find that it does not work and that there is not an improvement and that the problems develop which the gentleman from Oklahoma has raised, then it would be in the discretion of the Speaker to dispense with our proposed alternate method.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the only comment I would make on all of these amendments is this: I think we will find that a lot of them are not reform at all. They are just chaos.

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

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman will admit, I presume, that it is a new idea?

Mr. BIESTER. Yes, it is a new idea, and a worthwhile idea.

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

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

Mr. TAFT. I think one thing that should be made clear and which I do not believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made clear and that is the authority for an alternate procedure which at the discretion of the Speaker might or might not be followed. If it does not work, then we will remain with the present procedure. But in view of the tremendous amount of time wasted on quorum calls—and I have had some experience in this, if not in quantity but in quality at least—in the prior session when we had the so-called omnibus bill on the floor of the House, it seems to me it is worthwhile to experiment with this provision. It was set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 13 in some detail and has been studied very thoroughly. I think it is something at least worth trying. Then, you would have the other procedure to fall back on. You are not necessarily doing away with the present House rules by following this proposed procedure, but you are giving a try to a new idea which would save the House a great deal of time and lose none of the accuracy of the present quorum calls.

Mr. BIESTER. Members here know what amount of time is wasted upon quorum calls collectively in terms of the collective man-hours of the House, and also the individual time of the Members when you consider that one waits 15, 20, or 30 minutes for one's name to be called. That time is being spent away from service to your constituents and the real floor action which makes the time one spends in Congress a purposeful time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I oppose the amendment proposed here, and I particularly want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) on the fact that I know he has done a lot of work on this. It is entirely possible that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) have also worked on it, but the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. WHITE) did submit a substantial amount of material in writing and made a statement to the subcommittee back, I believe, as far back as almost a year ago, as I recall it, because he was concerned. I want to say that he did about the most complete job of analyzing the amount of time lost in coming over here for quorum calls of any that I have seen. And because of the work he has done, and the research and checking on this mattter, it is with some hesitancy that I do oppose this.

But I do it at this present time because it seems to me we are getting into a rather complicated situation where at the moment we might make the situation worse.

The committee will recall that we have adopted an amendment on yesterday offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY), in which we provided for the use of electronic recording equipment in connnection with quorum calls. Of course, the idea and the hope there is that, as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) proceeds with his work, that we are going to be able to speed up this whole situation of quorum calls and votes, and so on.

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

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to come to quorum calls any more than the rest of the Members, and anything that we can do to save time on calling the roll I think will be good. But I think one amendment that will do more good than anything else on that would be to require 10 Members to make a point of order that a quorum is not present. If we had that, we would do away with about nine-tenths of the quorum calls we now have, because then you would not have somebody just getting mad at the Chairman because he did not recognize him and, therefore, making a point of order that a quorum is not present. You would find that more than 50 percent of the points of order that are made are made that way. So I would suggest that if you needed 10 Members to make a point of order I do not think you could get 10 of them mad at one time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for his statement, and I think he might be entirely right, as to the results of that.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two points on this matter.

No. 1: The amendment is strictly discretionary, and it is at the option of the Chairman or the Speaker. In other words if it does not prove out he does not have to use it; we can relinquish it right there.

No. 2: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY) did not go to section XXIII, this is an optional basis for section XV, it also goes to section XXIII which does give you some means of cutting down on rollcalls in section XXIII in the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas. As the gentleman knows, of course, we have had a bill in the last day or so with problems in this connection, both in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, as well as in the House itself and, as I say, I would like to see a speedup of this process.

I have great sympathy with it. Unfortunately, at the present time it seems to me that it could be somewhat confusing because of the different processes, that in connection with being permissive, that the roll could be called, and also the question of errors that might arise in connection with these sign-ins, as I understand it.

I think at this time it is the judgment of the subcommittee that we best vote down the amendment at the present time, until there is further study on some kind of a program of this kind; therefore, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONABLE. Did the subcommittee consider any way in which the time could be shortened on quorum calls? Really that is something, I think, many Members would like to see accomplished.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate that very much. The gentleman will remember that yesterday in the debate we discussed at length the provision of the subcommittee. This was not right, and as I said before, we are in a position to leave the matter to the Joint Committee on House Administration, the committee of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) who is making a study as to the use of electronic equipment and various ways in which they would recommend rules changes to permit the speeding up of quorum calls.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. I think the subject has been fully and thoroughly covered. I would just like to emphasize again, it is an alternative and it is not compulsory.

The point has been raised with regard to the McClory amendment and what the effect might be, and I would just like to point out that no matter how we go about it with an electronic call system, if you are going to record it with a key or with a teller or with a light board or anything else, you are still going to have the problem with regard to the time taken for the quorum call. Because if you are not here on the floor, it is going to take some time to get over here to the floor.

It may be that if we go to time certain, and have something like the Senate procedure, and have to change the procedure of the House very much more materially than you have here.

I think that with this amendment, you could still work within the electronic system, but you are still going to have a timelag situation and you are still going to have a 30-minute period or something of that sort where people can come over and report.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman has made that statement, and I join him in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent amendment. It is in the alternative.

So many of us are so sick and tired of coming here and having to wait around for 10 or 15 or 20 minutes because somebody in a fit of pique made a point of order of no quorum.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have worked for some time on this amendment, and I think it is worth thinking about with some care.

If we move to electronic voting, as I hope we will, as the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, we do not deal with the problem that is dealt with in this amendment because when you go to electronic equipment or whether you stay with the present system, inevitably one is faced with the need to provide time for Members to get over here and respond to either a rollcall on some kind of mechanical or electrical registration.

The practical problem is this. As the parliamentary procedures are administered today, you cannot interrupt a rollcall for the purpose of making a motion to dispense with the further proceedings under the call until that rollcall has been completed.

Now that has been a practice for a long time. The fundamental question is this: Why not interrupt a rollcall once you have the quorum established? Why keep on going after you have met the constitutional requirement that there will be 218 Members on the floor or in the case of the Committee of the Whole, 100 Members?

So what the White amendment seeks to do is to make it in order earlier to move to dispense with the further proceedings under the call when you have met the constitutional requirement of a quorum.

Then you are left with the question: What about those who did not get over? They do not want to be identified as being absent—so it is provided that they can, in effect, sign in within a given and fixed period of time, which they can keep track of themselves.

There is one other very practical advantage in this amendment—and this is quite important in my judgment—if you set up a system whereby you might divide the whole House into, let us say, 12 separate lists and you lay them out around on the desk here, then if you are down at lunch and a quorum call takes place, you can come up immediately and sign in and go right back down without having to figure out whether you are going to hit the right point in the rollcall and if you missed then, you have to stay here another 10 minutes until the call goes around the second time.

This would make it much simpler for Members to get on with their business,

and it would save the time of the House. It would really make it possible for us to get more things done, and we are finding every day that our time is becoming more and more dissipated and scattered by these procedural patterns that are imposed upon us by older practices.

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

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

Mr. CONABLE. I think the gentleman has made a good case for the amendment. It is important that we find some way to shorten the waste periods in our legislative lives. It has been alleged that chaos would result. The proposed amendment sounds to me like an ingenious plan for shortening the process of the quorum call, and I think it should be supported.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. Is it not true that most of the abuses in relation to quorum calls occur in the Committee of the Whole of the House generally when we have repeated quorum calls during the course of the consideration of bills?

Mr. FRASER. I am a little reluctant to characterize it as an abuse, but I would say that we spend a lot of our time in that process.

Mr. WHITE. I will change the wording of my question. Is it not a fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY) does not address itself to problems arising from quorum calls while the House is in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, but I would say that does not matter. Even if it did, you would still have the question of whether you will let Members come in early and leave, or whether you are going to require——

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the McClory amendment does not provide a time factor, and if the Members later wanted more time they would not have it, and that the pending amendment offers an alternative?

Mr. FRASER. That is exactly correct. Under this amendment, electronic devices would fit in very logically and simply.

Mr. WHITE. If an electronic system should break down, would not the amendment provide an alternative for a fast quorum call?

Mr. FRASER. It would.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not also a fact that the Senate uses a system similar to the one proposed, although they do not allow the membership to continue to register their presence to expedite business?

Mr. FRASER. My understanding is that they call the roll until they establish a quorum.

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

(On request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRASER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

It was on the last point that I really wanted to ask the gentleman a question. I think he alluded to the subject. But this is a very, very significant difference, as I understand. As I understand it, when in the Senate a quorum is reached—the only purpose of having a quorum call is to determine that a majority of the Members is present—when they have reached a quorum, they want to wipe the record clean. In that way you would not get phony reports of how people work in the Congress, how many quorum calls they answered, and also you would not have as many quorum calls to show that they were there that day.

If you put a period in the amendment after the point where it says "a majority has been reached," it would be a better amendment than all that other stuff.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman has brought up a very important thought. In considering that possibility, we were faced with the practice in the Senate. They apparently have to work very hard to get their Members over to make a quorum. If we had to do the same thing here in the House, work hard to persuade people to come over when they knew it would not make any difference finally when the quorum was reached, I think you would have a difficult time getting a quorum in the House. We must retain the practice of recording the presence of Members, which will require Members to come over and be counted in the quorum.

Mr. Chairman, I make one last point. Someone suggested the request of 10 Members ought to be required in order to challenge the existence of a quorum. I think there is a constitutional problem. The Constitution provides for the presence of a majority of the Members of the House in order to do business. If one Member raises a point of order that a majority is not present, you are constitutionally in trouble if you do not accept that point of order and make a count. Much as that proposed change might be desirable, I think it would require a change in the language of our Constitution.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a brief comment. It seems to me that a great deal of our discussion yesterday on the subject of electronic voting was with respect to when it would be installed. There was a great interest in installing such a system at the earliest possible time. I think we ought to consider yesterday's action in our consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE). It is possible that his plan or some third alternative plan may inadvertently be an excuse or a reason for delaying the installation of the electric or electronic system which can expedite rollcalls and quorum calls with respect to issues before the House.

I would also like to make this observation. As I understand quorum calls, they are not all made for a useless purpose or to relieve somebody from being present on the floor of the House, but are mainly for the purpose of trying to bring people to the floor to conduct important business. If we adopt an amendment which merely gives a person an excuse to finish his lunch or to avoid being present on the floor of the House, it seems to me we are performing a disservice instead of making a change which can enable the Members to perform more efficiently their jobs.

I do not have strong feelings on this amendment. I can see how it can expedite the establishment of a quorum. If that is its sole purpose, it accomplishes that without question. But what happens 5 minutes later when there is not a quorum here, after 218 Members have signed in? The absence of a quorum can be raised again. Am I wrong on that statement?

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

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I did not want to refer to what the gentleman just said, but rather to point out that with the present system of coming into the well of the House at the end of a quorum call, I do not see how anything that is true about it now would not be true if the amendment is adopted. In other words, people sitting downstairs for a lunch may go into the well of the House anyway.

Mr. McCLORY. It is true, a number of times when we respond to the quorum call, we do not stay on the floor, but my point is that after a quorum is made, there usually is a much larger percentage of Members on the floor than before the quorum call is made. So it seems to me that the quorum call does serve that valid purpose. I raise the question whether the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) would have that effect. I think it would have the opposite effect.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if this saves half the time we spend in quorum calls, it is worth the effort. About 2 years ago I made an analysis of the quorum and rollcalls for the preceding 18 months. Based on the average time to call a roll and the average number of times a week we were in session, we had spent in floor time 14 weeks in calling the roll. If we could save 6 weeks of floor time, it seems to me it would be worthwhile.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that the installation of an electronic rollcall system is designed precisely for that purpose. The only question in my mind is whether or not we serve the purpose of establishing a quorum or producing more Members on the floor of the House by this amendment. It is a question I raise which I think we should consider in casting our vote on the proposal.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr.

Chairman, is it not true, I ask the gentleman from Illinois, that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would prevail, that such quorum calls could be taken by electronic means?

Mr. McCLORY. Yes. After the electronic system is established, we can take the rollcall by that means. Yes.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman realizes, does he not, that a quorum call utilizing an electronic device will not be instantaneous?

Mr. McCLORY. That is true, but it would be timesaving without any question at all, which I assume is the purpose of the amendment we are considering here.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, quorum calls are a part of our lives. We are engaged now in a constructive effort to see if we can keep the benefits and the values of the call of the House, the quorum call, without causing undue hardship upon the Members.

I believe the gentleman from Texas has a sound idea. There may be some bugs or defects in it. The gentleman from Iowa points out one of the problems. There is an answer, as the gentleman from Minnesota stated, to that suggestion, with the Senate practice.

It might be helpful, before we vote on this, if we would ask ourselves, why do we use the call of the House? What is the purpose of the quorum call?

First, we used it for the automatic vote. Under the changed procedure in this Congress, when we have the automatic vote they ring two bells and not three bells. This would not change that procedure. We would still have the ability to get an automatic yea-and-nay vote under that situation.

Second, once in a long time the call of the House is used as a delaying tactic. Occasionally a minority, not anxious for action on a particular measure, will require a series of quorum calls. This would not change that procedure. The minority might have to use 10 of these calls to occupy the same amount of time that six would occupy, but they would still have the constitutional right at any point to raise the question as to whether or not there were 218 Members, or 100 Members, as the case might be, on the floor of the House at that time.

What are other reasons?

Yesterday a distinguished Member of this body said to me that he had been absent for a few quorum calls, and he wanted to improve his batting average, and he said, "I think I will raise a point of order." Members still would have that right. Under this provision, instead of taking 40 minutes, it might take 15 minutes. A Member might infringe on the time of his beloved colleagues for perhaps 15 minutes instead of 40 minutes to improve his batting average.

I recall that not too long ago one of my colleagues was about to make a major speech, and he said, "I would like to have a crowd here. Will you make a point of order and get me a crowd?" This is another reason why we use the quorum call, the call of the House. Under the amendment of the gentleman from Texas the use of the quorum call for that purpose would not be infringed. A Member still would be able to get himself a crowd if his advance publicity had not done the job.

Finally, the last purpose I could think of is that frequently we will be engaged in general debate, and the Members who do not want to participate in the general debate, who have other things to occupy their time, will go back to their offices. All of a sudden the time will be yielded back in the general debate, and we are about to begin consideration under the 5-minute rule, so we want to have some way to get the word out to the Members that we are now going to make decisions on particular amendments, so we make a point of order that a quorum is not present. Again, we go through this 35- or 40-minute procedure.

Again, under the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, this function, this very legitimate form of the quorum call, would be kept. A Member still would have the right to do this. But it would occupy perhaps 15 minutes, as I say, instead of 35 or 40 mintues.

I believe we can keep the values of the quorum call, of the call of the House, and follow the Constitution, which permits Members to make a point of order, and yet save hours and hours—thousands of man-hours—a year through the adoption of this amendment.

I strongly support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Under all of the conditions the gentleman has set forth nothing is going to be changed unless 100 Members stay on the floor of the House, when legislation is considered in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Nothing being done here will change that.

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. If the Members do not want quorum calls, the way to avoid quorum calls is to keep 100 Members on the floor. Is that too much to expect from 435 Members?

Mr. UDALL. Well, we live in an imperfect world, not in a perfect world. In a perfect world we would all be here.

I have had problems, as the gentleman has, in trying to get 100 Members here.

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

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

Mr. BENNETT. I believe the gentleman's analysis of the reasons why we have quorum calls omitted the chief reason for the quorum call, and that is to have Members here to conduct business. The gentleman did not mention that. I hope in the revision of his remarks he will put that in.

Mr. UDALL. I would concur with the gentleman. This is an essential purpose. That is what the Constitution contemplated, that we do business with quorum.

Mr. BENNETT. If the gentleman will yield further, I did not mean that as a criticism, and did not imply the gentleman did not believe it. I just noted the list did not include it, and it is of paramount importance.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with him.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Following up the point just made, I believe we all ought to ask ourselves whether, knowing that the quorum call is only going to take 15 or 20 minutes, rather than 40 minutes, when a Member comes to the floor, he would be far more likely to remain on the floor. That is the very purpose the gentleman from Iowa mentioned, under the present rule.

It seems to me it is obvious he would, and that is one of the strongest reasons for this amendment. A Member who has come over to answer the quorum will remain because he knows that it will not last very long and thus you will get back to business sooner.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. There is not any assurance whatsoever that in putting a paper down here for you to sign it will save any time. That can be stretched out from here way out to yonder with the time consumed in that.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say something which is rather unusual. In the normal case, accolades are normally reserved for the conclusion of debate and the conclusion of the passage of a bill and never in midstream, but this has been a pretty long swim, and so I would like to take this opportunity to say how much I admire the way in which the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) have conducted the deliberations on this bill.

I have participated in a number of debates, as all Members here have, and I must say that I have never participated in one that seemed more reasoned and where more respect was paid to each individual Member than in the case of the bill which is before us now.

But above all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay my tribute and respect to the gentleman in the chair, the gentleman from Kentucky, because of the even-handed way in which he has conducted this debate and because of his patience. And when I say "the gentleman from Kentucky," I mean the gentleman from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa to the amendment offered by Mr. WHITE:

After the word "which" in line 16 of the White amendment, delete the words "it shall be in order to entertain a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call and".

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Is this an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, it is.

Mr. HALL. Or does the line reference refer to page 39 of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, judging from the discussion, the purpose of the amendment is to save time, but I say that without this perfecting amendment it can take more time. The reason for that is that we can have a quorum call and then have a motion and one could demand a quorum call on that motion. We can end up with more time wasted rather than less. All my amendment does is to delete from the amendment the requirement or the possibility of having a motion upon which there could be another rollcall demanded. In other words, when 100 Members answer, it stops. Members can still come up and sign if they want to, but at that time that proceeding stops and there is no motion intervening on which there could be another rollcall.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. One of the problems with the gentleman's amendment, although I think it has a lot of merit to it, is that the call of the House serves other functions than simply establishing a quorum, because under the procedure of the call of the House you may require the attendance of every Member of the House. There may be occasions in which the House itself decides it wants to require every Member to be present unless excused officially with the consent of the House. That is the problem of your amendment. You are in effect stating that the proceedings of the call are automatically dispensed with after you reach a quorum. In probably 99 out of 100 cases that is the result you want, but there may be a few occasions where there is a desire on the part of the House to compel all of the Members to be present.

And you would have eliminated that possibility by automatically causing a call of the roll to be discontinued.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. A quorum call does not require all Members to be present. That is another rule.

Mr. FRASER. There is no such thing as a quorum call in the rules. The rule provides that in the absence of a quorum the roll may be called.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But I say there are other rules that will require the presence of everyone if they are invoked. This has nothing to do with that at all.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have to differ with the gentleman. The rollcall, a call of the House, is a procedure which not only establishes and sets in motion the machinery, but the Sergeant at Arms can arrest people and the doors of the House can be locked. All of these matters are involved in a call of the House.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. We have only invoked this once in about 4 years, and I think some of the Members present will remember that I made a motion where the doors were really locked so that if everyone comes in, they cannot get out at that point. We do not usually do that, but as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has pointed out, there are a series of procedures that are set in motion that can go far beyond the simple signing in of the Members.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. All I am trying to do is to perfect the amendment so it will save time. Otherwise, we may under the White amendment take up more time than is consumed at the present time.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. It is the current practice that after the roll has been called twice and the Members have checked into the well, there is still in effect a motion which can be made to dispense with further proceedings even though you have not accounted for all the other Members and the Presiding Officer can say without objection further proceedings under the call are dispensed with, but someone can object. This changes that procedure, but it probably would not occur in 99 cases out of 100.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. My amendment would not eliminate that procedure.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately I was answering a telephone call when the gentleman's amendment was read.

Does this provide that if, for instance, the House is in the Committee of the Whole, upon the signing of the paper by 100 Members, that the House then resumes its sitting?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. As I have stated previously the purpose of the amendment is to save time. Either we must adopt this amendment to the amendment or it is going to take more time rather than less time. As the original amendment which has been offered is written now, it will end up taking more time because we could have a motion in the middle of the quorum call and we could have a rollcall on that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, and if the roll, or whatever you want is taken, this signed paper roll was taken at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, you could come in at 6 o'clock and sign that sheet and be accounted for as having been present?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That provision for signing is in the White amendment. That is not in my amendment to his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Then what do we do about the clocks? Do we put another light on the clocks to tell you what kind of a bobtailed affair is going on over here that I do not have to get here but I can sign in later? What kind of business is this?

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

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

Mr. REES. Could I read from a copy of the amendment? It says that if for a period of 30 minutes from the commencement of said quorum call Members are not present before the expiration of said 30 minutes, may have their presence recorded on said tally sheets.

So, they ring the bell for a quorum call and a Member has 30 minutes to come here and either answer "present" or sign his name on a tally sheet and then the rolls are closed and there is no way the Member can be recorded.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that we are nearing 7 o'clock. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 7 o'clock.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we have an understanding as to how many Members want to be heard on this?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes eight Members standing.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I must, regretfully, object.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17654) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SAFE BANKING ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, since 1964, nine banks across the country have failed, primarily because they dealt too heavily in brokered funds and tie-in loans. In 1970 alone, three banks have failed for these reasons, the latest occurring only last month.

Because of this situation and several other unsound banking practices, I have today introduced the Safe Banking Act of 1970, which is designed to strengthen

the banking system and to return banks and certain other financial institutions to the business for which they were chartered.

Our investigation which led to this legislation has revealed a complicated network of financial maneuvering, including phoney stock, international check kiting schemes, bogus banks, transfers of large sums of questionably obtained money in foreign bank accounts and loans to finance gambling operations.

It is imperative that this legislation be enacted immediately since there are a number of banks across the country still in operation who have been victimized by brokered funds and other questionable transactions. And, although these banks are still operating, there is a possibility that they could all become casualties.

The use of brokered funds, accompanied by tied-in loans is not new in the banking industry, but recently has been put to its greatest use because of the continuing shortage of money and high interest rates.

BAD RISKS GET BANK LOANS

Quite simply, this is how the brokered fund scheme works. A borrower goes to his bank to borrow $100,000. The bank itself does not have that amount of money to loan or else does not feel that the borrower is a good credit risk or that the reason for the loan is not solid enough to justify such an amount. The potential borrower is then either steered or on his own makes contact with a money broker. The money broker agrees that he will arrange for deposits to be made in the bank so that the potential borrower can obtain the loan. For this service, the broker is to be paid a percentage of the loan as a fee. In order to obtain the money to put in the bank, the broker advertises an interest rate in excess of that allowed by regulation Q, the regulation of the Federal Reserve Board which sets limits on the interest paid by financial institutions on savings. For instance, the broker may advertise for deposits with an interest of 7½ percent providing a minimum deposit of $5,000 is made. Such a deposit would be limited to 5½ percent for 1 year under the terms of regulation Q. However, the 2-percent difference is made up out of the fee paid the broker by the potential borrower and the "kicker" money is normally paid by the broker in advance to encourage participation in the program.

Thus, the situation looks like this. The bank has $100,000 in deposits, the borrower has a loan for $100,000, a group of depositors have $100,000 in savings in the bank. They are receiving an interest rate of 7½ percent, a portion of which is paid by the broker who has collected a nice fee for putting the whole package together.

BIG LOAN CAN BREAK BANK

The first problem arises when the bank borrower is unable to repay the loan either because the project for which the money was borrowed did not materialize as expected or the borrower simply had no intention of repaying the funds. The bank is still obligated to pay the savers who deposited the money for the loan and since the bank received no income from the loan that went sour, it has to obtain the funds to repay the savers from other sources. And, of course, if the loan is large enough, it can break the bank. The money broker, who gets his fee in advance, merely sits back and waits for the next loan customer to come along.

Since the problem with brokered funds began developing and banks began to fold, the money brokers have taken the attitude of innocent bystanders. The brokers contend that they are merely performing a needed banking service and do not have anything to do with inducing the financial institution to make a loan or evaluating the credit worthiness of the borrower. Some bank supervisory officials support the position of the brokers, adding that brokered funds, on their own, are not cause for worry.

I reject all of these arguments. The brokered fund scheme will not work without the tie-in loan, since there must be a source of income above the legal savings interest rate in order to attract depositors. That kicker must come from the borrower who is willing to pay the fees in order to obtain the loan.

Mr. Speaker, one of the largest banks in the South, throughout the years, has refused to participate with the Small Business Administration in making loans available to small businessmen on a cooperative basis. The bankers' reasoning is that "if the loan is good enough to be made, I will make it on my own without getting a guarantee from SBA, but if the loan is not worthy enough to be made, I do not want to make the loan even with SBA in the picture." This type of reasoning should be more properly applied to loans involving brokered funds. The bank should either make or not make the loan based on the qualifications of the borrower, not whether or not the borrower can arrange for brokered funds to be put in the bank. This is why the Safe Banking Act of 1970 would prohibit banks and insured savings and loans from accepting brokered deposits. On their very face, these deposits cause problems and it is an unsavory aspect of the banking industry which must be eliminated.

The following table shows the extent to which brokered funds were involved in nine bank closings since 1964:

INSURED BANK CLOSINGS FROM SEPT. 5, 1964 TO JULY 21, 1970, WHICH INVOLVED BROKERED FUNDS

Name and location of closed insured bank	Date of closing	Approximate total of brokered funds	Primary money broker(s)
Brighton National Bank, Brighton, Colo.	Jan. 22, 1965	$1,015,000	See listing attached.
San Francisco National Bank, San Francisco, Calif.	do	17,000,000	Do.
Bank of Pine Apple, Pine Apple, Ala.	Jan. 31, 1967	150,000	Washington Capital Corp., 27 William St., New York, N.Y.
Morrice State Bank, Morrice, Mich.	May 5, 1969	949,000	Leo Freedman, Pasadena, Tex.; Greater Miami Financial Corp., Miami, Fla.
First State Bank, Aransas Pass, Tex.	Sept. 2, 1969	820,000	Meyers, Pollock, Robbins, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Bankers Financial Equity Co., Boston, Mass.
First National Bank, Coalville, Utah	Oct. 3, 1969	1,000,000	Seaboard Planning Corp.; Bankers Financial Equity Co.
State Bank of Prairie City, Prairie City, Iowa	Feb. 22, 1970	848,000	Seaboard Planning Corp.; Bankers Financial Equity Co.; Sumner Financial Corp., Jacksonville, Fla.
Peoples State Savings Bank, Auburn, Mich.	Apr. 18, 1970	2,725,000	See listing attached
Farmers Bank of Petersburg, Petersburg, Ky.	June 25, 1970	737,000	Do.

THE BRIGHTON NATIONAL BANK, BRIGHTON, COLO.—MONEY BROKERS

Guaranty Depositors, Los Angeles, California.

W. B. Wolf & Company, Detroit, Michigan.

John Woodson and Associates, San Rafael, California.

Horace Chase, Incorporated, Sherman Oaks, California.

Colorado International Corporation, Denver, Colorado.

Resolute Insurance Group, Hartford, Connecticut.

MONEY BROKERS—RECORDS OF SAN FRANCISCO NATIONAL BANK, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.—NR–276

Associated Brokers, Ltd, El Paso, Texas.

Bankers Financial Equity Corp., c/o Mr. Harry Magazine, 8 Oliver Street, Boston 9, Massachusetts.

Tom Berkley, Berkley, Randall & Harvey (Lawyers), 2975 Sacramento Street, Berkeley 2, California.

Charles B. Elkins, 30 East 42d Street—Suite 1901, New York, New York.

Mr. A. A. Franks, 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Massachusetts.

Mr. Leon Friedman, Lincoln—Levine Towers, Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

Gifts for Thrift, Inc., 176 Broadway, New York, New York.

Mr. H. S. (Bud) Gobler, "Bud Gobler Financing", 15010 Ventura Boulevard—Suite 217, Sherman Oaks, California (formerly with Guaranty Depositors)

Guaranty Depositors, Guaranty Building, 1151 Northwestern Avenue, Los Angeles, California.

Greater Miami Savings Center, c/o Mr. Richard Finchell, President, Olympic Building, Miami, Florida.

Horace Chase, Inc., (see C/D Nos. 957 & 979, Barton & Estelle Lewis).

W. W. Inglis, Inglis Irving Trust Co., 1 Wall Street, New York City, New York.

John Woodson & Associates, 2208 Fourth Street, San Rafael, California (formerly with Guaranty Depositors).

Melvin E. Levinson, 33 North LaSalle, Chicago, Illinois.

Mr. Leo F. Lomski, President, Capital Dynamics International, Suite 200, 199 First Street, Los Altos, California.

Natalie Moorman, (Commercial Investors Inc.) 146 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco, California.

John C. Namos, 137 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California.

Jack Paller & Company of Philadelphia, Inc., (Acct. #1064268 with Philadelphia National Bank—only address can locate so far).

Park Acceptance Corporation, 1951 Guardian Building, Detroit, Michigan.

Renshaw, McKeown & Young, Inc., c/o Mr. Robert F. McKeown, 11000 West McNichols Road, Detroit, Michigan.

Robbie, Waters & Co., Inc., c/o Mr. Her-

man H. Robbie, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York.

San Diego Imperial Corporation, c/o Mr. D. R. Sully, Treasurer, P.O. Box 631, San Diego, California.

S. L. Miller & Co., Inc., 4 Blackberry Lane, P.O. Box 247, Westport, Connecticut.

The B. C. Morton Organization, Inc., (c/o Mr. Herman H. Robbie, Manager Corporate Finance Division), 22 East 40th Street, New York, New York.

Toddan Company, c/o Mr. Kenneth Beebe, Vice President, 50 East 42nd Street, New York, New York.

William L. Miller & Associates, Financial Center Building, Suite 401–405–14th Street, Oakland, California.

Wentworth & Co., Inc., Suite 108–109 Benson E., Jenkintown, Pennsylvania.

W. E. Rollins & Associates, 905 Century Building, Houston, Texas.

W. B. Wolf & Co., 482 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan.

Mr. Arthur G. Wolf, W. B. Wolf & Co., 512 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan.

THE PEOPLES STATE SAVINGS BANK, AUBURN, MICH.—MONEY BROKERS

Sumner Financial Corporation, 5821 San Juan Avenue, Suite 116, Jacksonville, Florida.

The Seaboard Planning Corporation (Formerly The B. C. Morton Organization, Inc.), 141 Milk Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Bankers Financial Equity Company, (A Subsidiary of The Seaboard Corporation), 9601 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California.

C. H. Wagner & Company, Inc., 185 Devonshire Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Primus Investment Company, 921 Twenty-Eighth Street, S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan. Roger VanNoord, Secretary-Treasurer.

Westamerica Securities, Inc.:

"The 300 Complex," Suite 311, 300 West, P.O. Box 20288, St. Petersburg, Florida.

1120 Citizens Bank Building, Orlando, Florida.

2601 E. Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 304, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

40 Sunshine Mall, Clearwater, Florida.

230 Highway A1A, Box 2312, Satellite Beach, Florida.

Suite 902, Republic Tower, 5700 Florida Blvd., Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

3655 28th Street, S.E., Eastbrook Mall, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Martin W. Harowitz & Company, Suite 108, 1904 Byrd Avenue, Richmond, Virginia.

James H. Roof, Jr., Agent, P.O. Box 1014, 308 Tampa Street Bldg., Suite 238, Tampa, Florida.

First Depositors of America, Inc., Suite 507, Olympia Bldg., 174 East Flagler Street, Miami, Florida.

R. E. Miller & Associates, 3219 Atlantic Blvd., Jacksonville, Florida.

FARMERS BANK OF PETERSBURG, PETERSBURG, KY.—MONEY BROKERS

Nationwide Securities Corporation.
Bankers Financial Equity Company.
Lundy Associates.
Zenith Funding Corporation.
Financial Service Corporation of America.
C. H. Wagner Company.
H. Adams Company.

One of the prime examples of how the money broker operation works involves the closing of the Peoples State Savings Bank of Auburn, Mich., which went under on April 16 of this year. In the Auburn case, some $2.7 million in brokered funds were deposited in the bank by 545 investors from various parts of the country. The deposits were made in an 8-week period in the spring. The investors were talked into buying a $5,000 letter of credit—savings deposit—that would pay them $5,700 at the end of 2 years. According to FDIC reports, more than $2,300,000 of that amount has been paid out as follows. Some 30 percent went to a loan to Graham B. Alvey and his wife of Sanford, Mich.; 16 percent each to Frank Harris of Alabama and Robert K. Drake of New Jersey; roughly 2 percent each to James McConnel of Florida and James Dondich of Nevada; and some 34 percent to the Sumner Financial Corp. of Jacksonville, Fla., the original money broker in the scheme.

DEPOSITS WENT TO BROKER'S ACCOUNT

Actually, the deal started when Alvey, who was developing a resort property in Michigan, sought to obtain additional funds from the Peoples Bank to finish the project. When the bank was unable to extend him additional money, Alvey was steered through a complicated network of money brokers and finally wound up with the Sumner Financial Corp. Apparently Sumner agreed to obtain deposits for the Auburn Bank so that Alvey could get his loan. The funds were obtained by Sumner, although it appears that other money brokers helped in the deal. But, instead of the money going directly to the Peoples Bank, it was deposited in an account at the Bank in the name of the Sumner Financial Corp. From that account, the money was apparently channeled to Alvey and the other parties, although who actually disbursed the money is unclear. By depositing the funds from the letters of credit in the account of Sumner, the Bank of Auburn was now in the position of having a liability without a corresponding asset. The bank was obligated to repay the letters of credit, but apparently did not have the use of the funds as they were deposited in the Sumner account.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. officials were amazed when they began looking through the bank records to find that there were no loan agreements between any of the parties who received funds from the Sumner account, including Alvey, who told a Banking and Currency Committee staff member that not only did he not sign loan papers with anyone, but that he never made a payment on the loan. In addition, none of the money which was funneled out of the bank was secured by collateral.

It is reported that some of the money obtained in the brokered deposit scheme in Auburn has been deposited in foreign secret bank accounts. It is known that two of the borrowers from Auburn traveled to Europe shortly after receiving the money but did not have the funds when they returned to this country.

Two of the men who received money in the Auburn case, McConnel and Dondich were charged in 1969 by the Securities and Exchange Commission with violations of the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities laws in connection with the sale of unregistered stock. The two consented to the issuance of a permanent injunction not to sell the stock. It is believed that the pair is involved with a link financing transaction with an Ohio bank that lost more than $1 million on brokered funds. Despite the Bank's losses, it is still operating.

QUESTIONABLE STOCK PLEDGED ON LOAN

Another bank which is still in operation but apparently has been hit hard by the money broker scheme is the Corbin Deposit Bank and Trust Co. of Corbin, Ky. and a related bank, the Bank of Williamsburg, Ky. The banks have filed a suit charging that a group of borrowers, a large money broker, Seaboard Corp., and numerous certificate of deposit holders engaged in a scheme with former bank officers to make $2.25 million worth of worthless and illegal loans. One of the individuals named in the suit is Samuel Calabrese of Los Angeles, who heads several companies, including Standard Computer and Picture Corp. of North Miami, Fla.

In 1969, the Securities and Exchange Commission suspended trading in Standard Computer and Pictures stock in an action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida. The SEC also named Calabrese as a defendant in the action and charged that:

He and some of the other defendants violated the antifraud provisions of the Federal Security laws in that they engaged in a scheme to have Standard acquire assets in non-arms-length transactions at inflated prices which were recorded on Standard's books as cost and, in furtherance of the scheme, prepared and disseminated a false and misleading report to shareholders.

In the case of the two Kentucky banks, Calabrese attempted to borrow $2.25 million to finance a deal with another company. Working through Seaboard, Calabrese apparently obtained deposits and a loan agreement was reached with Calabrese putting up as collateral for the loan 200,000 shares of Standard Computer and 300 shares of Photo Mark Computer Corp., which like Standard Computer, also had selling of its stock suspended for much the same reasons as applied to the Standard case. One of those named in the Photo Mark trading suspension injunction was Emanuel Lester, who in 1963 received a three-month $100,000 loan from the Citizens State Bank of Earth, Tex. The loan was made to Lester after he was able to secure $200,000 in deposits produced on his behalf by Sumner Financial Corp., the principal money broker in both the Auburn, Mich., and Prairie City, Iowa, banks which failed this year. When the Earth, Tex. bank loan came due, Lester had disappeared and the stock pledged as collateral on the loan turned out to be worthless. Lester, who has a police record dating from the 1940's, also is known as Emanuel Lieberman and is presently awaiting trial in Toronto, Canada, on charges of possession of stolen securities and in Baltimore on charges of mail fraud. In 1966, the Banking and Currency Committee conducted an investigation into the closing of the Crown Savings Bank of Newport News, Va. Although there were some brokered deposits in the bank, primarily the reason the bank failed was that it made out-of-territory, high-risk loans that were never repaid and also issued fraudulent certificates of deposit. Many of the loans that were obtained from Crown Savings Bank were used to finance loan sharking throughout the east coast of the United States and various

other illegal schemes. It is still too early to find all of the purposes for which the funds that have been obtained in the recent banking closings have been put to use.

However, it is interesting to note that Calabrese, who is one of the defendants in the Kentucky Bank suits, has made two loans totaling $800,000 to Circus Circus, Inc., a Las Vegas gambling casino. The first of these loans, for $300,000, was made in 1969 and carried an interest rate of 10 percent. And on February 23, 1970, Calabrese through one of his corporations, lent Circus Circus $500,000, also with a 10 percent interest rate.

DID BANK FUNDS GO TO GAMBLING CASINO?

Mr. Speaker, the American banking industry is indeed in a sad state when people cannot borrow money for homes and small businessmen are unable to secure loans in order to stay in business. But at the same time, banks are willing to lend to individuals of highly questionable background who may be turning around and lending the money to gambling casinos.

The Safe Banking Act of 1970 would outlaw brokered deposits by prohibiting a bank or savings and loan association from paying a broker, finder, or other person compensation for obtaining a deposit for a bank or savings and loan association. This prohibition would include a payment by anyone outside of the bank or S. & L. to a potential depositor.

If the money brokers are precluded from dealing with commercial banks, it is quite obvious that they will shift their attention to savings and loan associations, and, in fact, many of the brokers already deal with these institutions. While there are some regulations governing the acceptance of brokered deposits by savings and loan associations, it is felt that the regulations are not adequate to correct the situation if the money brokers shifted all their attention to S. & L.'s.

PREMIUM "GIVEAWAYS" ELIMINATED UNDER ACT

The Safe Banking Act of 1970 would also eliminate the so-called giveaways which banks and savings and loans use to attract deposits. These giveaways may take the form of a blanket, an alarm clock, a box of golf balls, or even ladies' wigs. The list of giveaway items is virtually endless and the use of such promotions has triggered what many believe to be unsound competition for deposits.

The Safe Banking Act of 1970 would do away with such premium giveaways, not only for savings deposits but also for demand deposits. Even though there are regulations governing the cost of the items which may be given away, these regulations are easy to get around and do not effectively curtail the practices. The premium giveaways are a form of unfair competition since the larger financial institutions are able to offer a better premium than the smaller institutions.

Depositors have also begun to "shop" financial institutions, seeking to deposit their money in institutions which offer the best gifts. Some financial institutions have been bothered by customers who make deposits, accept a gift, and promptly close their account and move the money to another financial institution and begin the process all over again.

To illustrate how expensive the premium giveaway program has become, it is reported that in New York City alone during the month of July, $40 million was spent in advertising premium giveaways. This figure represents only the advertising of the premiums in newspapers, radio, and television and does not include the cost of the premiums.

In this period of tight money when it is virtually impossible for a person to obtain funds for a home, it is strange that $40 million can be pumped into giveaway advertising.

EQUITY KICKER WOULD BE PROHIBITED

The Safe Banking Act of 1970 would also put a stop to another unsound and unwholesome financial practice. This involves the so-called equity kicker which is being used by many financial institutions, particularly since we have moved into the tight money period. The equity kicker goes under many names, such as equity sweeteners, a New York kicker, or a piece of the action. For virtually every name there is a different type of equity feature. For instance, the lender receives—either by his demand and as a tie-in transaction or by the borrowers offer as an inducement for the loan or for a reduced interest rate—a certain number of shares of the borrower's stock in addition to or in lieu of the maximum interest rate on the loan or in lieu of shares of stock, the lender may receive rights to buy stock, generally referred to as "warrants." These warrants will allow the lender to buy stock in the borrowers company at a predetermined price. If the value of the stock goes up, the lender will exercise his right to buy the stock but will pay the lower predetermined price, thus making an instant profit.

Another technique used is that of "shadow warrants." This is an arrangement under which the borrower agrees to pay the amount equal to the profit the lender would receive if he had received a certain number of warrants and exercised them on a certain date.

The borrower may agree to pay the bank or other financial institution a stipulated dollar amount for each point that the market price of the borrower's stock advances between the date of the loan and a specified date.

Under another type of equity arrangement, the lender may receive a percentage of gross profits, rents, or sales from the borrower.

Should the loan be in connection with land development, an equity kicker may provide that after repayment of the loan—with interest—the proceeds of the sale of a designated number of lots shall go to the lender as a bonus.

An equity arrangement apparently used by one bank in connection with a loan to a closely held corporation provided for additional interest charges of $15,000 at maturity or, in the event of prepayment or the making of a public offering; and provided further in the event of sale of stock by any stockholder the bank would receive the greater of, first, an additional sum computed on the basis of the time elapsed to the date of the sale, or second, the difference between the total price percentage of the borrowers total outstanding stock at the time of the sale and the State book value of the same percentage of stock at the time of the loan.

There are a number of reasons why financial institutions should not be allowed equity kickers when coupled with loans. These arguments include:

First. Lead to risker loans and possible impairment of safety of depositors' funds—as well as capital of bank. Loans should be based on credit worthiness and not on possibilities of speculative profits.

Second. Lender may take lower interest rate, lend larger amounts or make longer term loans if it gets an equity kicker. Lender's fixed income would be reduced; less money would be available for other borrowers.

Third. Lender may tend to deny credit to businesses competing with one in which lender has an equity interest.

Fourth. Borrowers who do not have bargaining power equal to that of lenders may be victimized. Lender may end up owning the borrower's enterprise in whole or in substantial or controlling part.

Fifth. Equity participations that are to be liquidated through additional money payments by the borrower may be so onerous as to lead to failure of the enterprise.

Sixth. Small business investment companies afford banks and holding companies an appropriate vehicle for assisting small businesses and for acquiring some equity interest in such businesses, subject to congressionally imposed limitations and Federal supervision.

Seventh. The argument that equity participation provides a hedge against inflation has little force in relation to bank loans inasmuch as they are, in large part, of relatively short duration. Besides, a hedge against inflation can be, and probably is, achieved through the rate of interest that lenders charge—and borrowers are willing to pay.

Eighth. Congressional policy is against banks and bank holding companies owning and engaging in nonbank businesses.

Ninth. Bank acquisitions of a substantial share of competing businesses may lead to violations of the antitrust laws.

Tenth. If banks may not take equity kickers, borrowers will have more incentive to seek loans from banks.

Eleventh. The spirit—if not the terms—of the usury laws is violated.

Under the Safe Banking Act of 1970, equity kickers would not be allowed in connection with a loan from any financial institution. This does not mean that equity type financing will not be made available, but rather that a lender must either make a loan or take an equity position, but cannot do both.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of problems in connection with the operations of various types of financial institutions throughout the country and some of the most elaborate swindles and semilegal swindles ever devised are being

worked on these financial institutions even as I address this body today. In the coming days, I will from time to time have more to say about these questionable banking practices and it is my sincere hope that the Safe Banking Act of 1970 will be enacted quickly so as to return our financial institutions to the business for which they were established.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to prohibit brokered deposits in banks and other financial institutions, to prohibit the use of so-called giveaways in the solicitation of deposits, and to prohibit lenders from acquiring equity participations in connection with loans, and for other purposes

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

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec.
101. Short title.

§ 101. Short title.

This Act may be cited as the Safe Banking Act of 1970.

CHAPTER 2—BROKERED DEPOSITS PROHIBITED

Sec.
111. Amendment of Federal Deposit Insurance Act.
112. Amendment of Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

§ 111. Amendment of Federal Deposit Insurance Act

Subsection (g) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended by striking out the next to last sentence thereof, relating to penalties for violations of such subsection, by inserting "(1)" at the beginning thereof, and by adding thereto the following paragraphs:

"(2) No insured bank or officer, director, agent, or substantial stockholder thereof may pay or agree to pay a broker, finder, or other person compensation for obtaining a deposit for such bank. For the purposes of this paragraph, any payment made by any other person to induce the placing of a deposit in a bank shall be deemed to be a payment of compensation by the bank if the bank had or reasonably should have had knowledge of such a payment when it accepted the deposit.

"(3) Any violation by an insured bank of the provisions of this subsection or of regulations issued hereunder shall subject the bank to a penalty of not more than 10 percent of the amount of the deposit to which the violation relates. The Corporation may recover the penalty, by suit or otherwise, for its own use, together with the costs and expenses of the recovery.

"(4) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'payment of interest' includes an agreement to pay interest and includes payments to the depositor or any other person directly or indirectly made by any officer, director, agent, or substantial stockholder of the bank in which the deposit is made if the bank had or reasonably should have had knowledge of the agreement or payment when it accepted the deposit. The Board of Directors shall by regulation prescribe definitions of the terms 'payment of compensation' and 'substantial stockholder' and shall prescribe such further definitions of 'payment of interest' as it may deem appropriate for the purposes of this subsection. The Board of Directors shall prescribe such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this subsection and prevent evasions thereof."

§ 112. Amendment of Federal Home Loan Bank Act

Section 5B of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1425b) is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 5B." and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) No member which is an insured institution as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act and no officer, director, agent, or substantial stockholder thereof shall pay or agree to pay a broker, finder, or other person compensation for obtaining funds to be deposited or invested in such member (hereinafter in this section referred to as deposits). For the purposes of this paragraph, any payment made by any other person to induce the placing of a deposit in such a member shall be deemed to be a payment of such compensation by the member if the member had or reasonably should have had knowledge of such a payment when it accepted the deposit.

"(c) Any violation by a member of the provisions of this subsection or of regulations issued hereunder shall subject the member to a penalty of not more than 10 percent of the amount of the deposit to which the violation relates. The Board may recover the penalty, by suit or otherwise, for the use of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, together with the costs and expenses of the recovery.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the term 'payment of interest or dividends' includes an agreement to pay interest or dividends and includes payments to the depositor or investor or any other person directly or indirectly made by any officer, director, agent, or substantial stockholder of the member in which the deposit is made if the member had or reasonably should have had knowledge of the agreement or payment when it accepted the deposit. The Board shall by regulation prescribe definitions of the term 'payment of compensation' and 'substantial stockholders' and shall prescribe such further definitions of 'payment of interest or dividends' as it may deem appropriate for the purposes of this section. The Board shall prescribe such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section and prevent evasions thereof."

CHAPTER 3—CERTAIN GIVEAWAYS PROHIBITED

Sec.
121. Amendment of section 19(j), Federal Reserve Act.
122. Amendment of section 18(g), Federal Deposit Insurance Act.
123. Amendment of section 5B, Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

§ 121. Amendment of section 19(j), Federal Reserve Act.

Section 19(j) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except for the payment of interest on deposits subject to limitation under this section, no member bank may offer or deliver any merchandise or any certificate, stamp, ticket, or other obligation or memorandum which is or may be redeemable in merchandise, money, or credit as an inducement to any person to make or add to any deposit."

§ 122. Amendment of section 18(g), Federal Deposit Insurance Act

Section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except for the payment of interest on deposits subject to limitation under this section, no insured bank may offer or deliver any merchandise or any certificate, stamp, ticket, or other obligation or memorandum which is or may be redeemable in merchandise, money, or credit as an inducement to any person to make or add to any deposit."

§ 123. Amendment of section 5B, Federal Home Loan Bank Act

Section 5B(a) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1425b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except in the case of interest or dividends subject to limitation under this section, no member may offer or deliver any merchandise or any certificate, stamp, ticket, or other obligation or memorandum which is or may be redeemable in merchandise, money, or credit as an inducement to any person to make, open, or add to any deposit or account."

CHAPTER 4—CERTAIN EQUITY PARTICIPATIONS PROHIBITED

Sec.
131. Definitions.
132. Prohibition on equity participations by lenders.
133. Civil liability.
134. Criminal penalty.

§ 131. Definitions

(a) The definitions and rules of construction set forth in this section apply for the purpose of this chapter.

(b) The term "lender" includes any commercial bank, trust company, mortgage banker, savings bank, building and loan association, savings and loan association, insurance company, or other person or organization engaged in the business of making or placing loans.

(c) The term "equity participation" refers to

(1) an ownership interest in any property or enterprise; or

(2) any right to any payment or credit which is proportionate to or contingent upon the net or gross income from any property or enterprise, including but not limited to

(A) a share in the profits, income, or earnings from a business enterprise of the borrower;

(B) warrants entitling the lender to purchase stock of the borrower at a fixed price; or

(C) shadow warrants entitling the lender to compensation based upon changes in the market price of the borrower's stock over a specified period.

§ 132. Prohibition on equity participation by lenders

No lender may accept any equity participation in consideration of the making of any loan.

§ 133. Civil liability.

Any lender which acquires an equity participation from a borrower in violation of this chapter shall, upon demand, assign all its right, title, and interest therein to the borrower and in addition be liable to the borrower in an amount equal to twice the fair market value of the equity participation at the time of its creation or at the time of demand, whichever is higher, and shall in addition be liable to the borrower for his reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit as determined by the court in any action to enforce the liability created by this section. Any such action may be brought in any district court of the United States regardless of the amount in controversy, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction, within six years after the date on which the liability arises.

§ 134. Criminal penalty.

Whoever willfully violates the provisions of section 132 of this chapter, or willfully and knowingly participates in any such violation, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

BOMB IS NOT "DISSENT"

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, clearly one of the most important challenges facing Congress today is that of developing effective measures to stop terrorist bombings.

A recent editorial in the Birmingham

News offers some constructive thoughts on this problem. I am placing this article in the RECORD at this time, so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read this article:

BOMB IS NOT "DISSENT"

Both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are investigating a new and dangerous phenomenon in this country—terrorist bombings.

New York Police Commissioner Howard Leary told a Senate panel last week, "We can say the present crop of explosive devices, in the main, represent distorted petitions for redress of grievance."

"Distorted" is an understated adjective. Persons who resort to random violence for political purposes are as wantonly criminal as those who would use the same tactics to commit theft. The victims of these "petitions" bleed just as freely as bystanders shot in the course of armed robbery.

The stakes are different, but the means are equally intolerable.

We hope the investigations will gather sufficient facts to guide the nation's lawmakers in drafting enlightened measures to deal with the problem.

Some senators have cautioned against legislation which prevents violence, but also tends to repress all political and social dissent. But their colleagues are not children, and realize the elemental danger of passing legislation which goes too far.

While some may call terrorism dissent, this does not change the nature of the act nor make it legitimate.

Effective countermeasures are needed to halt this madness which goes far beyond any rational person's definition of protest.

QUALITY EDUCATION FOR OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, today in communities throughout this Nation, parents of schoolchildren are perplexed. Wanting quality education for their children, they find instead disrupting experimentation. Wanting harmony, they find discord.

Why are parents caught in this trap? The reasons are clear: A generation of children has grown up since 1954, when the Supreme Court first declared that segregation of schools was illegal, that separate but equal education was no longer a valid policy.

Since that time, our Nation's courts have often disagreed with each other—and with their own previous decisions—as to the best strategy to be followed in desegregating our public schools.

Freedom of choice once enjoyed the favor of our courts, but despite the fact that such freedom still enjoys the favor of the American people, black and white, our courts have ruled that basic freedom illegal.

And they have proceeded to replace freedom with coercion. Parents no longer have the right to decide where their children should go to school. The courts have taken that responsibility upon themselves, and in their zealous exercise of this new power, they have very nearly made a shambles of public education in the United States.

Thousands of children who entered the first grade in 1954 were graduated from our Nation's colleges and universities this past spring. And after all this time, we still have no consistent and effective way of dealing with this most complex issue.

The basic question that faced this country 16 years ago—a question that has indeed begged for an answer throughout much of our history—still wants for a solution.

How shall we in this country live together in peace and in prosperity and in prospect for a brighter future?

Somehow, Mr. Speaker, we in this House have evaded that question, eluded our responsibility and brought much confusion down on the homes of American people throughout the country.

Too often, our silence on this issue has been deafening, but how long will that deafening silence muffle the storms of discontent that are growing in our land? How long will we be able to sit here, couched in our seeming indifference, when those storms begin to rage?

Must social chaos be the price of this Nation's social conscience? It need not.

Must the destruction of public education in the United States be the wages of our sin of neglect and decision? I think not.

Must another generation of children grow up to find their elementary and secondary education a mere testing ground for social projects only to see that testing ground shattered by explosive elements waiting to be detonated at this very moment? We cannot let that happen.

Mr. Speaker, our children have suffered long enough, our courts have taken enough blame, our public school systems have been in disarray long enough, and the voice of this Congress has stammered far too long.

Educators from eight States, inside and outside the South, met last weekend in Charlotte, N.C., in an effort to determine through their mutual experiences if a cogent policy for desegregation could be hewn from the maze of court decisions regarding the issue.

The sessions ended as they began, in confusion. These highly educated men and women, after hours of discussion and study, were still baffled by conflicting opinions offered by the courts.

But there was one resolution which came out of that conference which bears repeating here. The educators petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court to define what is needed for a unitary school system as quickly as possible. We must recognize this resolution as a cry for help, for that is what it is.

I believe it is the responsibility of this Congress to develop fair and enforceable guidelines—but above all understandable guidelines—leading to the solution of this problem.

Much valuable time has already been lost in following the haphazard policy of requiring a school system to devise a plan for desegregation, when as often as not, these plans are found unacceptable by the courts who commissioned them.

Let us waste no more time in resolving the issue.

I am convinced that the forcible busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance is not the answer. The conference in North Carolina last weekend said as much itself.

I am more convinced that forcible busing was an impractical and unworkable policy from the beginning, and the discontent and opposition it has encountered since its inception prove it is almost universally unpopular as well.

It makes no sense to me to force a little boy in the first grade to be transported 10 or even 20 miles away from home just to appease some bureaucratic conception of what real integration ought to be.

It is a harsh fact of life that not every child in the first grade can be driven to school by his mother or by his governess. Imagine the terror a little boy must feel when he boards a strange bus that keeps taking him farther and farther away from home. For many of them, the journey must seem like it will never end.

It is past time for our sons and daughters to serve as our guinea pigs—it is time for us to realize they are little boys and girls who need education. So let us educate them.

It is past time for antagonistic dialog—it is time for decisive action. So let us act.

I rise today not to oppose social progress, but to propose new policies to assure that progress; not to destroy our public school system, but to preserve it, and to improve it.

I rise to restore a measure of sanity to this highly emotional debate. I rise to assert the rights of men—not of one race, but of one Nation.

I rise to act.

Five months ago, I introduced a bill to establish nondiscriminatory school systems and to preserve the rights of elementary and secondary students to attend schools in their own neighborhood.

Today, 5 months later, that bill has still not been considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. Not one hearing has been held concerning this bill, and the beginning of what promises to be another turbulent school year is little more than a month away.

What shall we say to our constituents if this session ends without our having come to grips with this problem? Can we tell our people how much we favor quality education, or true equality among the races, and hope they will not search beyond our hollow words?

The people deserve more than that, and they are certain to demand more.

My bill provides that the right of elementary and secondary education students to attend their neighborhood schools shall not be abridged by any Federal authority because of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin of the student.

It provides that each local nondiscriminatory system shall have the right to determine its own attendance zones without interference from Federal authority as long as those zones are reasonably drawn to serve the needs of the community and no effort is made by drawing such attendance zones to force a student to attend a particular school because of his race.

It provides that each local nondiscriminatory system shall have the right to determine the placement of faculty

and administrative personnel without interference from Federal authority as long as such placement reasonably serves the needs of the school system and no effort is made through its placement to discriminate against any faculty or administrative member on the basis of race.

These proposals are neither revolutionary nor reactionary. They are reasonable approaches to the solution of this problem. They have been offered in good faith that this Congress is dedicated to education and to racial understanding, but more, that we are still dedicated to freedom.

I urge that consideration of the bill I have offered be swiftly arranged in the Committee on Education and Labor, and that this bill be reported out of committee at the earliest possible date so that this Congress may exercise its constitutional mandate and heed the people's will.

ELIMINATING AMPHETAMINES

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today calling on Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Edwards to lay the foundation for eliminating amphetamines by conducting studies to show that they are necessary and effective in only very limited medical situations.

Amphetamines are one of the main characters in a large cast of abusable drugs. And if we can eliminate the black-market amphetamines, we will have gone a long way in controlling drug abuse in the United States. In fact, I think that if we controlled the abuse of amphetamines, we could reduce the drug problem by as much as 20 percent.

There are only two recognized medical uses for amphetamines. They are used to treat narcolepsy, sleeping disease, and hyperkinetic, overactive children. Between these two there is very little need for amphetamines. But we are seeing that there are more than 8 billion produced and it is estimated that half of these get into illegal traffic.

The overwhelming amount of the amphetamines are used for the treatment of obesity. Yet we do not have any store of evidence that amphetamines are effective. And herein lies one of the biggest problems.

We have allowed amphetamines for diet pills when we know that this has resulted in mass production far above actual medical needs. FDA should conduct, or have done, studies to show that amphetamines are not effective in obesity cases.

Several nations have banned amphetamines. Alternative substances for diet pills which do not affect the central nervous system have been found. I think that we are going to have to do something like that in this country.

The problem is not one that is situated entirely within the young population of our Nation. There are thousands and possibly millions of middle-aged adults who go to the medicine cabinet for diet pills to get picked up. Unfortunately, there are too many physicians who are loose about dispensing diet pills and, as a result, adults are just as much a part of the drug subculture as a hophead on some street corner waiting for a fix.

Earlier this year I asked FDA to label amphetamines so that the person taking diet pills would know that he is taking a pill which could have effects on his central nervous system and which could also develop a dependency.

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AND AIRLINE FARES

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, a number of my colleagues and I filed a supplemental complaint with the Civil Aeronautics Board, seeking relief from the recent airline fare increase that a Federal appellate court earlier this month found to be illegal.

In this complaint, we are requesting that the Board promptly institute a proceeding, in which we plan to appear, to determine the amount of the overcharge to the traveling public and to establish a just means of compensating the public for the unlawful fares it has been required to pay.

The complaint which we filed follows:

[Before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.]

IN THE MATTER OF DOMESTIC PASSENGER FARES ESTABLISHED BY THE BOARD AND HELD TO BE UNLAWFUL—DOCKET 21322

Supplemental complaint of Members of Congress and air transportation users with request for institution of appropriate proceedings for determining relief for the period beginning October 1, 1969.

Communications with respect to this document should be sent to:

The Honorable John E. Moss, Member of Congress, 2185 Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515;

Richard W. Klabzuba, 2185 Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; and

Stanford G. Ross, Esq., Caplin & Drysdale, 1101 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Dated: July 24, 1970.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT

I

Complainants initiated the instant proceeding with a complaint filed with the Board on August 20, 1969, setting forth objections to certain tariffs that had been proposed by the domestic carriers. On September 12, 1969, the Board suspended those tariffs and ordered them investigated. At the same time, the Board set forth a fare formula of its own and announced that it would approve tariffs filed in accordance with that formula. Under the Board's proposal the carriers would be granted a fare increase estimated by the Board to produce an increase in industry revenue of approximately 6.35 per cent. When the carriers filed the tariffs that the Board had described, complainants again objected. The Board dismissed these objections and allowed the new tariffs to go into effect beginning October 1, 1969. Complainants then petitioned the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for review of the Board's decisions.

II

On July 9, 1970, the Court of Appeals rendered an opinion and judgment in this case. It sustained complainants' contentions that the Board's order of September 12 "determined" domestic passenger fares within the meaning of section 1002(d) of the Federal Aviation Act, and that the tariffs filed by the carriers on the basis of that order were the responsibility of the agency. This holding was founded on, essentially, five considerations:

(1) That, "as a practical matter, the Board's order amounted to the prescription of rates . . . ." (Slip op., p. 12);

(2) That the Court was aware of no case in which a regulatory agency "has set out such a complete and detailed scheme for making rates which it wanted filed and in which a court has held that the resulting rates were carrier-made rates." (Slip op., pp. 16–17);

(3) That "in the absence of . . . a retrospective remedy for reparation for air line passengers, the procedural safeguards provided in the Federal Aviation Act become the public's sole defense against unreasonable rates permitted by the Board." Therefore, courts need not share the "reparation concern" of courts construing I.C.C. precedents, a concern which has led such courts to find particular tariffs to be carrier-made and therefore subject to reparations even after a general increase in rates ordered by the agency. (Slip op., p. 30 n.14);

(4) That "if . . . the rates resulting from this procedure are carrier-made, rather than agency-made, the public would not only be forced out of its role in ratemaking, but judicial review of the Board's actions would be severely limited." (Slip op., p. 17);

(5) That the Board was incorrect in maintaining that "abdication from its proper supervisory role under the statute need be the result of today's holding requiring the Board to comply with the statute in rate-making." (Slip op., p. 20).

The Court of Appeals concluded its opinion as follows:

"Since the record shows, as the Board admits, that the public notice and hearing requirements of Section 1002(d) were not observed in issuing the order of September 12, that order is invalid and the tariffs filed by the carriers based thereon are unlawful. Under the circumstances, this case is remanded to the Board for further proceedings." (Slip op., p. 23).

III

The mandate of the Court of Appeals is scheduled to issue shortly. We assume that the Board will promptly take the necessary steps, in accordance with the Federal Aviation Act and the decision of the Court of Appeals, to remedy the presently prevailing fares, which are based on the Board's order of September 12 and therefore unlawful.

We recognize that the present situation with respect to fares is unprecedented and that the Board faces a most difficult and sensitive problem. As we view the situation, the Board cannot determine lawful fares for the future without holding a hearing and complying with the other procedural and substantive standards of 1002 (d) and (e) of the Act. Moreover, we do not believe that there can be any lawful tariffs on file until the Board corrects its errors and establishes legal fares.

In order to avoid a hiatus while the Board is determined lawful fares for the future, complainants suggest that the Board might re-establish the fares that prevailed prior to October 1, 1969. Those fares, never having been challenged, may be presumed to be lawful; they therefore might properly be ordered into effect following the most summary hearing under section 1002(d).

IV

The purpose of this supplemental complaint is to request that the Board promptly institute an adjudicatory proceeding for the purpose of determining appropriate relief for the period extending from October 1, 1969, through the date on which lawful domestic passenger fares are re-established. During that period the traveling public has been required to pay excessive fares, established pursuant to a Board-determined fare formula, without regard to the standards of sections 1002(e) and 102 of the Federal Aviation Act. The issue to be determined in the proceeding which complainants request—that is, the question of what relief is appropriate to remedy an illegal and excessive Board-determined rate—is apparently one of first impression. Complainants respectfully request that the Board, in order to discharge its statutory duties to the public, undertake to consider that issue on an expedited basis.

In the course of the requested proceedings, complainants suggest that the Board should examine, *inter alia*, the following issues relevant to forms of relief:

(a) *Calculation of the sum unlawfully exacted from the public by reason of the Board's order of September 12.*

In this connection, complainants would note that the amount of the overcharge may well be equal to the 6.35 per cent fare increase accorded by the Board; there may, however, be other methods of measuring the injury to the public. This is a matter that would be determined in the course of the requested proceedings.

(b) *The proper disposition of the overcharge.*

Complainants believe the Board has the duty, in fairness to the traveling public, to determine some use for the overcharge which compensates the traveling public for the unlawful fares it was required to pay. It might be appropriate, for example, to order that the carriers establish a form of refund procedure for those persons who are able to show that they traveled by air during the period in question.*

Alternatively, the Board might order the carriers to establish an appropriate fund or reserve in the amount of the overcharge, which would then be applied against such eventual future rates as may lawfully be established. *Compare Bebchick* v. *Public Util. Comm'n*, 318 F.2d 187 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 373 U.S. 913 (1963).

It is essential under the circumstances of this case that the Board accord relief sufficient to compensate the traveling public for the Board's wrongful order of September 12. Sound administrative process requires that the wrong to the public be righted. It is only simple justice that the Board use its broad powers and expertise to fashion some equitable form of redress for the traveling public. We read the congressional purpose of the Federal Aviation Act, as reflected in the rule of ratemaking of section 1002(e) and the definition of public interest in section 102 of the statute, to require no less. *Compare J. I. Cas Co.* v. *Borak*, 377 U.S. 426 (1964); *NLRB* v. *Strong*, 393 U.S. 541 (1969). Because the domestic passenger fares that have prevailed during the period since October 1, 1969, were not determined by the Board in accordance with those sections, the Board should proceed forthwith to determine a proper form of redress.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD W. KLABZUBA,
STANFORD G. ROSS,
(For Complainants).

John E. Moss, Glenn M. Anderson, Thomas L. Ashley, Walter S. Baring, George E. Brown, Jr., Phillip Burton, Daniel E. Button, Jeffery Cohelan, James C. Corman, John D. Dingell, Don Edwards, Richard T. Hanna, Augustus F. Hawkins, Chet Holifield, Harold T. Johnson, Robert L. Leggett, Joseph M. McDade.

John McFall, Spark M. Matsunaga, George P. Miller, Joseph G. Minish, Patsy T. Mink, Jerry L. Pettis, Thomas M. Rees, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Edward R. Roybal, Bernie Sisk, Charles M. Teague, John Tunney, Lionel Van Deerlin, Jerome R. Waldie, Charles H. Wilson.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon: Air West, Inc.; Allegheny Airlines, Inc.; American Airlines, Inc.; Braniff Airways, Inc.; Continental Air Lines, Inc.; Delta Air Lines, Inc.; Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; Frontier Airlines, Inc.; Mohawk Airlines, Inc.; National Airlines, Inc.; North Central Airlines, Inc.; Northeast Airlines, Inc.; Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Ozark Air Lines, Inc.; Piedmont Aviation, Inc.; Southern Airways, Inc.; Texas International Airlines, Inc.; Trans World Airlines, Inc.; United Air Lines, Inc.; Western Air Lines, Inc., by causing a copy of it to be mailed to such carrier or its agent properly addressed with postage prepaid.

RICHARD W. KLABZUBA.

JULY 24, 1970.

* Because the issue in the requested proceedings would be the appropriate form of relief for illegal and excessive Board-determined fares, the suggested remedy would be entirely distinguishable from the reparations which are awarded by other agencies for unlawful carrier-determined fares. Complaints are prepared to develop this point at the requested proceedings.

THE COAL MINER

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, coal mining is a dangerous occupation. Coal miners, more than most Americans, are prone to disabling injuries and disease.

The sight of disabled miners is a common one throughout America's coal fields. It is a tragic sight, one that calls for some action on the part of their countrymen to alleviate the distress which comes with disability.

At the present time disabled coal miners are entitled to complete hospital and medical care from the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund for 1 year after they have left the industry. This coverage is complete for the man, his wife, and all of his dependent children under 22 years of age.

Such coverage is unique in our Nation, and extends beyond that normally granted to men who become disabled from nonwork related disability.

But, it is not enough. Hospital and medical protection should be provided for disabled coal miners for life, or until they are once again productive citizens in our society.

The UMWA welfare fund does provide for such protection if the man suffering a disability is eligible for a pension. At the present time the retirement age for a coal miner is 55 with 20 years of service in the mines.

Unfortunately, there are still some miners not covered. Equity demands that protection be given them. But the resources of the welfare fund are not adequate to the task, given the other demands upon it.

I believe that the answer to this dilemma is given in a letter from the president of the UMW, Mr. Tony Boyle. Mr. Boyle suggests that disabled miners should be paid from the Treasury of the United States with supplemental payments from the welfare fund.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this proposal is sound and merits the attention of the Congress. I have already directed my staff to begin drafting legislation which would implement the proposal made by Mr. Boyle. I hope to have such legislation ready for introduction in the next several days. Hopefully, the proposal by Mr. Boyle will receive the support of many other Members of the Congress so that it can be speedily enacted into law.

I am inserting the letter from Mr. Boyle into the RECORD for the information of the Congress, and so that this proposal may receive the wide publicity it deserves:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1970.

Hon. JAMES KEE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEE: Disabled coal miners under 65 years of age face a serious problem of medical and hospital care which must be assumed by the nation. These miners have suffered disability as the result of employment under hazardous conditions in an industry vital to the nation's health, comfort and economic welfare. They richly merit assistance from the nation in their hour of need.

The United Mine Workers of America has sought to meet the hospital and medical care needs of these disabled workers through the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund which it negotiated with the coal industry. The Fund expended more than $55 million of a total income of $163 million, for hospital and medical care for mine workers during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970 the Fund spent over $65 million out of a total income of $174 million for hospital and medical care.

Because of the ever-escalating costs of medical and hospital care, the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund has been forced to limit medical and hospital benefits to one year following disability for mine workers too young to qualify for a pension. Our union fully recognizes that this is inadequate to the needs of mine workers.

The UMW intends to win a much higher industry contribution to the Welfare and Retirement Fund in its 1971 negotiations. Even if the present forty cents per ton contribution were doubled, it would not be sufficient to provide indefinite hospital and medical benefits to disabled miners because of the need to increase pensions, survivors benefits and other benefits.

During recent weeks, mine workers who have been unemployed for more than one year because of disability have picketed and disrupted production of vitally needed coal in several mine fields. We recognize that the disabled miners' needs are urgent and very real. The UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund, however, cannot provide indefinite medical and hospital care for these disabled

miners without denying benefits to other working and retired members and survivors.

The real answer to this problem, especially in the face of soaring medical and hospital costs, is a program of hospital and medical benefits for disabled miners similar to Medicare which would become applicable one year after disability. Such a program should provide uniform benefits for continuing medical and hospital care costs resulting from disability. The UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund now provides certain supplemental benefits to retired members over 65 who are enrolled in the Medicare program and would attempt to provide similar benefits under a federal program for disabled mine workers who have exhausted benefits now paid from the Fund.

In the view of the UMW, such a program would best be supported from general taxation. We urge the immediate introduction of legislation to meet the health care needs of disabled mine workers following one year of disability. We will be more than pleased to work with your office in shaping a satisfactory legislative measure.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE,
President, United Mine Workers of America.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL EMERGENCY IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, the city of Chicago has been confronted with an energy crisis of the greatest magnitude. With the winter months fast approaching, the supply of low-sulphur-content residual fuel oil so necessary to the operation of the city, remains at an extremely precarious level. In simple terms, this shortage means that the recipients of this fuel; namely, the hospitals, the schools, the apartment buildings, as well as many industrial facilities, will be forced to face our famous Chicago winter weather without heat. This predicament is compounded by the fact that the city of Chicago, in order to conform to strict State antipollution guidelines, has recently enacted an ordinance which would require many industries to convert from their present fuel to this low-sulphur residual fuel.

The hard facts are that while the demand for residual oil in Chicago is increasing, the supply available in the United States is rapidly decreasing. At present, the national supply is more than 25 percent below last year's level. In Illinois, the supply on hand is 30 percent below last year's level. Last winter, the city of Chicago was down to a mere 5-day supply. We cannot allow this to happen again. For economic reasons, the domestic oil companies are just not producing this inexpensive residual oil. They find it more profitable to refine their crude oil into gasoline and other petroleum products.

In order to prevent a catastrophe, some 15 suppliers of residual oil to Chicago applied in June for an import license. This license, granted through the Oil Import Appeals Board of the Department of the Interior, would permit them to go anywhere in the world to locate residual oil. They are currently prohibited from doing so simply because they are residents of district 2—the Midwest. District 1—the east coast—has no such restriction. The entire United States is divided into five administrative districts plus Puerto Rico. These districts are the ones used for the regulation of petroleum during World War II.

The only distinction made within districts 1 through 4 is for residual oil which is, I repeat, effectively exempt from control only in district 1. As the result of a Presidential proclamation, allocations to importers in districts 1 through 4 are set at the level which each imported in 1957. In June, I wrote to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the President's Oil Policy Committee. Many of my colleagues in the House also did so. In my letters I urged them to use all the power of their respective offices to, first, grant the appeals in question and, second, end the discriminatory measures presently in effect against districts 2 through 4.

On July 20, the Oil Import Appeals Board granted the appeals of several of the Chicago petitioners on the grounds of "excessive hardship." This action will permit these companies to search the world market in order to obtain residual oil. They now have a "hunting license." I only hope that there is game available in the forest. As of last week, none of these companies had been able to purchase 1 gallon of foreign residual oil. The amount of oil released by the Board amounts to approximately 25 percent of what was asked for. If the full allotment had been granted and if the companies were able to obtain the foreign oil before the start of the winter season, then the crisis would have been greatly eased.

Mr. Speaker, if this allocation is not increased by the Board, I fear that the remaining amount will be insufficient to meet the needs of the city of Chicago. While I, in many ways, applaud the action taken by the Board, I cannot help but believe that this action will merely postpone the inevitable. Unless something is done to correct the inequitable situation that exists between district 1 and the rest of the Nation, Chicago's current energy crisis will become an annual one. The administration must direct itself to the crux of this problem. The midcontinent area—district 2—of our Nation must be placed on an equal basis with the east coast with reference to residual fuel oil imports.

It is interesting to note that the recent report of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control indicates that broad support already exists within the Nixon administration for applying district 1 policy uniformly across United States—see paragraphs 334 and 430b, pages 359 and 361 of the report.

Such action should be taken no later than September 1, 1970, in order to provide a permanent solution to the problem which plagues Chicago and the Middle West, and threatens the safety and comfort of their citizens in the coming winter.

I am enclosing for the RECORD, the text of my letter to the President as well as related correspondence, various charts, and newspaper articles.

JUNE 23, 1970.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Midwest and, in particular, the City of Chicago, has been placed in an untenable position wherein the demand for residual fuel oil far exceeds available supply.

This domestic situation began approximately four years ago on the East Coast when air pollution control affected the sulfur limits of fuels. The aftermath was that the oil industry turned to other markets to dispose of the bottom-of-the-barrel residual fuel oil. Most of the refiners resorted to increasing the manufacture of asphalt and petroleum coke in place of residual fuel oil. This is understandable since asphalt and petroleum coke are not directly affected by a sulfur specification and high sulfur crude oil is a desirable low cost raw material for the refiner.

In the last two years, domestic refiners have altered their manufacturing process to the extent that approximately 59,300,000 barrels (2,490,600,000 gallons) of various grades of residual fuels have been withdrawn from the Midwest and, in particular, the Chicago market, per annum.

Today, the residual consumer is competing with the refiner who uses residual fuel as a feed-stock to make additional asphalt and coke.

District 1 (East Coast) recognized that an international energy crisis was approaching and applied to the Department of the Interior to import residual oils to offset the increased consumer demand and reduced domestic residual manufacturing. The Federal Government accepted the gravity of the situation and granted unrestricted residual oil imports to the East Coast (District 1). The Midwest is in the same desperate energy crisis, unfortunately, discrimination exists in that District 2 (Midwest Chicago) cannot import residual oils.

The new refineries being built in our area have not made any provisions for residual manufacturing. Chicago has become an island with an insufficient energy supply source, not only to combat freezing weather for the domestic consumer, but to allow for industrial and economic growth. If something is not done soon to remedy this intolerable situation, it will be a very cold winter in Chicago.

Mr. President, I urge you to use all the power of your office to remove the discriminatory measures now in effect against the Midwest, and in particular Chicago, so that we can avail ourselves of the residual oil in the world markets. The Oil Import Appeals Board has the ability and power to grant this request and end this discrimination and I pray that you will be successful in assisting us with this problem.

Respectfully yours,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recently my colleague from Chicago, Congressman Dan Rostenkowski, has communicated to you the urgent need for additional sources of residual fuel oil for residents of Chicago. He asked that you use all the powers of your office to insure that the discriminatory prohibitions now in effect which prevent District 2 (Midwest/Chicago) from importing residual fuel oil produced abroad. District 1 (East Coast) now has unrestricted access to foreign produced residual fuel oil.

I support Congressman Rostenkowski's request. Under existing law, the Oil Import Appeals Board is authorized to modify existing petroleum import restrictions on the grounds of extreme hardship. No case of extreme hardship could be clearer than that which faces Chicago if the present discriminatory measures remain in effect.

In addition, I urge you again, as I and many of my colleagues have in the past, to put into effect the recommendations of your Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls. The Task Force said in its report on February 2, 1970:

"We . . . recommend that residual fuel oil from [the Western Hemisphere], to be used domestically as fuel either directly or after desulphurization, be subject only to existing tariffs and that Eastern Hemisphere origin residual oil pay an increased tariff sufficient to offset the anticipated cost of desulphurizing Latin American residual fuel oil." (Para. 430b, P. 136).

If the existing quotas on importation of foreign residual fuel oil were replaced by tariffs, as the Task Force recommended, not only would citizens in the Midwest have access to now unavailable supplies, but they would be saving money on fuel oil costs as well. The Task Force estimated that an Illinois family of four pays almost $90 per year more for petroleum products because of existing import quotas than it would without them. If the quota system continues, this cost for such families may rise to almost $150 per year by 1980. This is not the price of fuel oil itself, but an artificial add-on caused by an out-moded quota system which the Task Force recommended be scrapped.

The existing quota system, which you could eliminate, raises the cost to consumers of all petroleum products. But the present situation relating to residual fuel oil is not only a matter of increased cost—it is a matter of the health and welfare of Chicago's citizens. For economic reasons, domestic manufacturers have reduced their output of residual fuel oil. Without access to supplies abroad, residents of District 2, especially residents of Chicago, will simply not be able to buy residual fuel oil when the cold weather arrives. It will be a cold winter for Chicago citizens unless you and the Oil Import Appeals Board act now.

I join Congressman Rostenkowski in urging your attention and action on this matter.

Respectfully,

ABNER J. MIKVA,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 30, 1970.

Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROSTENKOWSKI: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter regarding the availability of an adequate supply of residual fuel oil in the Midwest, particularly in the Chicago area. You may be assured that your letter requesting an increase in the level of import quotas of residual fuel oil for District 2 will be brought to the President's early attention.

With cordial regard.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

[Department of the Interior News release, July 6, 1970]

LOW SULPHUR RESIDUAL FUEL OIL ALLOCATION LEVEL INCREASED TO MEET SUPPLY REQUIREMENTS

The Department of the Interior today announced an increase in the level of low sulphur residual fuel oil imports by 9.5 million barrels for the allocation period of April 1, 1970 to March 31, 1971.

The action was concurred in by the Oil Policy Committee.

The increase is restricted to Districts II–IV which consists generally of all states except those on the East and West Coasts.

Potential supplies of low sulphur fuel oil are not encouraging according to Bureau of Mines information, and the demand during the current allocation period cannot be accurately predicted. On this basis, a departmental decision was made to increase the level of imports into Districts II–IV.

The increase was assigned to the Oil Import Appeals Board in order for the Board to grant allocations and licenses only on the grounds of exceptional hardship caused by the mandatory oil import program.

During this period, the Department will take aggressive action to develop a program for review by the Oil Policy Committee which will offer (incentives) to domestic refiners to manufacture low sulphur residual fuel oil in the Midwest area.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROSTENKOWSKI: Because of my responsibilities as Chairman of the Oil Policy Committee, your letter of June 23, 1970, to the President regarding residual fuel oil availability in the Chicago area was sent to me.

Your letter refers to the ability of the Oil Import Appeals Board to remedy this situation. On this account, I have enclosed a copy of the July 6, 1970, Department of the Interior announcement of the increase of 9.5 million barrels in the level of low sulfur residual fuel oil which has been assigned to the OIAB for allocation in Districts II–IV.

Sincerely,

G. A. LINCOLN,
Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OIL IMPORT APPEALS BOARD,
Washington, D.C.

In the matter of Petro Products, Inc., Docket No. S–17 (resid); Thomas P. Reidy, Docket No. S–32 (resid); Torco Oil Co., Docket No. S–34 (resid); Apex Oil Co., Docket No. S–42 (resid); Joseph F. Reidy & Sons, Inc., Docket No. S–58 (resid); Bell Oil Co., Docket No. S–66 (resid); Osceola Refining Co., Docket No. S–71 (resid); Marine Fueling, Inc., Docket No. S–74 (resid); Phoenix Oil Corporation, Docket No. S–75 (resid); Industrial Fuel and Asphalt Corp., Docket No. S–76 (resid); Oils, Incorporated, Docket No. S–78 (resid); Ashland Oil, Inc., Docket No. S–86 (resid); W. O. Schock Co., Docket No. S–97 (resid); Central Petroleum Company, Docket No. S–104 (resid); Southern Missouri Oil Company, Docket No. S–112 (resid); Koch Industries, Inc., Docket No. S–119 (resid), Petitioners.

CONSOLIDATED DECISION

These petitioners have each requested an allocation to import No. 6 fuel oil into Districts II–IV during the April 1, 1970 to March 31, 1971 allocation period. None is now eligible for such a product allocation issued by the Oil Import Administration by reason that none was an importer of finished product in the year 1957. Their petitions to the Board are based on claims of exceptional hardship.

Although these petitioners differ in size, type of operation, degree of integration and geographic location, all are marketers of residual fuel oil in District II. All petitioners cite the shortage of residual fuel as their customer's hardship as well as their own.

Hearings were held on petitions, when requested, and this consolidated decision is based upon full record before the Board.

Against this background the Board finds the following as significant:

1. Residual fuel oil demand in areas served by the pettitioners has increased significantly due to curtailment of natural gas sales to industrial, commercial and governmental purchasers of gas. This applies to new as well as historic users.

2. New regulations to curb air pollution in many parts of the area served by these petitioners have necessitated the use of low sulfur fuels in facilities that had formerly used high sulfur coal. To meet fuel needs in the immediate future, oil must be imported because there is a general shortage of suitable domestic fuels, such as coal, natural gas, and residual fuel oils.

3. Neither the consumers, nor the suppliers of domestic fuels anticipated shortages of suitable fuels as evidenced by depressed market conditions during the immediately preceding several years. In turn, the depressed market conditions contributed to the severe shortages by further reducing incentive to produce these fuels.

4. The relaxation of East Coast residual fuel oil import control, announced in mid-1967, resulted in Gulf Coast residual prices being decreased to be competitive with foreign supplies. The economics then dictated that refiners develop more profitable markets for this material. This was accomplished by building refinery units such cokers, deasphalting units and hydrocrackers, that would utilize residual fractions as inputs. Construction of most of these new facilities was completed in 1969 and early 1970 coinciding in time with the sudden demand outlined above.

The Board concludes that the foregoing combination has created shortage of residual fuel oils of the desired quality in District II and has considered the requests of each petitioner to reach determination as to whether or not an exceptional hardship is suffered attributable to the limiting factors of the Mandatory Import Program. The Board has considered the physical capacity of the petitioner, its experience, and its record of sales.

The Board concluded that the following awards to import residual fuel oil into Districts II–IV were proper for the allocation period April 1, 1970 to March 31, 1971:

[Docket and petitioner]

	Allocations (barrels)
S–17, Petro Products, Inc	0
S–32, Thomas P. Reidy	0
S–34, Torco Oil Co	870,000
S–42, Apex Oil Co	1,320,000
S–58, Joseph F. Reidy & Sons, Inc.	0
S–66, Bell Oil Co	0
S–71, Osceola Refining Co	350,000
S–74, Marine Fueling, Inc	500,000
S–75, Phoenix Oil Corporation	0
S–76, Industrial Fuel and Asphalt Corp.	0
S–78, Oils, Incorporated	480,000
S–86, Ashland Oil, Inc	3,000,000
S–97, W. O. Schock Co	0
S–104, Central Petroleum Company	0
S–112, Southern Missouri Oil Company	0
S–119, Koch Industries, Inc	720,000

STANLEY NEHMER,
Member.

———— ————,
Member.

LEWIS S. FLAGG, III,
Chairman.

TOTAL REQUESTED ALLOCATION FOR RESIDUAL FUEL OIL BEFORE THE OIL IMPORT APPEALS BOARD, 1970 COMPANIES WHICH COULD MARKET OR USE SUCH ALLOCATION IN THE CHICAGO AREA

Petition No.	Company	Request (in barrels)	Allocation
S-15	Commonwealth Edition	6,000,000	4,500,000
S-34	Torco Oil Co	1,500,000	870,000
S-42	Apex Oil Co	3,000,000	[1] 1,320,000
S-66	Bell Oil (R. W. Troch)	1,300,000	0
S-74	Marine Fueling	2,500,000	[1] 500,000
S-75	Phoenix Oil Corp	600,000	0
S-78	Oils Inc	2,000,000	480,000
S-86	Ashland Oil	4,700,000	[1] 3,000,000
S-119	Koch Industries	1,900,000	720,000
	Total	23,500,000	11,390,000

[1] The major portion of this allocation is not likely to be used in the Chicago area.

DEMAND FOR RESIDUAL OIL,[1] CHICAGO AREA

[In millions of barrels]

	Total [2]	Heating only
1966	21.2	11.5
1967	23.4	14.0
1968	24.1	13.8
1969 (estimated)	25.0	14.5
1970-71 (July 1-June 30) (minimum projections)	26.0	15.0
Available under firm contract (estimated)	16.0	9.0
Present supply gap, Chicago area	10.0	6.0

[1] No. 5 and No. 6 fuel oil.
[2] Includes heating, industrial, railroad, utility use.

Source: Mineral Industry Surveys, Department of the Interior.

OILS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 5, 1970.

Hon. DANIEL ROSTENKOWSKI,
Congressman, Chicago, Ill.
Attention: Mr. W. Nega,

DEAR SIR: This is to confirm that we and a group of interested citizens will meet in your office, Room 1724 of the Federal Building in Chicago, at 9:00 A.M. on June 12, 1970.

The purpose of this meeting, as you know, is to protest the oil import restrictions and to enlist your aid, in whatever manner you may believe appropriate, to make our various governmental departments aware of the total energy crisis we will be confronted with in Chicago during the 1970–1971 heating season. Further, to impress upon the Oil Import Appeals Board the need to give Chicago the same opportunity as the East Coast to import residual oil.

There is and will continue to be for some time, a total lack of energy for heating and processing. This shortage applies to all forms of energy and with local pollution laws regarding sulfur content compounding the fuel situation, we see an impending disaster for Chicago.

We have made several overtures to make people aware of the critical nature of energy supplies and are not encouraged with their response. We assure you that unless some action is taken by various governmental agencies, our city and its citizens will experience a very serious heating emergency during the oncoming winter.

We believe that Chicago cannot properly face the winter of 1970–1971 unless permission is granted to import residual fuel oil and, a reconsideration of the recently enacted Air Pollution Codes for Chicago and Cook County, as it relates to Sulfur Content.

We will appreciate the opportunity to review this matter with you and obtain your comments and counsel.

Very truly yours,

BYRON S. WEIL,
President.

TORCO OIL CO.,
Chicago, Ill., April 6, 1970.

Congressman DANIEL ROSTENKOWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROSTENKOWSKI: We at Torco Oil Company of Chicago, ask for your assistance for an urgent and serious matter!

Thursday, April 16, 1970 at 10:00 a.m. we are to appear before the Oil Import Appeals Board to request that we be granted an allocation to import No. 6 fuel oil. We understand that you as a Congressman, in such matter, regularly express support for your constituents, when you believe the cause to be a good one.

We now find ourselves in a "squeeze". The City Council of Chicago adapted amendments to the Air Pollution Control Ordinance. When they become law and go into effect on July 5, 1970, the first amendment limits sulphur content of coal and oil to 2.5% by weight. The State of Illinois is contemplating a law which would limit sulphur content by weight to 1.5%. With many coal burning plants converting to residual fuel oil because of these controls, the demand for residual fuel oil has greatly increased coupled with the major oil companies no longer making residual fuel oil domestically in the amounts to satisfy demands.

Approximately 90% of our business is done in the Chicagoland area. There is a severe likelihood, if not a certainty, that it if we are unable to supply our customers, we will lose them forever. Being the largest independent supplier of residual fuel oil in the Chicagoland area, approximately forty jobber companies we supply, plus City, State and Federal Institutions, such as the Chicago Housing Authority for the past two years, and City, State and County Facilities through jobber customers.

It is ironic that the entire East Coast is able to import residual fuel oil without restriction. Why should this be so, while the Midwest cannot get any in the period of severe shortage?

We would be deeply grateful to you, for any assistance you can give.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. TORTORIELLO,
President.

CARSON PETROLEUM CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 9, 1970.

Hon. DANIEL ROSTENKOWSKI,
Congressman,
Chicago, Ill.
Attention: Mr. W. Nega.

DEAR SIR: This company is seriously concerned with the impending energy crisis confronting our industry for the winter season 1970–1971, as outlined to you in a letter from Mr. Byron S. Weil, president of Oils, Incorporated dated June 15th, 1970.

We the Carson Petroleum Company have contracts with the United States Government to supply the following grades of fuel oils and the quantities shown for the shipping period May 1, 1970 thru April 30th, 1971:

[In gallons]

No. 2 fuel oil	480,700
No. 5 fuel oil	2,000,400
No. 6 fuel oil	4,681,300
Total quantities on contract	7,162,400

The government contract number to cover these quantities is DSA–600–70–D–1084. The greater portion of the gallonage is to be delivered to various destinations within the Metropolitan Chicago area and must have a maximum sulphur content of 1%.

We firmly believe that the requirements of the United States Government are just as important as the requirements of utilities and steel companies and warrant even prior consideration in the importation of residual oils. Lack of supply of import residual oils might seriously handicap our shipping performance against schedules from the government during the season 1970–1971.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES W. EPHGRAVE,
President.

CEMENT TRANSIT CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 16, 1970.

Hon. DANIEL ROSTENKOWSKI,
Congressman,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Last Friday, June 12, 1970, I was pleased to attend the meeting at the Federal Building with yourself and people in the Chicago area interested in the critical energy shortage that exists today. We, along with many other consumers of Number 6 fuel oil, are indeed alarmed at both the supply and the cost of this product.

Having a Great Lakes steamship that is run on residual fuel, we have the knowledge that this shortage is severe in at least the entire Great Lakes area and something must be done to allow the importation of this product into this zone. I certainly would think you will be able to gain support from other Congressmen and Senators in this area to help our cause.

I was certainly honored to meet you last Friday and I am confident you will be able to help the situation in Chicago and by doing this, help the entire Middle West portion of our country.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. SECRIST,
Marine Manager.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 5, 1970]

NEW RUCKUS ON FOREIGN-OIL IMPORTS TO PIN NIXON BETWEEN POLLUTION ISSUE, COAL GROUPS

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—Last Month, President Nixon sidestepped a possible collision with the oil industry over a Cabinet task force proposal to replace existing oil-import quotas with a system of tariffs. He adroitly delayed final action, possibly until after Election Day.

A new foreign-oil ruckus is heading Mr. Nixon's way, this time involving the coal industry, and it's doubtful the President will be as lucky in finding a safe neutral corner.

The conflict—currently working its way toward the White House through the Oil Import Appeals Board deep in the Interior Department—grows out of a request by Commonwealth Edison Co. to import foreign residual oil to fuel its Ridgeland generating station just outside Chicago's city limits. When Mr. Nixon approaches this question, however, he'll find his Administration uncomfortably pinned between two larger and politically more troublesome issues.

AIR POLLUTION RHETORIC

On one side is the credibility of Nixon Administration rhetoric about wanting to clean up the environment. Commonwealth, to meet a 1970 commitment to help improve the quality of the air Chicagoans breathe, wants to substitute low-sulphur-content imported oil or the high-sulphur-content domestic coal currently being burned at Ridgeland. Thus a rejection of the utility's import application could be interpreted as meaning the Nixon Administration really doesn't care much about clean air. Deferring final action—as was done on the task force proposal—could lead to much the same interpretation and hurt Republicans in the fall election.

On the other side are the coal industry and the fact that existing oil-import regulations dating back to 1959 have permitted only a relative trickle of foreign residual oil (the molasses-like end-product of some refinery

process) into the important 15-state mid-continent region known as District II, which includes Chicago.

Coal representives argue that once this barrier is breached, many other District II coal burners with air-pollution problems will flock to Washington to obtain foreign oil rights for their plants—the substantially higher cost of oil notwithstanding. This would mean a serious setback for coal demand in the 15 states, which currently accounts for more than half of total yearly U.S. coal use. As a result, the coal argument runs, promising techniques for removing most of the sulphur from stack emissions of coal-fired plants will languish for lack of interest and investors will be leery of risking their money in development of new coal mines.

COAL-INDUSTRY OPPOSITION

A number of Capitol Hill heavyweights from the coal states whose views can't easily be ignored by the White House, already have been mobilized behind these arguments by the National Coal Policy Conference and the National Coal Association, two major industry lobby groups. Together with the United Mine Workers union, they represent the chief formal opposition to the Commonwealth Edison application.

Rep. Edmondson (D. Okla.) chairman of the House Mines and Mining Subcommittee, for example wrote the Oil Import Appeals Board that "the precedent-shattering nature of Commonwealth's application if approved, will have seriously harmful effects upon our country's economic posture and national security. Apparently Commonwealth has not concerned itself with the far-reaching effects approval of their application would have on similarly situated industries. . . . It is difficult for me to see how the many, many additional applications which would inevitably follow could be treated differently."

For the oil import board, at least, such appeals don't seem to have had much effect. The panel's chairman, Lewis Flagg III, an Interior Department employe, hasn't released the Commonwealth ruling. The board's other two members, Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Assistant Commerce Secretary for Resources, and Paul H. Riley, Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary for Supply, who constitute the necessary majority, have signed a finding that the utility is faced with "exceptional hardship" and should get 4.5 million barrels of imported residual oil in the 12 months starting April 1.

OPINION DISMISSES OBJECTIONS

The majority opinion dismisses coal-industry objections and seems to open the door wide to other foreign-oil applicants. The opinion states that the "basic issue . . . is not one of coal versus oil since the petitioner has made a decision to discontinue burning coal as a basic fuel at the Ridgeland station under any circumstances." The opinion notes that Commonwealth did get a belated offer of domestic residual oil from Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), but this fuel would contain 70% more sulphur than the foreign oil and cost a third more.

A formal appeals board decision, however, will represent only a first step through the oil import labyrinth for Commonwealth. Next, it's up to Interior Secretary Hickel to lift the ceiling on residual oil imports into District II, currently set at a mere 219,000 barrels yearly. Presumably such action first would have to clear the President's new interagency committee on oil import policy and perhaps the White House itself. Routine issuance of an import license by the Oil Import Administration would follow.

Interior Department officials doubt, though, that this emergency relief procedure, provided under the original Eisenhower oil-import proclamation, is the proper way to handle the backlog of additional residual-oil applications building up rapidly in the appeals board office. So far, District II import license requests totaling more than 25 million barrels (equivalent to about six million tons of coal) are on file.

EXTENT OF DEMAND UNCLEAR

Just the other day, for example, Detroit Edison Co. asked for 3.5 million barrels in the 12 months beginning April 1 to provide back-up fuel for its Delray station. The plant normally burns pollution-free natural gas, but increasingly tight supplies of that energy source have increased the periods when its gas is diverted to home use. More critical, the utility says, is the fact that domestic refiners from which it formerly purchased residual oil aren't any longer offering to supply it.

There are strong indications, moreover, that the full extent of demand for foreign residual oil in the 15-state region has only begun to reveal itself. One District II case presently before the Oil Import Appeals Board involves a group of 12 oil-terminal operating companies, which hasn't specified how much residual oil its members would like to bring in. Elmer L. Hoehn, a member of the law firm representing the terminal operators (and formerly oil import administrator in the Johnson Administration) says his clients are still canvassing their customers' needs. Preliminary findings suggest that dozens of new local air ordinances will require "tens of millions" of barrels of foreign residual oil to satisfy them, Mr. Hoehn comments.

For the long term, it's obvious that the Administration must at least consider a broad policy change designed to make heavy industrial fuel oil as easy to obtain in District II and other districts as it is currently in the 16 eastern seaboard states comprising District I.

In prior years, when the environment wasn't a major issue, residual oil use hinged largely on its transportation costs. Because it had easy tanker access to Venezuelan refineries, therefore, District I started out under the import program with an "historic" right to import vastly more fuel oil than all the other districts combined. In 1966, controls on foreign residual oil into District I were loosened to the point that, in effect, importers could bring in all they were able to sell.

The recent report of the Cabinet task force on oil-import control indicates broad support already exists within the Administration for opening the entire country to foreign fuel oil. The panel majority, representing five of its seven members, questioned the rationale of allowing imported heavy oil access to one region but not others. It said this inequity would be ended in the overall change to a tariff system. The minority members, Commerce Secretary Stans and Interior Secretary Hickel, also suggested that "consideration should be given to applying (District I) policy uniformly across the U.S.," even though the two dissenters would retain other features of the present quota system.

Most Venezuelan and U.S. crude oils actually leave the ground with sulphur levels close to those in coal, and the troublesome mineral eventually ends up in the residual product. However, there are well-established commercial processes for desulphurizing oil—an advantage coal still lacks. A number of companies currently are working on ways to remove sulphur dioxide, the gas produced when high-sulphur-content coal is burned, but many experts in the field believe it will be at least several years before all of the wrinkles are out of these techniques.

[From the Energy Division of the New York Chase Manhattan Bank, Apr. 30, 1970]

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION IN MARCH 1970

DEMAND

The slowdown in the growth of the economy, which has received widespread attention in recent weeks, is certainly not reflected in the demand for petroleum products. The over-all demand gain in March was 6.9 percent above the year-earlier level. For the first quarter of 1970, the gain amounted to 5.2 percent, 800,000 barrels a day.

This rate of growth is higher than most oilmen have been forecasting for the year as a whole. The additional strength can be traced to substantially higher demand for residual fuel which was nearly 10 percent in March, and over 9 percent in the first quarter. Part of this growth undoubtedly reflects the colder than normal weather during the first quarter of 1970. The effect is twofold. Existing customers, of course, use more oil in colder weather. In addition, consumers who normally buy natural gas on an interruptible basis, found their supplies severely limited this winter, due to the shortage of gas. In consequence, they turned to fuel oil to a greater extent than they have ever done in the past. Of perhaps more importance than the weather is the effect of air pollution control regulations. This subject is discussed in more detail later in this report. Suffice it to say here that one outcome of these regulations has been to cause some consumers of coal to switch to residual fuel.

After a slow start early in the year, gasoline demand came back strongly in March and posted a 10 percent gain. This was enough to bring about a 5.3 percent increase above the year-earlier level for the first quarter as a whole. The second most important transportation fuel, jet grade kerosene, also performed strongly, registering an 11 percent gain both in March and for the first quarter of 1970. The residential and commercial uses of kerosene failed to equal the year-earlier level during the first quarter. Distillate fuel oil demand grew moderately, at about the rate anticipated for the year as a whole.

SUPPLY

New supply declined in March by 167,000 barrels a day below the February level, as a result of lower imports. Domestic production was continued at the same rate as in February. All classes of imports were lower in March than in February with the largest drop recorded by residual fuel oil.

Production of crude oil in the United States during the first quarter of 1970 was over 600,000 barrels a day above the year-ago level. More than half of this increase—380,000 barrels daily—occurred in Texas. It is important to note, however, that a much greater boost in the allowable production factor was needed to achieve this increase in production than was the case in earlier years. For example, the biggest first quarter increase in Texas production since the end of World War II occurred in 1951. In that quarter, production was raised by 686,000 barrels a day and required an 18 percent increase in the allowable production factor. In 1959, a 3 percent rise in the production allowable brought forth an extra 259,000 barrels a day. In the first quarter of 1970, on the other hand, the production allowable factor was 68 percent—24 percent above the year-earlier level. These numbers suggest that a further boost in production of the same magnitude as occurred this year would lift the allowable factor right up to the 100 percent level. And such an increase may only be one year away.

INVENTORIES

At the end of March, the over-all level of stocks amounted to 907 million barrels. The 15 million barrel drawdown of defined products in storage was partly offset by a 5 million barrel increase in crude oil stocks.

Gasoline stocks, although 12 million barrels higher than a year ago, represented fewer days' supply than in March, 1969. Kerosine and distillate stocks were also higher than a year ago, with the excess located in the East and West Coast regions. Residual fuel oil stocks were lower it all parts of the country, but most of the difference, relative to a year ago, was on the West Coast.

PRICE

The last few days of March saw the beginning of a general price increase for gasoline. As usual, this event received widespread unfavorable comment in the press. To see this move in perspective, it should be noted that during the first quarter of 1970 the average of retail gasoline prices in 52 cities around the nation was below the year-ago level. At the wholesale level, gasoline prices at the end of March were equal to, or below, year-earlier levels in the West Coast, Interior and Gulf Coast markets. Only in the east were they slightly higher.

Kerosine and distillate fuel prices declined moderately in the Gulf Coast market during March, and distillate was also priced lower in the Mid-Continent region. This is a normal seasonal movement, reflecting the end of the peak period of demand for heating oils.

In a contra-seasonal change, however, prices for residual fuel oil rose by 5 cents a barrel in the east, and by 25 cents a barrel on the West Coast. Stimulated by strong demand, particularly for low sulphur fuel, prices for residual fuel are firmer now than they have been for many years. (G. J. Shuttlesworth.)

POLLUTION CONTROL AND FUEL SUPPLY

Since this nation changed from an agricultural economy to the greatest industrial power in the world, the use of fuels to serve the various energy markets has grown enormously. Indeed, it is the intensive use of energy that has permitted the attainment of such an advanced level of industrial achievement. In the race for productivity, however, we have paid insufficient attention to the protection of our environment.

In consequence, the price that we are paying for our high standard of living, with its correspondingly high use of energy, is an increasingly unacceptable amount of pollution of our air and water resources. All segments of society are agreed that this situation must be corrected. The disagreements arise over the means to achieve this end. The purpose of this article is to consider in terms of the effect on our future supplies of energy what has been done in the fight against air pollution thus far, and what has been proposed.

There are two main forms of air pollution. The first is the emission of particulate matter, which can be readily observed by everyone, and which is probably the less harmful of the two, besides being the more easily controlled. The second, and more insidious form, is the contamination of the atmosphere by various chemical compounds. In the area of industrial air pollution, the main emphasis to date has been on the elimination of sulphurous compounds, principally sulphur dioxide. A more serious source of air pollution, representing half of the measured amounts, is the noxious compounds emitted by the exhaust systems of our various modes of transportation.

The elimination of these two forms of air pollution can be approached from two separate angles. In some cases the problem can be solved by the removal of the pollutants from the fuels before they are burned. Alternatively, the devices in which the fuels are burned can be modified to prevent the pollutants from being discharged into the atmosphere. Either method must inevitably lead to higher costs, since it must be presumed that in the absence of pollution control techniques industry was operating at the lowest level of costs attainable.

In view of the competitive nature of our society, it is not reasonable to expect industry to adopt air pollution control techniques voluntarily. To be sure, some firms will always take the lead in this kind of activity, but in so doing, they are immediately put at a disadvantage in terms of costs compared with those of their competitors who sit back and do nothing. Government, as the representative of the people, has a role to play.

There are those who believe that government should control the composition of our various fuels and the uses to which they may be put, but this approach has the disadvantage of introducing unnecessary rigidity into the efforts to fight air pollution. This is a new field of endeavor, and it would appear preferable to give free rein to this nation's great innovative ability. Let all possible solutions be examined with government acting as coordinator. In order to put the spur to industry's efforts, government should set goals and establish an appropriate timetable, but in this regard great care should be exercised to ensure that the timetable allows adequate time for the best solutions to be found rather than plunging the nation into a series of very costly crash programs.

The first air pollution control regulations imposed in this country have been directed toward the elimination of the 37 million tons a year of sulphur dioxide that is released to the atmosphere. And, in this instance, government has chosen to limit the sulphur content of the fuel before it is burned, rather than tackling the problem of eliminating the sulphurous gases produced by combustion.

These regulations have had a serious effect on the domestic coal industry. Although this nation has tremendous reserves of coal, these reserves vary considerably in quality, in location, and in sulphur content. Each grade has developed its own particular niche in the over-all market, and substitution of one grade for another is, in general, neither practical nor economic. Moreover, it is not feasible to improve the quality by removing sulphur from the coal before it is burned. Substantial reserves of low-sulphur coal exist, but current production from these reserves is largely committed to the steel industry and to export markets where it commands a premium price. There is very little available for use by coal's largest customer—the electric utility market.

In this fast growing market coal's share declined from 54 percent in 1967 to 51 percent in 1969, as many electric power plants, particularly in the east, turned from coal to other fuels. The most desirable fuel, from the point of view of air pollution, is natural gas, but supplies of this product are not plentiful enough to permit an expansion of its use by the electric utility industry. Moreover, in those areas where coal is widely used, gas is a very expensive alternative. Electric utility management has therefore turned to residual fuel oil to fill the void.

Residual fuel oil has traditionally been a high sulphur product, but, unlike coal, it can be further processed to remove most of the surphur. This is an expensive undertaking and the resultant product must inevitably be priced considerably above the level of high sulphur fuel oil. Low sulphur fuel oils can also be produced, of course, from crude oils which themselves have a very low sulphur content, but crude oils of this quality are not available in the western hemisphere. It would be imprudent, to say the least, to depend too heavily on low sulphur fuel oils from unreliable sources for a market as vital to our economic well-being as the production of electricity.

Because, in the past, ample supplies of underpriced natural gas were made available to industry, the market for domestically produced residual fuel oil dwindled. Domestic refiners could not profitably produce this product and sell it in competition with natural gas. In consequence, imports played an increasingly important part in the supply of residual fuel, and now account for two-thirds of the total supply across the nation. Since these imports are, in fact, concentrated in the east coast region of the United States, they account for almost 90 percent of the supply in that part of the country. Recently, there was evidence of an increased demand for residual fuel oil in the mid-western section of the country, where several companies have applied for licenses to import low sulphur oil, due to lack of alternative fuels which met air pollution control regulations.

Economics still do not favor a return to domestic residual fuel oil, so, to the extent that low sulphur fuel oil is the only available product capable of meeting air pollution control regulations, we must accept the fact that this segment of our energy needs will have to come increasingly either from foreign refineries or from plants located in the United States, but which are permitted to utilize a foreign feedstock. Even with the full use of foreign capacity, supply relative to demand is likely to remain tight, and there will be few bargain prices around for this product.

The question of ways and means to eliminate vehicles as a source of air pollution is still under discussion in government. Proposals have been made that gasoline be replaced, as our chief transportation fuel, by cleaner burning products such as propane or natural gas. While these products might be acceptable from a technical standpoint, limitations of supply make them impractical alternatives to gasoline. This nation's current gasoline consumption amounts to almost 12 trillion cubic feet a year in terms of natural gas. At a time when there is great doubt that present gas markets can be significantly expanded, it would appear out of the question to add a new market that is already more than half as large as the total natural gas market in this country, and which, if added to the existing market, would increase demand by more than 50 percent.

Most of our propane supply is extracted from natural gas, and currently amounts to three-quarters of a million barrels a day. There is not the slightest possibility that this source of propane could ever yield sufficient material to enable it to replace gasoline as our principal transportation fuel. In the battle against air pollution by vehicles the internal combustion engine may undergo considerable modification, or it may be scrapped altogether. But one thing is virtually certain and that is that petroleum products will continue to power the automobile for the foreseeable future. For over half a century, the refining industry has been geared to produce gasoline as its most important product. This situation cannot be changed overnight. Indeed, up to the present no practical alternative to gasoline has even been proposed. And if one were agreed upon in the near future, it would take well over a decade before such a product could be made available in sufficient quantity to satisfy the market. Enormous amounts of money would need to be invested to bring about such a change, and this investment would have to be recovered from the motorist in the form of higher prices.

Cleaner air is a most worthwhile goal and one that we cannot abandon, but in working toward that goal we must not lose sight of the cost, both in monetary terms and in terms of security of supply. (John D. Emerson.)

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 2, 1970]

POWER CRISIS: A SHORTAGE OF ENERGY THREATENS INDUSTRIES AND HOMES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES—DEMAND ALREADY TOPS SUPPLY IN SOME AREAS—ELECTRICITY, GAS, COAL, OIL ALL TIGHT—FOR SOME: LONG, HOT SUMMER

(By Thomas Lindley Ehrich)

This country—an insatiable, power-consuming culture of electric toothbrushes, power lawn mowers, gas-fired barbecues and air-conditioned homes with electric garage

doors—is suddenly faced with a broad energy shortage.

For the first time in history, the nation's energy supply is failing to keep ahead of the ever-growing demand. America's factories and consumers are increasing use of electricity, natural gas, coal and other fuels faster than the suppliers of energy can boost the output. Some analysts see the problem as temporary, but others view it as a historical turning point in which the energy resources that always have been taken for granted become a limiting factor in national growth.

The impact of this "energy gap" is spreading through industry and is beginning to touch consumers. Its scope and seriousness are emerging in scores of scattered but related symptoms:

—Fuel and power shortages are interrupting factory operations, increasing manufacturers' costs and hurting their profits. The shortages also are influencing corporate plant-location decisions and crimping industrial-expansion hopes of some areas.

—Consumers and homeowners are being threatened with less-reliable utility service, including the prospect of summer power failures. While rates rise and service grows chancier, some are beginning to wonder whatever happened to Reddy Kilowatt, that nearly vanished symbol of cheap, dependable, instant electricity.

—Utilities are cutting back on promotions they traditionally have used to increase their business. New York and Philadelphia power companies, for instance, have stopped promoting air-conditioner sales. Meantime, utility executives are scrambling to boost capacity and are hoping for breaks with the weather.

"CRISIS AMID ABUNDANCE"

The problem worries Washington officials. "What we have is a crisis amid abundance," declares S. David Freeman, director of the energy-policy staff of the White House Office of Science and Technology.

As the Federal Government's top planner in the energy field, Mr. Freeman lately has been raising provocative questions: Though doubling of power use every decade always has been a sign of progress, isn't it now a "mixed blessing"? Aren't utility salesmen "doing a better job than the producers"? Should utility rate structures, which have always favored the big customers (the more you use, the lower the rate) be changed to "flat or even regressive," which would penalize bigger volume users?

Some experts speculate that the energy gap, if it persists, will have major, long-range consequences. "Lack of energy is going to start inhibiting our economic growth and perhaps our standard of living," says E. F. Andrews, purchasing vice president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc., a steelmaker.

"You may have some industries that will be operating seven or eight months a year" due to energy shortages, speculates Robert M. Fletcher, Armco Steel Corp.'s director of raw materials purchasing.

THE GOOD LIFE

Presidential adviser Freeman suggests that the affluent society might have to curb its appetite for more goods that consume energy. "Electricity has helped bring the good life to many Americans," and it isn't possible to stop its growth, but "the rate of growth . . . is subject to discussion and action," he remarked in a recent speech.

The energy gap stems from what Mr. Freeman calls a "runaway market" for energy at a time when suppliers have been hit with a multiplicity of troubles ranging from construction delays and labor strife to bad weather and antipollution crusades that stall projects.

One big problem is that energy suppliers simply underestimated growth in demand. For many years, energy use had been growing at about 3% a year, but starting in 1965 demand growth jumped to 5% annually. Especially startling were the 9% annual spurts in electric-power use in 1968 and 1969.

The pinch affects all major sources of energy and has become an interlocking problem. Thus, attempts to switch from one energy source to another seldom help.

A lag in natural gas exploration, which producers blame on prices set "unrealistically" low by Government regulators, is tightening supplies. For the past two years, consumption of gas has outrun new discoveries, which puts a drain on the nation's gas reserves. Some major pipelines are strained to capacity. Last winter's extreme cold severely depleted supplies at some storage areas.

Coal shortages stemming from recurring labor trouble at the mines, a crackdown on mine safety that has closed some mines and a lag in new mine openings, have grown severe. Mining concerns are unable to boost production quickly, and users' stockpiles have greatly dwindled.

AN ILLUSTRATION

Antipollution pressures are affecting demand as well as supply. "Companies we've been trying to sell gas to for years without much success are now knocking at our door wanting gas to substitute primarily for coal," which pollutes the air more, says Robert E. Seymour, executive vice president of Consolidated Natural Gas Co. The company, like other gas distributors, can't fill all the orders. Similar requests are inflating demand for low-sulphur fuel oil, which also has become hard to get.

The severe disruptions that this situation can cause a big energy user can be seen in the case of PPG Industries, Inc., the Pittsburgh-based maker of paint, chemicals and glass.

This winter, PPG's glass division had gas service reduced at various plants on two dozen occasions; utilities had curtailed service to industrial customers to keep pumping fuel to homeowners on extremely cold days. In some cases, the PPG plants had to close and send workers home, and in others the plants hastily switched to fuel oil or liquid propane to keep operating—but that caused product-quality problems such as flaws in the glass, company officials say.

The cold-weather woes are behind it, but PPG is now is faced with hot-weather problems. John White, a vice president of the PPG glass division, says one major utility that supplies electric power to the plants recently called to ask what operations the company could close down in the event of power shortages this summer. So now the division, which has disaster plans for storms, fire and war, has had to draw up one for "a call from the electric company," says Mr. White.

That's not all. PPG is expanding its three fiber glass division plants, but it can't get gas to run the expanded plants. Facing the prospect of letting big new facilities sit idle, the company is considering the possibility of installing costly equipment, to use liquid propane or fuel oil—but both would be more expensive than gas and the changeover could delay the start-up of the facilities, officials say.

To top it off, PPG's fiber glass plants in Shelby and Lexington, N.C. just got a letter from Duke Power Co. saying their rates will be rising 18% because the utility, to fight pollution, is buying more-expensive low-sulphur coal to power steam generators.

A DRAIN ON EARNINGS

As the PPG case illustrates, the energy shortages can hit companies in many ways. It all adds up to another drain on profits. In reporting first quarter earnings this year, several companies blamed declines partly on higher fuel costs and on plant shutdowns due to gas shortages. U.S. Steel Corp., Koppers Co. and Republic Steel Corp. were among these companies.

Lukens Steel Co. blamed part of its 40% drop in first quarter earnings on operating troubles caused by fuel shortages. Out of 84 operating days in the first quarter, Lukens' gas supply was cut by as much as 45% on 26 days, forcing cutbacks in operations. "We certainly feel very strongly that there's a general energy shortage," says W. E. Mullestein, Lukens' president.

The gas shortage was one reason Armco Steel recently decided to build a steel plant in Texas—where gas from nearby fields is plentiful—rather than in the Midwest, where supplies are tight.

A number of gas suppliers have told industrial customers they're clamping a lid on new business. Usually, that means any customer can expect to receive only as much gas this year as he received in 1969. Some utilities are actually cutting back. Pittsburgh's Peoples Natural Gas Co., a unit of Consolidated Natural Gas, is holding industrial gas deliveries this year to 10% below last year's level.

The gas gap could hurt some communities' efforts to build up local industry, utility executives concede. UGI Corp., a Philadelphia-based gas distributor serving eastern Pennsylvania, figures that its need to exercise "selectivity" in taking on new business "will discourage industries from moving into the area," comments W. C. McElroy, vice president for operations.

While shortages of gas, fuel oil and coal are primarily affecting industry, consumers will feel the effects of the electric power pinch.

The strain on electric capacity could become severe this summer. "If we have a hot summer, people will really be astounded at the amount of outages that will occur," predicts Robert M. Taylor partner of R. W. Beck & Associates, a consulting firm for utilities. "Utilities are hoping for a cold summer."

In many places, utilities' reserve generating capacity is precariously low. "Generally speaking, electric utilities are all sort of treading on the edge of a precipice," claims one industry analyst.

The Federal Office of Emergency Preparedness, which normally worries about such things as nuclear holocaust and natural disasters, now is worrying about power failures. A recent OEP study identified numerous areas of the country where reserve electric capacity is dangerously slim. These areas include New York City, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis-St. Paul, the Pennsylvania-Maryland-New Jersey area and all of the Southeast except Florida.

(Some utilities say their reserve position is stronger than the OEP figures indicate, but the utilities generally are counting new or unproved generating capacity that the OEP contends can't be relied upon.)

Some customers in these areas can't be sure their air-conditioners will keep humming through summer's heat waves. If power demands begins to strain capacity of New York's Consolidated Edison, for example, Con Ed plans to ask customers to turn off air-conditioners when nobody's home, to keep lights off during the day and even to stop opening and closing the freezer door so often—all to curb the power drain.

LOAD SHEDDING

Other strain-easing steps at Con Edison will include reducing voltage, which could cause light bulbs and motors to function inefficiently, and asking large industries to cut back their power use.

If such steps fail, the utility will turn to what industry men call "load shedding"—which simply means your power gets cut off

temporarily if you're in the area that's "shed." According to a plan adopted by the Public Service Commission of New York State, the blacking out would be done at substations, indicating large areas would be affected. Asked to give an example, Joseph Swidler, PSC chairman, replies: "Well, for instance, we might black out Westchester County"—a suburban area of about 900,000 residents.

Analysts say the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland power area is in worse shape than New York. Elaborate power pools designed to enable, say, Con Ed to buy excess electricity from as far west as Illinois will provide some relief this summer. But with capacity tight in nearly all Eastern states, a heat wave hitting several cities simultaneously would nullify these power-exchange arrangements.

The answer to the energy gap may be simple economics—making energy cost enough to encourage conservation in its use and greater investment in energy facilities. Presidential adviser Freeman suggests that a rate structure that increases according to volume used would help curb indiscriminate use of electric power, such as the practice of letting air-conditioners hum around the clock when they're not really needed.

"If energy began to cost more, people would think of better insulation, building houses to utilize the heat of the sun" and other steps to conserve energy, Mr. Freeman says.

Whether or not anything as drastic as a "regressive" rate structure materializes, it's clear energy costs will rise sharply as energy suppliers absorb higher costs and expand facilities to overcome shortages. Utilities have greatly increased the pace and amount of rate boosts over the past year or so, and many more increases are probable. Environmental considerations will boost fuel costs, too, as more users are pressured into switching to higher-cost, cleaner-burning fuels. Coal companies unable to keep up with demand and hit by higher costs due to new safety rules are making price boosts that industry sources figure may total 30% or more by year's end.

[From the Oil Daily, June 8, 1970]

TONE OF THE MARKET: MOST AREA PRICES UNSTEADY

While the gasoline market place sputtered and assumed a topsy-turvy posture pricewise throughout most of the country last week, main actors on the petroleum product stage continued to be residuals and distillates.

Residuals which used to be practically give-away products (Number 5 and Number 6 fuels) are now in heavy demand. In fact, sources appear concerned about availability of supply next winter. Present stocks are over 45.5 million barrels or 25.8 percent under the inventory situation that existed this time last year. Reason for this significant popularity for product rests on several factors including the much discussed pollution problem. A problem that has increasingly drawn the attention of the public and government at all levels.

The industrial complex which in the main has used coal for fuel power realize that high-sulphur coal will not fit in with growing restrictions on pollutants. Big consumers of fuel for power such as utilities and steel mills are switching to Number 5 and Number 6 fuels. While natural gas is a very suitable power source, the industrial community is concerned about developing shortage of supply and dwindling reserves.

Another factor is that most modern refineries have erected coking plants and use residuals as feedstocks for manufacturing coke. Even some of the older refineries have converted facilities for making this product. With increasing emphasis in recent years toward higher output of gasoline from the incremental barrel of crude, production of residuals has fallen sharply at a time when a sudden appetite for product developed.

The transition between manufacture of residuals and coke is based on economics. Any large conversion phase is expensive and refiners must look at both sides of the coin to evaluate action.

As to distillates, present inventories are a little under 3 million barrels or 2.8 percent over this time last year. Stocks of product on the Gulf Coast are reported to be 1.25 million barrels under the same period last year with majority of product stocks now sitting on the East Coast. Prices of distillates, which are increasingly being used as a cutting fuel to blend with both Number 5 and Number 6, are reported solid with little or no discounting, and sources believe this situation will continue throughout the summer.

There is some talk in the field that an increase in foreign product quota may be necessary to meet needs of consumers, particularly next fall, but this probability is apparently one of speculation.

Meanwhile, gasoline markets can only be described as restless. Some price restoration moves in recent days appear to have held up while others have faltered. The Group 3 wholesale market dropped another 0.25 cents last week to a level of 11.75 cents.

In action at weekend, Continental Oil Co. announced that effective Friday, June 4, it eliminated temporary dealer allowances in Minneapolis-St. Paul to return normal dealer tank wagon level of 18.9 cents which supports suggested retail price of 37.9 cents for regular. Effective the same date, Conoco eliminated temporary dealer allowances in Oklahoma City, returning to its normal tank wagon price of 18.2 cents for regular which supports suggested retail of 35.9 cents. Prices had been as much as 8 cents off normal in that city.

In Tulsa, some independents were reported lowering their prices at the pump by as much as 5 cents. The majors were said to be holding the line at weekend.

[From the Oil Daily, June 18, 1970]

TONE OF THE MARKET: RESID SUPPLY TIGHTENS

Extremely sharp buyer interest for residual fuel on the Eastern Seaboard continues, with the open market reported practically nonexistent. Supply of product is considered very tight with no relief in sight.

With this situation present at this time of year, observers are fearful of market conditions next fall. While showing a small percentage increase over last week, residual stocks continue to be considerably below inventories on hand at this time last year. Stocks are approximately 14.5 million barrels or 23.4 percent down.

The tight supply situation also exists in the Midwest, with resulting price strength. Buyers are eagerly seeking product. General feeling is that buyers will buy every barrel they can get their hands on.

Despite the fact that distillate stocks are over 4 million barrels or 3.7 percent over last year, price firmness of product is reported steady in all sectors of the country, with apparently no signs of any decline in the summer months.

Meanwhile, gasoline price improvement continues to accelerate, with major suppliers announcing almost daily the withdrawal of dealer allowances in spreading areas of formerly depressed markets. Gasoline stocks are currently at the 14 million barrel plus level or 7.1 percent over last year.

Motor gasoline demand during the February-April period of this year continued strong, averaging more than 5.5 million barrels daily, 308,000 or 5.9 percent higher than in same months of 1969. This figure should rise appreciably during the May-June period.

Gulf Oil Corp is removing dealer allowances in most of its marketing territory, with the exception of spotted areas, including Montana, Michigan, northern Illinois and Wisconsin.

American Oil Co has removed dealer allowances throughout Illinois. The move was effective at 5 PM Wednesday in all areas except Chicago; beginning Thursday morning, June 25, allowances were dropped in the Lake County, Ind. and throughout Michigan. Also effective Thursday, American Oil removed dealer allowances in Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee and Texas.

[From the Oil Daily, June 6–22, 1970]

OPC SHOOTS DOWN HICKEL'S RESID IMPORT KITTY

(By Jim Collins)

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Hickel's plan to establish a "kitty" of about 10 million barrels for imports of low-sulfur residual fuel oil for utilities in the midwest who can't obtain domestic "clean" fuel for their plants, has been stopped in its tracks by the Oil Policy Committee headed by director George Lincoln of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

Hickel was ready to move a week ago (see The Oil Daily, June 15), but decided he should check the issue to the OPC. Hickel has authority under the current presidential proclamation to increase the level of residual imports in Districts II–IV at his discretion.

The Oil Policy Committee, however, has decided to take a detailed look at the whole residual import situation, as it might affect the Midwest, sources for the low-sulfur residual, the impact on shipments from Venezuela, the prospect that domestic low-sulfur residual requirements would be met more and more from foreign sources—some outside the Western Hemisphere—and how all of these factors are involved in "national security."

A subcommittee of the Oil Policy Committee has been set up to make the residual review. It is headed by Elmer Bennett, special assistant to Lincoln on oil import policy.

The breadth of the residual investigation indicates that policy recommendations to the White House, and revisions in resid import controls by President Nixon, will not be made for another month or two, despite the high-priority of the study.

Predictions at this early point are that the Oil Policy Committee will not recommend opening the import gates wider for foreign low-sulfur residual for the Midwest—either for utilities or for wholesale marketers who are also seeking import quotas.

The total amount of foreign low-sulfur residual sought by the utilities (some already granted to Commonwealth Edison at Chicago) comes to about 23,000 bd. Commonwealth was granted 3.5 million barrels for the year by the Oil Import Appeals Board, and this was approved by Hickel. Still pending are requests from Detroit Edison, for two million barrels; Cleveland Electric for about one million barrels; and Consumers Power in Michigan for about two million barrels.

Altogether, however, there are "hardship" requests now on file with the OIAB for about 105,000 bd—most of these from Midwest independent terminal operators and other wholesalers who are having difficulty obtaining domestic supplies of residual.

While the utilities and oil marketers are having trouble obtaining the residual they want, the coast industry is arming itself against the threat of a "flood" of imported residual in the Midwest.

After the report, in the Oil Daily, that Hickel was considering a 10 million-barrel kitty of residual for Midwest utilities, the National Coal Policy Conference fired off a telegram to Hickel urging that he hold up

action until "the whole question of fuels and energy" in the area could be discussed with him. They sent a copy of their message to President Nixon as well.

The Coal Conference told Hickel that "utilities are now giving very serious consideration to the construction of full-scale sulfur dioxide removal systems which will allow continued utilization of domestic fuels. Further imports of foreign residual oil would certainly retard this effort."

Some members of the Oil Policy Committee fear that opening the gates for low-sulfur residual would encourage shipments from the Eastern Hemisphere—if the oil is still available—while further depressing the market for Venezuelan high-sulfur residual in the United States.

Another complication is that foreign residual supplies are reported to be tight.

In the U.S., residual supply continued to drop as new hydrocracking equipment at refineries upgrades residual into more valuable products.

While the Oil Policy Committee is not expected to make a recommendation on residual imports to Nixon for some weeks, some officials are willing to predict now that the OPC will not favor opening the import gates in the Midwest for any substantial amount of low-sulfur residual fuel oil.

Rather, they predict, the committee will probably recommend opening the gates on a preferential basis for residual originating from Venezuelan crude oil, or offer bonus crude oil imports, limited to the Western Hemisphere, for imported high-sulfur residual that could be reprocessed in domestic plants to make low-sulfur fuel.

At the bottom of the concern by most Oil Policy Committee members is the very large dependence which now exists on the East Coast by utilities, and others, for foreign residual. If these supplies were reduced, or cut off, by any foreign emergency, some big-city utilities in the East, and other resid markets, would be thrown into a tailspin, threatening widescale brownouts and blackouts and fuel shortages by industrial consumers, apartment buildings, schools and hospitals.

The OPC wants to avoid the development of similar dependency on foreign residual in the Midwest.

It would not be exaggerating, some officials say, to describe the developing residual import situation as the "most sensitive issue involved in oil import national security at this time."

[From the Oil Daily, June 26, 1970]

TONE OF THE MARKET: RESID SUPPLY TIGHTENS

Extremely sharp buyer interest for residual fuel on the Eastern Seaboard continues, with the open market reported practically nonexistent. Supply of product is considered very tight with no relief in sight.

With this situation present at this time of year, observers are fearful of market conditions next fall. While showing a small percentage increase over last week, residual stocks continue to be considerably below inventories on hand at this time last year. Stocks are approximately 14.5 million barrels or 23.4 percent down.

The tight supply situation also exists in the Midwest, with resulting price strength. Buyers are eagerly seeking product. General feeling is that buyers will buy every barrel they can get their hands on.

Despite the fact that distillate stocks are over 4 million barrels or 3.7 percent over last year, price firmness of product is reported steady in all sectors of the country, with apparently no signs of any decline in the summer months.

Meanwhile, gasoline price improvement continues to accelerate, with major suppliers announcing almost daily the withdrawal of dealer allowances in spreading areas of formerly depressed markets. Gasoline stocks are currently at the 14 million barrel plus level or 7.1 percent over last year.

Motor gasoline demand during the February-April period of this year continued strong, averaging more than 5.5 million barrels daily, 308,000 or 5.9 percent higher than in same months of 1969. This figure should rise appreciably during the May-June period.

Gulf Oil Corp is removing dealer allowances in most of its marketing territory, with the exception of spotted areas, including Montana, Michigan, northern Illinois and Wisconsin.

American Oil Co has removed dealer allowances throughout Illinois. The move was effective at 5 PM Wednesday in all areas except Chicago: beginning Thursday morning, June 25, allowances were dropped in the Chicago area, including Lake County, Ind. and throughout Michigan. Also effective Thursday, American Oil removed dealer allowances in Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee and Texas.

[From the Oil Daily, June 26, 1970]

PETROCHEM, RESID STUDY LAUNCHED

WASHINGTON.—The Oil Policy Committee is now cranking up intensive studies of two big oil import issues, with recommendations for action on them expected to go to President Nixon within the next 90 days.

The issues cover imports of feedstocks for domestic petrochemical plants—particularly those owned by nonoil chemical companies—and what to do to relieve the apparent approaching fuel "crisis" facing electric utilities in the Midwest who can't get domestic supplies of low-sulfur fuel oil, coal or natural gas.

The situation has already become so tight that three utilities have appeals before the Oil Import Appeals Board for import quotas of low-sulfur residual—Consumers Power in Michigan, a Cleveland Utility and Detroit Edison—totaling about six million barrels.

Meanwhile, there are indications that top energy and air pollution control officials in the Nixon administration have reached a tacit agreement not to push hard this summer against utility use of sulfurous fuels—fearing this would have a serious impact on generation of electricity, which is expected to fall short of consumer requirements some days this summer, anyway.

As one administration official commented to the Oil Daily:

"What we are rapidly approaching is a confrontation between adequate supplies of electricity and the drive to cut down on air pollution—sulfur dioxide—from use of sulfurous fuels by the utilities and other big consumers.

"It's a question of the immovable object meeting the irresistible force—and there is a growing awareness within the government that you simply can not shut down utilities and other plants just because the technology is not yet available to remove sulfur from stack gases, and supplies of low-sulfur fuels are not available in the quantity required."

With gas short and residual output continuing to decline from domestic refineries—and technology not available to desulfurize stack gases—the only option open is to permit more imports of residual fuel oil in the Midwest, some officials believe.

But, they want to set up a program that will be equitable for all consumers and which will encourage an increase in domestic supplies of low-sulfur fuel oil—and which will not have an adverse impact on Venezuela.

The other big pending issue involves feedstocks for petrochemical plants in the U.S. and proposals by two groups of chemical firms for more imports to meet their requirements.

On this issue, too, it is expected the Oil Policy Committee will recommend opening the import gates wider—but the details still must be worked out.

The issue is so complex that officials believe recommendations to the White House will take several months and will not be ready for action until the next allocation year, 1971.

Meanwhile, the two groups of chemical firms—called the "Petrochem" and "Chemco" groups—have come up with a joint proposal on oil imports which has been presented to the Oil Policy Committee and to Congress.

Under this plan, petrochem producers would have the option on a plant-by-plant basis to elect between two alternatives.

(1) If a plant can not use foreign feedstocks directly it would be granted import allocations based on petrochemical output—up to a level of 20 percent—plus imports for exports of petrochemicals. The company would be granted the right to sell or exchange its imports for domestic feedstocks.

(2) If a plant is able to use foreign feedstocks directly it should be permitted to do so without limitations on imports—based on the amount converted into petrochemicals in the plant. Any flow of fuel by-products from the plant would be controlled under the oil import control program. In addition, plants would have the right to exchange imports for domestic feedstocks on a like-for-like basis. Downstream petrochemical producers who do not actually process feedstocks would be permitted to participate by means of a certificate of petrochemical end-use that would entitle their suppliers to import the petrochem feedstocks involved. This would permit the oil refining industry to operate competitively as merchant olefin manufacturers to sell feedstocks for petrochem use, the chemical companies say.

The Petrochem and Chemco firms assert that such a program would "separate" the petrochemical program from the energy program and "should satisfy the concern of the oil industry that the petrochemical program would result in competition in the energy market from raw materials obtained at world prices."

The chemical firms also argue that their plan would not injure domestic oil producers. The quota option would enable plants using domestic feedstocks to remain competitive and be a market for domestic producers. In addition, plants using foreign feedstocks would be built in the U.S. instead of abroad and their nonpetrochemical operations would create a market for domestic oil that would be lost if the plants were built overseas.

The chemical firms are pushing the Oil Policy Committee to move quickly, arguing that plant investment decisions are being held up awaiting a decision on feedstock costs but that many decisions can wait no longer. But OPC's decision is still several months away.

[From the New York Times, June 29, 1970]

A SHORTAGE OF POLLUTION-FREE OIL SEEN

(By Peter Kihiss)

Suppliers of low-sulphur fuel oil—needed to meet air-pollution controls—report that they probably will be able to fill only 80 to 90 per cent of the demand on the East Coast next winter, according to the city's Environmental Protection Administration.

Announcing an appeal to the Secretary of the Interior to liberalize Federal oil import quotas, Administrator Jerome Kretchmer said last week that large fuel consumers here had already sought permission to return to higher-sulphur fuels if shortages developed.

The higher-sulphur fuels have been blamed for putting sulphur dioxide into the air and for increasing respiratory ail-

ments. Mr. Kretchmer wrote Secretary Walter J. Hickel that "our population now breathes air with sulphur dioxide levels three times higher than those described as acceptable by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare."

KILLING EFFECT ALLEGED

Mr. Kretchmer cited a report by Ralph Nader, consumer protection advocate, as estimating that "air pollution—primarily sulphur dioxide—kills from 1,000 to 2,000 people per year in New York City." The Administrator said "that figure could well double if you do not cut through the politics of oil to protect the health and lives of our urban citizens."

The sulphur content of fuels was limited to 1 per cent last Oct. 1, with a scheduled further cut Oct. 1, 1971 to 0.3 per cent, for residual fuel oil—used in power and other large plant—and to 0.2 percent for distil late fuel oil—used in homes.

In his letter dated last Thursday, Mr. Kretchmer asserted that "the single reason for the shortage of low-sulphur fuel oil" was lack of Federal consideration of air pollution in setting oil import policies.

He said that sufficient low-sulphur fuel oils and natural gas were available abroad and that "vast quantities" of other oils could be obtained for desulphurization—except for the oil import barriers.

BONUS IMPORTS SUGGESTED

Mr. Kretchmer proposed a bonus plan for companies providing low-sulphur fuels, on a principle he said was in effect on the West Coast.

Under this, companies importing a barrel of low-sulphur residual oil or converting a barrel of high-sulphur imported crude oil to low-sulphur residual oil for this region would get a bonus import quota of one barrel of crude oil for each such barrel.

Companies importing natural gas from other countries or Alaska would get a bonus of a barrel of crude oil for every 3,000 standard cubic feet of gas. Crude or residual oil could be imported without limit to be converted to low-sulphur distillate oil.

Meanwhile the state's plans for environmental clean-up moved ahead yesterday, with Governor Rockefeller naming six private citizens to join the heads of nine state agencies as members of the new State Environmental Board. The new appointees are:

Joe G. Moore Jr., vice president of Eastman Dillon, Union Securities & Co., commissioner until last April for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Charles H. Callison, executive vice president of the National Audubon Society.

William H. Whyte, conservation leader and author of "The Organization Man" and "The Exploding Metropolis."

Dr. Lamont C. Cole of Trumansburg, professor of zoology at Cornell University.

Dr. E. Corrine Brown Galvin of Ithaca, author, teacher and civic leader.

Jerome Wilkenfeld, director of environmental health for the Hooker Chemical Corporation and member of the State Air Pollution Control Board since its start in 1957.

NEW STANDARDS DUE

The six, serving staggered terms, will be paid $100 a day, not to exceed $5,000 a year. They will be joined on the board by Henry L. Diamond, who on Wednesday becomes the state's first Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, and by the State Commissioners of Health, Agriculture, Commerce, Transportation, Local Government and Parks; the chairman of the Public Service Commission and the Industrial Commissioner.

The board is to act on environmental standards proposed by Commissioner Diamond, whose new agency will take over the present Conservation Department and the air and water pollution control responsibilities of the Health Department.

In interviews and a WCBS–TV Newsmakers telecast, Commissioner Diamond said yesterday that 880 of 1,700 water polluters identified by the state in 1965 had either cleaned up their problems or shut down. He predicted that a crackdown on others ordered by the Governor would show results in "60 to 90 days."

The state is pressing for increasing the Federal share of the cost of sewage-treatment projects—a share that Commissioner Diamond said has been only 7 per cent of the total expense. The state last spring appropriated $750-million as advances on the Federal share, Mr. Diamond said.

[From the Oil Daily, July 6, 1970]

INTERIOR RAISES LOW-SULPHUR RESIDUAL IMPORTS IN MIDWEST

WASHINGTON.—Interior Department Friday announced an increase in the level of low-sulphur residual fuel oil imports in the mid-west by 9.5 million barrels for the allocation period of April 1, 1970, to March 31, 1971, with the approval of the Oil Policy Committee.

The increase is restricted to Districts II–IV.

"Potential supplies of low-sulphur fuel oil are not encouraging according to Bureau of Mines information, and the demand during the current allocation period cannot be accurately predicted," Interior said. "On this basis, a departmental decision was made to increase the level of imports into Districts II–IV."

The increase was assigned to the Oil Import Appeals Board for allocations and licenses only on the grounds of exceptional hardship caused by the mandatory oil import program.

"During this period, the department will take aggressive action to develop a program for review by the Oil Policy Committee which will offer incentives to domestic refiners to manufacture low-sulphur residual fuel oil in the mid-west area," Interior said.

The additional 9.5 million barrels of residual is expected to go to utilities who are short of coal and natural gas. Detroit Edison is expected to be allocated 2.5 million barrels out of the "kitty." Quotas may also be granted to a Michigan utility and one at Cleveland.

[From the Oils & Gas Journal, July 6, 1970]

OILMEN TO GET BLAME FOR ENERGY SHORTAGE—UNLESS THEY ACT NOW

This nation is in the midst of an energy shortage. We don't have to wait until next winter. Or 10 years from today.

No less an authority than John Emerson, energy economist of Chase Manhattan Bank, bluntly says: "Never before in this century have we faced such serious and widespread shortages of energy. These shortages are upon us now."

There's one predictable result of this sudden crisis. Someone will get the blame. Guess who? It's a good bet that—when the politicians and the consuming public realize the predicament—they'll rough up the oil and gas industry.

Get ready for it. The critics will charge that as a supplier of 75% of the nation's energy oilmen should have foreseen the crisis and arranged supplies.

Such blame is unfair, of course. Oil authorities predicted the present high-level demand. That's no surprise. But oilmen had little control over the energy trends that account for the shortages.

What's the cause then? Failure of nuclear power to fulfill its expected role is one major cause. Cheap atomic energy was promised in 1964 with the economic analysis on the Oyster Creek plant in New Jersey. The TVA gave an even more glowing analysis 2 years later. As a result, orders for atomic energy generating units jumped dramatically. The electric power industry hailed the advent of the nuclear energy revolution.

These plants should be coming on stream right now. But they aren't. Why? Higher than expected construction costs. Delays in delivery of vital equipment. Bitter opposition to plant sites from neighbors afraid of radiation. Fear of thermal pollution of rivers and lakes. All these factors sent nuclear power costs into uneconomic orbit. The power industry then switched to ordering fossil-fuel plants. But the lost capacity was not recovered.

This failure of nuclear energy to live up to its prospects came at the same time a sudden national concern with pollution imposed unnatural burdens on oil, natural gas, and coal. Sulfur restrictions eliminated large supplies of oil and coal from use as fuel. In addition, the coal industry is suffering a series of nagging strikes that may continue indefinitely. Natural-gas supply, already suffering from low prices, just isn't sufficient to fill the gap.

All this makes it vital that oilmen, first, understand the factors that have brought on an energy shortage. It's then just as important that the industry start now educating the public on the reasons for the crisis.

Unless the consumer is made aware of why he has to suffer economic loss or inconvenience, his wrath easily can result in crippling legislation or adverse administrative decisions.

More political restrictions are not the answer. Instead, incentives to search for new reserves of oil and gas must be restored. The nation must adopt a realistic policy on the environment so that more of the already known reserves of fossil fuels are made available.

It's time now for oil to make its position clear in the energy crisis.

[From U.S. Oil Week, July 27, 1970]

RESIDUAL PRICES MAY ENCOURAGE CONGRESS' PROBE

Residual fuel oil is now worth as much as distillate in the greater Chicago market.

Postings for heavy oil have risen so sharply that agencies around the nation are finding suppliers refuse to respond with bids.

The sole bidder to supply the Elgin, Ill., Public School system was Standard Oil offering 10.55¢ a gallon for 450,000 gallons of regular #5 oil escalating with Standard's daily posting.

Last year Standard won the bid at 7.69¢.

Chicago posted price for low sulfur #5 is 10.5¢ with high sulfur #5 at 10¢ and *high* sulfur #6 at 8.75¢.

In the same market #2 oil is posted at 10.5¢.

The school system rejected the offer and scratched its head.

In the New York area bids for low-sulfur resid have been recorded recently at about $3.50.

Sen. Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) last week fired off a letter to the President urging:

An emergency meeting of the Oil Policy Committee under the Office of Emergency Preparedness to find out why residual oil is in short supply, and convene a meeting with the oil industry and federal, state and local government leaders to seek a solution.

The Antitrust Division to learn whether international oil companies have been guilty of "collusion" in the present shortage.

Council of Economic Advisers to plan a halt to the residual oil price spiral.

Kennedy asked the White House to take the lead in solving the problem—even though residual imports to the east coast are not strictly controlled—because of the White House's "special relationship" with the oil industry.

Kennedy wanted to know why the oil industry, with its many subsidies and special

benefits allegedly based on national security needs, could allow such a shortage to occur.

Unless the supply picture brightens, he said, a disaster could take place as schools, hospitals and large buildings lose their heat this winter.

Meanwhile two frightened electric power industry executives have been pounding the pavement in Washington looking for heavy oil for their Massachusetts plants.

Both represent city-owned light companies that found no one wanted to bid to supply them #6 oil.

Alban Spurrell, manager of the Braintree, Mass., lighting department, and Francis King, manager of the Holyoke city light company, visited members of Congress and oil imports officials last week.

POLLUTION GOALS SUFFER

Unable to switch to coal (and that's in short supply anyway) and unable to buy natural gas, they sought help to keep the city lights from going out.

Braintree's oil contract runs out July 31.

Suppliers have agreed to come up with oil at prices over $3 per barrel.

The state of Maryland found no bidders to supply heavy fuel oil a few weeks ago.

In Baltimore where 1% sulfur maximum is now the limit, the city school system, with more than 50 coal-burning schools, is negotiating with air pollution officials in hopes of using 2% coal because of the resid shortage.

Formal applications for a "variance" haven't been asked, but they're in the offing.

State air pollution officials are expected to grant them too if the schools and six state-owned buildings agree to switch to oil or natural gas.

Two colleges in northern Virginia recently found suppliers wouldn't bid on their residual needs.

True local air pollution agencies are lowering the allowed sulfur content.

True, natural gas pipelines are cutting back on their dump gas contracts forcing big users over onto the residual market.

True, refiners in the U.S. aren't going to throw away their hydrocrackers and sharply step up production to meet the demand.

Some relief is in sight.

The Oil Imports Appeals Board last week allowed in 7.2 million barrels in the year ending March 31, 1971 in the midwest where you still otherwise can't get a residual imports ticket unless you were importing in 1957.

Even with tickets, marketers will find it tough getting a supply and finding ships to bring it in.

Closing the Suez Canal has caused a big tanker shortage and sky-high rates.

It seems as if the big refiners didn't take the Clean Air Act of 1967 and the natural gas tightness seriously.

If the shortage of heavy oil is truly worldwide and real, in addition to the valid tanker shortage, refiners may pay dearly for their poor planning.

State air pollution officials may be forced into granting exceptions to tightening restrictions on sulfur content to allow big buildings to continue to be heated this winter.

They don't like to do it and may accuse oil suppliers of collusion.

It won't be long before the Justice Department gum shoes start knocking on doors.

Congress isn't going to like the complaints from power, school, industry and apartment officials.

The industry's present public image won't gain from the experience and some of the ill-will may rub off on light oil marketers . . . some of whom find their supplies tight too.

A large segment of the public may get the idea that leaving supply and demand to private enterprise and government controls isn't in the public interest.

A particularly dangerous possibility for refiners and producers is the attempt by some residual-starved buyers is a growing interest in importing crude oil.

If refiners are asking 10.5¢ for the residuum, why not buy unrefined products available at $1.33 in Iraq or $1.27 in Kuwait.

That's about 3¢ a gallon.

As one public power devotee last week argued:

"What good's 'national security' if the lights go out?"

Here are a few recent bid offers from the midwest and east coast:

—Chicago's Transit Authority found *no bidders* to supply 3.2 million gallons of #5 oil and 1,290,000 gallons of #6 regular. Deliveries were to begin Oct. 8. Last year six firms bid.

—University of Illinois was to open bids at deadline for the third time on 8 million gallons of #6 oil "closet" to 2%. Earlier request for bids drew only one response that was rejected.

—Kingston, N.Y., school board found no bidders for 130,000 gallons of #6 oil and settled for 9¢ by negotiation.

—Phillips won a contract to supply Chouteau County, Mont., School Districts 2 and 11 65,000 gallons at 8.665¢ in 7000-gallon drops.

Union Oil, the only other bidder, offered 8.263¢ but Phillips was picked because of its specifications.

—Since no one bid to supply the Putnam, Conn., Housing Authority for 200,000 gallons of #6, negotiations produced two offers, $2.92 and $3.10 a barrel delivered.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from Illinois for his statement and for his diligent work on this important issue.

Rising concern over air pollution coupled with the oil industry's underestimation of demand will create a shortage of low-sulfur residual fuel oil this winter, industry sources say.

Residual fuel oil—the heavy oil left over after aviation fuel, gasoline, and higher grade products have been refined from crude oil—is used by electric utilities to power generators which produce electricity. It is also used to power industrial plants and to heat schools, hospitals, office and apartment buildings.

What might this shortage mean?

First, higher electric rates. Many utilities have fuel adjustment clauses which allow for rate increases when fuel prices rise. Some companies which do not have such contract provisions, such as Philadelphia Electric Co., are asking State legislatures for them.

Second, industries which can not get sufficient supplies of low-sulfur oil may be forced to choose between shutting down or using a high sulfur fuel and risking fines, an oil industry points out.

Third, municipalities faced with a choice between factory shutdowns and clear air may be forced to suspend low-sulfur limitations of clean air laws.

Industry observers say the speed with which many municipalities enacted strict air pollution regulations caught the petroleum industry unprepared.

The regulations limit the amount of sulfur in fuel. Their purpose is to cut down on sulfur dioxide, which is given off during the burning process.

One result is that many utilities and industries which were burning coal had to find another energy source. Coal is naturally high in sulfur and is difficult to desulfurize.

A $900,000, federally funded project is underway to remove sulfur from coal as it is burned, but this is expected to take at least 5 years.

Another result is that many utilities and industries using residual fuel oil to change to oil with less sulfur.

New York City laws, for example, insist on less than 1 percent sulfur content in fuel oil. Chicago allows 2 percent. Both are lower than the 2.5 to 3 percent sulfur found in much residual fuel oil.

Industry sources report that utilities and power plants are rushing to buy low-sulfur residual oil. They add that the demand is greater than the supply.

Coal was responsible for 51 percent of the electric power generated in the United States in 1969. Natural gas accounted for 23 percent, residual oil for 10 percent, nuclear power for 1½ percent, and hydroelectric power the rest.

I join my colleagues in the House in asking that the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the President's Oil Policy Committee to use all the power of their respective offices to first, grant the appeals in question; and, second, end the discriminatory measures presently in effect against districts 2 through 4.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago faces a fuel oil shortage this winter of catastrophic proportions unless action is taken now to permit a more realistic reserve of residual fuel oil.

In recent months several Midwest oil firms have petitioned the Department of Interior's Oil Import Appeals Board for permission to import No. 6 fuel oil into the district serving the city of Chicago. Estimates are that the present national stocks of this oil are more than 25 percent below that of last year. In Illinois alone, these stocks are 30 percent below last year's levels.

Owing to existing oil import quotas, residual fuel oils are not permitted to be imported into the Midwestern States from overseas. This decision has, up until now, been maintained despite the fact that New England and the Eastern United States may import all the residual fuel oil needed to meet their needs.

On July 20 this year, the Oil Import Appeals Board agreed to permit seven of 16 petitioning firms to import residual fuel oil during the allocation period from April 1, 1970, to March 31, 1971. This undoubtedly will help somewhat to offset the demands of the coming winter. But it is not enough.

Mr. Speaker, there must be some modification of this unwarranted restriction for the Midwestern States. Chicago adopted, on July 1, 1970, a series of enforceable air-pollution laws. These laws sharply restrict the burning of high-sulfur residual fuels. Yet the oil companies, which surely do not want to add to the city's pollution problems at this late date, are not permitted to use low-sulfur residual fuel because it cannot be imported from abroad into the Midwest.

This Nation we all love must give up

its traditional proclivity to react to overwhelming crisis. Surely we have all learned in this kinetic age that we must anticipate calamities and take some logical preparations to avert or mitigate them. Too many lives have been lost in the past; too many people injured or needlessly inconvenienced; too many essential services have been curtailed or stopped merely because actions were not taken when they would do the most good—before disaster struck.

Chicago and the mid-west are plagued with severe winter storms that paralyze traffic and restrict everyone to the warmth and security of their homes and apartments. At one point in recent years, the reserves of available fuel were within 3 days of being expended. Divine providence and a few days of sunshine prevented almost certain disaster on that occasion. Surely we are not so naive as to believe a similar calamity may not occur again.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this entire question of oil imports will be reviewed at the earliest possible date. Too many Americans are totally unaware of the shortages they face if action is not taken soon to make these various restrictions and quotas and allotments more responsive to the needs of the people they are ultimately intended to serve.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) in deploring a situation which threatens the health and welfare of Chicagoans and all residents of the Midwest.

My distinguished colleague has described the events which led to the present residual fuel oil shortage in PAD District II and to the recent Oil Import Appeals Board decision to allow new imports of foreign residual fuel oil by Chicago distributors. We are, of course, gratified that the Board—after the intervention of members of the Chicago congressional delegation directly with the President—has seen fit to allow us a little relief from a potential disaster. In a decision dated July 20, the Board granted a hardship waiver to seven residual fuel oil distributors to locate and import for Chicagoans and Midwesterners some 7.24 million barrels of foreign residual fuel oil between April 1, 1970, and March 31, 1971. This is a step in the right direction, but it is not sufficient for several reasons.

First, the Board's decision authorizes only seven of the original 16 petitioners to import foreign-produced residual fuel oil for the needs of District II residents. While I am certainly not an expert on the capacities, experience, and sale records of the petitioners involved, and thus am not in a position to quarrel with the allocations made, I believe it is clear that when less than half of those requesting authority to import foreign-produced oil were denied that authority, the public interest has not been adequately served.

The second problem with the Board's decision is that it is only for a limited period and only for limited amounts based on this one-time showing of hardship. Why, as long as the Board was considering this problem, could it not have done for District II what has previously been done for District I—east coast—and remove all restrictions on the importation of foreign residual fuel oil. This would have solved the problem once and for all. Under the Board's decision, however, residents of Chicago and elsewhere in District II will likely be faced with precisely the same crisis situation next year—and will have to seek the same kind of crisis relief.

Finally, the Board's action falls far short of what American citizens have a right to expect by way of modification of the restrictive oil import quota system. The President's own Cabinet task force on oil import policy recommended early in 1970—February 2, 1970—that the present oil import quota system be scrapped in its entirety and replaced by a system of tariffs. This was a general recommendation which related to all petroleum products and to all parts of the country for an indefinite period in the future. There was no limitation as to time or geographical area, as is contained in the Board's latest ruling.

In addition to these general recommendations, which I and other Congressmen have often and loudly urged the President to implement for the good of the American consumer, the task force also made a specific recommendation relating to precisely the commodity we are discussing here—residual fuel oil produced abroad. This is what the task force recommended:

> We . . . recommend that residual fuel oil from [the Western Hemisphere], to be used domestically as fuel either directly or after desulphurization, be subject only to existing tariffs and that Eastern Hemisphere origin residual oil pay an increased tariff sufficient to offset the anticipated cost of desulphurizing Latin American residual fuel oil. (Para. 430b, p. 136).

If the existing quotas on importation of foreign residual oil were replaced by tariffs, as the task force recommended, not only would citizens in the Midwest have access to now unavailable supplies of residual fuel oil, but they would have access to them at reduced prices. They would be saving money on fuel oil costs as well as obtaining a product which is not available because of artificial trade barriers. The task force estimated that an Illinois family of four pays almost $90 per year more for petroleum products because of existing import quotas than it would without them. If the quota system continues, this cost for such families will go up even more, perhaps reaching nearly $150 per year by 1980. This is not the cost of the fuel oil itself, but an artificial, inflated add-on caused by an outmoded quota system which the task force has urged the President to abolish.

Recently, there has been an ominous development here in Congress related to the oil import quota system. That system was established by President Eisenhower in the early 1950's by Executive order. The system still operates under the authority of that Presidential edict and could thus be modified or eliminated merely by a stroke of the President's pen. However, the Ways and Means Committee of this House has voted to prevent the President from administratively modifying the oil import quota system. This may be a useful tactic for both the President and the oil industry—since it makes the task of eliminating the quota system more difficult and takes the pressure off the White House—but it is a disaster for the consumer. I sincerely hope that the committee will change its decision on the matter of oil import quotas, or at least that it will permit a vote on this important matter when the import quota bill reaches the floor of the House.

The existing quota system is bad because it is a special-interest device to protect domestic oil producers, which is tremendously costly to American consumers and which—so the task force found—is not necessary for our national security or to encourage domestic production. But as bad as the whole import quota system is, its effects are visible mostly in terms of increased costs. The restrictive policy on residual fuel oil holds an even greater danger—it poses a risk to the very health and welfare of the residents of Chicago and the Midwest. For this reason, the President and the Oil Import Appeals Board should act immediately to preclude the disastrous results which would follow from a residual fuel oil shortage in Chicago this winter.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in focusing attention on a serious problem that faces Chicago and the entire Midwest. The problem is the declining supply of residual fuel oil available in this area of the country. One cause of the decreasing supply of residual fuel oil is that air pollution regulations have restricted the use of high-sulfur fuel and increased the need for the low-sulfur residual fuel oil. A second cause is that, for economic reasons, domestic oil companies have reduced their production of residual oil. As a result, the Midwest is now confronted with an insufficient supply of residual oil and an increasing demand for it by consumers and industries.

Recently, the Oil Import Appeals Board of the Department of Interior awarded certain oil companies the right to import residual fuel oil into Districts 2 to 4 in the Midwest. But the amounts of oil allowed to be imported were only 25 percent of the amounts requested and far below the amount that will be needed. To remedy this situation, there must be a substantial increase in these allocations. When a similar crisis developed in the east coast—District 1—several years ago, the Federal Government granted unrestricted residual imports to that area. District 2, in which Chicago is located, has not been granted that same privilege. I, therefore, want to add my support to Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI's efforts to see that this discriminatory situation is changed. We feel that the policy of importing residual oil should be applied uniformly throughout the country and that the Midwest should be placed on an equal basis with the east coast. The removal of import restrictions from District 2 is needed to

alleviate the shortage of residual fuel oil that threatens the Midwest.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, who has taken this special order to discuss the residual fuel oil shortage in the 15-State midcontinent region, including Chicago, which is known as District II.

For many months I have been directing my efforts toward securing relief for the hard-pressed dealers and users of residual fuel oil in District II. Consequently, I was pleased and gratified that the Oil Import Appeals Board on July 20 did provide some relief in the Midwest area by assigning allocations to several District II companies to import residual fuel oil during the period April 1, 1970, to March 31, 1971.

This action on the part of the Appeals Board will immediately make available to the Chicago area several million barrels of residual fuel oil which are desperately needed to meet the heating and energy needs of the people of Chicago during the coming winter. I want to commend and congratulate Lewis S. Flagg III, as well as co-members of the Board, Stanley Nehmer and George H. Schueller, for taking this very constructive action. This is definitely a step in the right direction, because it provides immediate relief in the critical residual fuel oil shortage that exists in the Midwest area, but unfortunately, long-term solution to the shortage remains to be found.

Presently oil importers in the 16 eastern seaboard States, comprising District I, in effect, can import all the residual oil they are able to sell, while those in District II, the Midwest region, are severely restricted in their import quotas.

The basis for this inequitable situation was established when the mandatory oil import program came into being in 1959. At that time a flood of low-cost imported crude oil and finished petroleum products were threatening to disrupt domestic oil exploration and production operations, and it was felt that this, in turn, was a threat to our national security. When voluntary controls failed, mandatory controls were imposed restricting, with certain exceptions, to 12.2 percent of domestic production, imports of crude oil, unfinished oil, finished petroleum products, and residual fuel oil.

The Interior Department has already granted unrestricted residual oil imports to District I—east coast—because of the fuel crisis that was developing there. District II—the Midwest—now finds itself in the same critical fuel crisis which has been alleviated to some extent by the recent decision of the Appeals Board.

However, the situation that caused the shortage still exists, and unless some long-term solution is found, the shortage shall continue to exist in the future despite the temporary corrective action that has been taken by the Board to relieve the crisis.

I want to point out that Chicago air pollution officials are continuing to push for use of low-sulfur fuels in order to cut down on sulfur dioxide air pollution. At the same time, because of economic advantages, oil refineries are continuing to switch to the manufacture of asphalt and petroleum coke in place of residual fuel oil. Simultaneously, the industrial community is becoming concerned over a developing shortage of supply and dwindling reserves of natural gas which is a suitable low-sulfur power source.

Consequently, with a threatening gas shortage, with high-sulfur content coal unacceptable, with domestic residual fuel output declining and with increasing demand for low-sulfur residual fuel as a result of the fight on air pollution, the only long-term solution to the fuel crisis in the Chicago area is to permit more imports of residual fuel oil into the Midwest.

The report issued in February by the Cabinet task force on oil import control questioned the rationale of allowing imports of oil to one region but not to others and indicated support by five of the seven panel members for opening the entire country to foreign fuel oil. Even the minority members, Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans and Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel, agreed that "consideration should be given to applying—District I—policy uniformly across the United States."

In the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent, more office buildings, more hospitals, more universities, more hotels, and more industrial facilities are located than probably any other district in the United States. These facilities, as well as thousands upon thousands of families residing in the area, rely on residual heating oil—No. 6 fuel oil—and I am still deeply concerned about their source of heat for the coming winter.

Mr. Speaker, in order to be certain that our people in the Chicago area will not suffer, I urge the administration to provide equity between District I and District II so that the Midwest region as well as the east coast region will not be restricted in importing residual fuel oil so desperately needed as a heat and energy source during the coming winter.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the special order given today by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI).

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

There was no objection.

THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTHWICK, MASS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in southern Massachusetts, along the Connecticut border, lies a small town of approximately 6,300 people. With an historic past reflecting the same troubles and glories experienced by our Nation itself, the town of Southwick is this month celebrating 200 years of existence as an incorporated entity.

Southwick, like many towns in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts, was first settled during the period of the French and Indian War. It officially came into existence during the same traumatic period of upheaval that witnessed the coming of the American Revolution. Such a tradition shapes a town and its people, providing them with a rich and full understanding of America's past.

Prior to its incorporation, Southwick was part of Westfield. Being located on the outskirts of the main town, it was known as the Outer Commons. For many years, the people of this area journeyed to Westfield for their Sunday religious services and for their town meetings. Since the trip was quite difficult and often dangerous, the settlers petitioned the Massachusetts General Court for separation from the mother town.

The difficulties of travel do not fully explain, however, the true motivation which compelled the citizens of the Outer Commons to establish their own town. I am inclined to believe that, to a large degree, the spirit of the times prompted the petition for separation. Men of the frontier were men of independence, and in the 1960's Massachusetts was decidedly a frontier region. It would have been difficult, if not impossible, to convince these men to remain an adjunct to a neighboring town when they had all the potential to become a town on their own.

Thus it was, on November 7, 1770, that Southwick was incorporated as a district separate from Westfield. Within 5 years, Southwick was granted full town powers. It was during this period that the town got its present name, being called Southwick because of its southern location with regard to Westfield.

One of the first acts following election of town officers was a vote to raise a company of 25 minutemen. At the same time, a delegate was chosen to the provincial congress.

When talk of a revolution came to a head, and news of the battle of Lexington reached Southwick, the town responded quickly. The 25 minutemen were dispatched to Roxbury on the 21st of April 1775, where they were assigned to a regiment. Some of these men served for the entire war, others for a shorter period of time.

The town continued to support the revolutionary conflict throughout the duration. In 1780, Southwick voted to pay a bounty of $1,000—in continental bills—to each of three men who would enter the army. Later, in 1781, the town supported nine soldiers in the regular army, having offered $1,000 bounty for enlistments, and 20 shillings per month as pay. For a town of roughly 800 people, Southwick made a substantial contribution to the birth of our Nation.

Throughout the years, the people of Southwick have always responded vigorously when this Nation needed them. For example, during the period of the War Between the States, 125 of Southwick's men, out of a population of 1,188, saw service.

During its early years, Southwick was involved in a border dispute with the State of Connecticut. Six square miles of Southwick jutt into Connecticut interrupting what is, otherwise, nearly a straight line between the two States. This came about when the colonial surveyors made an error and set the Massachusetts-Connecticut border too far north, to the detriment of Massachusetts. The error was discovered while they were working in the Southwick region, and to compensate Massachusetts, a little extra land was allowed in this area. By 1800, the dispute was settled peacefully in the New England spirit of cooperation.

Along with its rich heritage of history, Southwick has often been praised for its scenic beauty. The Congamond Lakes, three in number, are located there. With their gently sloping and thickly wooded banks, and their shoreline of inlets and coves, these lakes have for years attracted visitors and provided recreation for the people of Southwick.

The lakes derived their name from the Congamuck Indians who lived in the area and often gathered at the lakes for tribal meetings. Later, when the colonial settlers came, they used the lakes as a source of food, for recreation, and as a source of waterpower to run their mills.

At one time, ice was harvested from the lakes and this became an additional source of revenue for the town. The ice was stored in five buildings, two of which were the largest of their kind in the United States. With the coming of manufactured ice and the refrigerator, the industry, of course, became obsolete.

Eventually, the Congamond Lakes became a favorite spot for people to relax and enjoy themselves. A railroad brought people to the lakes from nearby cities and towns. A large pavilion and hotel were built to accommodate visitors. When they were there, they found many picnics and parties to attend, and, for the sporting-minded, regattas were held. A great favorite was the steamboat ride on the lake.

Today, the lakes are a great year-round recreational area and they continue to attract and charm visitors from far and wide. The residents of Southwick have the advantage of having access to facilities for ice skating, fishing, boating, swimming, and camping. Such opportunities to enjoy nature and breathe clean air are just a couple of the many good reasons for living in Southwick.

The town of Southwick has long been proud of the fine quality of education it provides for its children. One-room schoolhouses were the rule until 1928 when the consolidated school was built. The small one-room schoolhouse provided a good education, but as the population grew it made more sense to bring everyone together.

Today, the children of Southwick continue to receive a high quality education. The three schools, consolidated school, Woodland School, and Southwick Senior High School, serve the growing student population.

The excellence of Southwick's public education can be illustrated in many ways. For example, in 1966 Southwick could boast that one of its teachers, Mrs. Leah Benway, was named the "Massachusetts Teacher of the Year." This year, the quality of the Southwick High School graduating class is shown by the fact that out of 87 seniors more than half are continuing their education and 14 received the great distinction of being selected for the National Honor Society.

Southwick has always been known as an agricultural town and its early fortunes were accumulated by the persevering efforts on the part of thrifty husbandmen, especially in the area of the tobacco crop.

Today, as in the past, tobacco continues to be Southwick's main crop. Other small industries and services have grown up, however, and these have helped contribute to and support Southwick's growing population. In 1947 the population was 1,885, in 1955 it was 4,479, in 1960 it was 5,139, and, as I mentioned, the 1970 census estimated the population to be 6,329.

More importantly, Southwick continues to thrive in spirit. It is a town made up of the finest people—industrious, warm, friendly, community minded—people we can all be proud of. Each man, woman, and child in Southwick can justifiably sing the praises of their town as they join together in celebration.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all Members of the House as I honor today the town of Southwick, celebrating its 200th anniversary.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE SCHOOL PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, much of the South is in turmoil today. We are told that the last vestiges of school segregation will disappear this September. I think our people are willing to accept that. It has taken awhile to get used to this change in our lives, but change must come and, as law-abiding citizens, the people of the South are prepared to do what is right.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you read the headlines this fall and you get the impression that the "old segregationist South" has not changed, look deeper before drawing any conclusions. Because the courts and the bureaucrats in HEW and Justice have not been satisfied with desegregation. With an almost vindictive, arrogant attitude that has passed through all bounds of reason and proceeded out into space, they continue demanding not only desegregation but racially balanced integration, contrary to law. Mr. Speaker, in a county such as Mobile, Ala., where the population is about 60 percent white and 40 percent black, there is only one way to so thoroughly mix up the school population and that is by drawing gerrymandered attendance zones. We have now witnessed a horrible example of this in the most recent court order in the Mobile school case. Children living a block or two from a school are required to attend another school 5 or 6 miles away. Apparently there is some question as to whether the Mobile County School Board is in a position to provide transportation for these students. And the unfortunate thing is that those who are hurt the worst are the poor, both white and black students, in many cases. What does a parent do with a child who must go 5 miles to school and has no transportation?

The frustrating thing about all this, Mr. Speaker, is that the President set out some rather clear policies on the school problem back in March of this year. At that time he said:

> The neighborhood school will be deemed the most appropriate base (for a school) system.

He also said:

> Transportation of pupils beyond normal geographic school zones for the purpose of achieving racial balance will not be required.

But Mr. Speaker, how do you get the President's words translated into reality? Here I believe President Nixon has let the country down. The Mobile school plan is basically the brain child of the Department of Justice. Many other improper and illegal plans are the product of HEW dreamers. It is not good enough any more to just blame the courts, because the courts are not school boards, they do not have the expertise to draw school zones. But the courts all too often accept almost without question the plans submitted by HEW and the Department of Justice.

It is not good enough to say that the HEW and Justice bureaucrats have done these things, and somehow absolve the administration.

It is not good enough for the President to speak and then forget it.

It is not good enough for the President to blame the courts when his own people are writing the basic decisions for the courts.

No, Mr. Speaker, if the President really really means what he said in March; if he was not just trying to lull the good people of the South into a sense of apathy; if the President really believes in the neighborhood school concept; then he will put a stop once and for all to the dreamy-eyed plans of those in the executive branch. He can do it. He can see that his policies are carried out. He can see that the vindictiveness of those who work for him comes to an abrupt halt—if he really means what he says.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the President cannot look over every school plan that is proposed by those in HEW and Justice. But, by gosh, he can make it clear that if anyone submits a plan that disregards basic educational needs, that requires considerable transportation, that has as its sole purpose the racial balance of the students, that ignores the neighborhood school principle, then heads will roll.

The President must understand that those under his control are not carrying out his policy.

Take, for example, the question of the expected invasion of Federal lawyers and U.S. marshals into the South. The President rather promptly said loud and clear that he was not going to have "vigilantes" moving into the South. As a matter

of fact, the President reiterated this point to me very forcefully last week. But on the same day that the President made his "vigilante" statement, the papers in my district carried an adjoining article saying that the Justice Department was not really worried too much about what the President said, they are going to send their 100 lawyers and marshals down anyway. Well after that little gem I have been trying to get a clear-cut statement out of the White House as to who is really running this railroad and I get nothing but confused responses because nobody seems to know whether we are going to have our vigilantes or not.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt about the President's sincerity when he made his vigilante statement. But again, if the bureaucrats are unwilling to carry out the President's policies and orders, then some heads should roll. And I suspect that some of those heads are presently connected to bodies very near to the President.

Mr. Speaker, it is an open secret that the President is very upset that some of his so-called close advisers led him down the primrose path on the question of tax exemptions for private schools. Private schools have been in existence in this country for generations. Legitimate contributions to these schools have been exempt for as long as I can remember. Some of the best schools in our Nation are those which are privately endowed, some private schools are run by churches which learned a long time ago that Sunday schoolrooms could be put to good use during the week by organizing a private school. Sure, some private schools are springing up as a result of the integration of public schools. Some will survive and some will not. But there is no legitimate basis at all for denying a tax exemption to these schools if they serve a useful purpose in educating our children. The public schools in most cases are already overcrowded as it is.

The issue of tax exemption of private schools is before the courts now. That is where it should stay.

But how unfortunate that with the already explosive situation that is resulting from the unreasonable court decisions we must also have thrown at us the vigilantes and at the same time suffer attacks on the private schools of the South.

Mr. Speaker, if the President does not have staff people and Cabinet officers who are willing to implement his policy, then he ought to replace them. I think President Nixon has been generally realistic in his approach to the school problems of the South, but he is failing in his job if he does not assure himself that his orders are being carried out. The sin of omission is just as serious in my book as the sin of commission.

There was a time when we in the South used to accept statements of those highly placed in the administration. We used to go back home and say, "See, there is a difference, this administration does have compassion for our school problems." But no more do we grab this bait and run with it. We have been burned too many times. Only this morning the Associated Press reported that new HEW Secretary Elliott L. Richardson, in an address to the National Association of County Commissioners, said yesterday:

Requirements of school desegregation must be judged by educational standards rather than on the basis of racial balance.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when this type of statement would give us hope. But how can I go back home and praise Elliott Richardson when my people know from personal experience that the Federal Government, the courts and the bureaucrats have in fact thrown "educational standards" out the window in order to achieve a "racial balance?"

We have been getting many encouraging words, but actions speak the loudest in a time of turmoil.

OIL RESOURCES AND THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the article appearing in the Sunday, July 26, New York Times by William D. Smith, sheds a good deal of light on the controversy involved in the importation of oil to the United States.

The fact that this country is facing the possibility of a severe energy shortage means that political and special interest considerations must be overridden. We must protect our energy supplies with a national policy for increasing and further developing our petroleum resources, not only for our national security, but also for the well-being of our citizens.

I believe this article is worthy of note and would be informative to the reader. It deals with a very complicated subject and yet one of the more important facing us today.

U.S. Oil Industry Regrets It Was Right

(By William D. Smith)

If an industry could have a facial expression, the United States oil industry would be wearing a bittersweet smile.

The smile would be a result of having seen recent events prove some of its serious forecasts and urgent warnings correct.

The pleasure, however, is mitigated by the pain that the industry is nonetheless suffering from having seen its predictions come true.

Throughout the long and heated political controversy over oil imports, the industry has maintained that foreign sources of petroleum were relatively undependable and that their lower-than-domestic price levels could be quite ephemeral. For this thesis oilmen were raked over the political coals. The price of Middle East crude oil is now at least 75 cents a barrel more than domestic.

For more than a decade oil and gas producers have warned that Federally set "low" natural gas prices would dampen the incentive to look for gas and thus produce a future shortage. Again this was treated as a totally self-serving ploy.—"There is a shortage of natural gas today," Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel reportedly explained.

John Emerson, energy economist of the Chase Manhattan Bank recently went even further, "Never before in this century have we faced such serious and widespread shortages of energy. These shortages are upon us now."

The industry warned that rushing into low-sulphur, anti-pollution legislation and regulations might produce supply problems.—There appears a very good chance that there will be a shortage of low-sulphur residual fuel oil this winter, forcing cities and corporations to choose between lack of heat and power and the present practicality of recent anti-pollution laws.

Being correct, at least on the surface level, gives the industry no reason to gloat. In each instance it is costing the oil companies money. If they pass on the cost, as they probably will have to, it cuts into what little affection the public has left for the industry.

"No one will remember that Senator Kennedy or Senator Muskie and other so-called consumer representatives have advocated policies that have often ultimately resulted in higher costs. They will only blame us for raising the price of gasoline or heating oil," a vice president and counsel for a major company commented last week.

The executive's statement is probably too one-sided. The present situations are the result of many complex forces; some alterable, some not.

Nonetheless, some politicians and academicians, past and present, may have been guilty of thinking that a big desk and pet theories were a substitute for the hard facts of industrial life.

There is a very good chance that by fall the American consumer may be paying more for gasoline, natural gas and residual fuel. This means that the cost of running his car, his home and his factory will cost more.

These major impacts on the battle with inflation have not gone unnoticed in Washington although it appears that no major constructive actions have as yet occurred.

The leap in the price of overseas crude oil is a result of soaring tanker costs. Few analysts expect costs to go down in the very near future.

But if tankers are the central reason, the Arab-Israeli war is the underlying cause.

On May 3 in Syria, the Trans Arabian Pipeline was knocked out of commission by an errant or deliberately aggressive bulldozer. The Syrian Government has not allowed its repair, preventing 500,000 barrels a day of Saudi Arabian crude from reaching the Mediterranean.

At the other end of the Mediterranean the Libyan Government cut back oil production by 15 per cent, or 500,000 barrels a day.

The loss of almost 1 million barrels a day of oil west of Suez and close to world markets has strained tanker capacity. Replacement of this oil with oil from the Persian Gulf around South Africa takes six to eight times the tanker capacity.

CHARTER RATES RISE

Spot charter rates have risen to their highest level since the 1956 Suez crisis and are more than 50 per cent higher than during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

Persian Gulf oil is now coming into the United States at about $4.50 a barrel compared with Louisiana crude delivered to East Coast refineries at $3.75.

There is no chance of a shortage, however, because Texas and Louisiana will increase their production to meet the need. There is a very real chance of consumer price increases.

The Oil and Gas Journal, a trade publication, reports that Professors Phillip Areeda and James McKie, two of the chief advocates of sharply increased oil imports, have now backed off considerably from that position.

F.P.C. REGULATION UPHELD

The natural gas supply and demand controversy is a far older argument. In 1954 the Supreme Court ruled that natural-gas producers were subject to Power Commission. In 1960 the regulatory agency began

fixing well-head prices for all gas sold interstate. The Supreme Court upheld this right again in 1965 despite vigorous cries of outrage from producers, who said it would kill incentive to drill.

Time has proven the oilmen right. Wildcat drilling dropped 40 per cent between 1956 and 1968. Geophysical activity fell 56 per cent.

Some of the drop off may have been artificial; just to show the Government. Nonetheless the results are uncontestable. In 1969 the United States proved reserves of natural gas fell 12,241 trillion cubic feet, the largest in the nation's history.

The previous record drop was in 1968, when they fell 5,548 trillion cubic feet. These are the only declines in the history of the industry.

POSITIONS CHANGED

The F.P.C. is now trying to rectify the situation by raising prices. Some of the people who supported the lower prices several years ago are now in the forefront of those pushing higher prices.

The Interior Department is trying to speed up lease sales of suspected gas fields, but is running into opposition from Conservationists. But even if this opposition is overcome, it will take from three to seven years for these areas to begin producing.

In the meantime Canadian sources of gas can be tapped although Canadian American relations on energy matters are at an all-time low. Liquefied natural gas quite possibly will reach this country from Algeria, Nigeria or Venezuela. Contracts have already been signed to import Algerian L.N.G., but the Algerian Government's recent nationalization of American oil company properties puts this source of L.N.G. in a very questionable position.

SUPPLY OUTLOOK TIGHT

The supply outlook for this winter is tight. Industry sources say that there will be enough to heat homes, but that the industrial market, which accounts for about 50 per cent of total sales, may be in bad shape. Many distributors already have been forced to impose severe limitations on new industrial loads, and there is a real possibility that deliveries to existing customers may have to be curtailed, according to J. W. Heiney, president of the American Gas Association.

It would seem almost certain that consumer prices will have to go up, and possibly sharply.

The crude oil reserve situation is not much better, according to the American Petroleum Institute. Last year crude oil reserves dropped to 29,632 billion barrels, the lowest level in 15 years.

The A.P.I. explained the situation simply by saying that lack of incentives had led to a long and steady decline in exploratory drilling during a period of mushrooming production and consumption.

The oil industry in recent weeks seems to have won a lot of points, but through no fault of its own, it well may be losing the game.

FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to provide additional assistance to the State of Texas for the reconstruction of areas damaged by tornadoes occurring on April 17 and 18, and May 11, 1970.

I have waited until now to introduce this bill because I wanted to work out the details of it with the executive branch, because similar legislation introduced earlier by some of my distinguished colleagues in both bodies did not fully bring the vast resources of the Federal Government to bear adequately on the victims of natural disaster.

My particular concern for the State of Texas stems from the wave of killer tornadoes that swept this spring across my district, the 18th District of Texas, as well as the district of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. MAHON).

To the credit of this Nation, appropriate relief agencies have been doing a tremendous job in promoting recovery in the blighted areas. Their work, however, would be greatly facilitated by the passage of the bill I am introducing today.

A PROPOSAL TO HELP LIMIT AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, July 28. Look outside your office window. Take a deep breath of air, or do you dare to?

Tokyo, July 28. Look outside your window. Take a deep breath. Or have you heard that police are warning citizens to stay inside because of air pollution.

New York, July 28. Look outside your window. The clouds over the city, the ones blotting out light and sunshine are the same clouds of pollution blackening your lungs.

This is just part of what is going on today.

We have had our Earth Day, our funding to fight pollution and our citizens groups keeping this issue before the Nation. We have had all this, but what is hanging over the Nation's head is a blanket of dead air.

If we do not act soon to strictly enforce pollution laws and clean up the atmosphere we will be wrapping victims of pollution in blankets of dead air.

If we can ban cars from city streets during snow removal, I feel we can take it upon ourselves to institute a temporary limitation, on a voluntary basis, on driving, to prevent a health hazard which has far greater implications than snow drifts ever had. I therefore urge all motorists to help fight the pollution by commuting to work for the next few days by car pool or mass transit.

Antipollution experts have noted that strong sunlight, only light winds and car exhaust fumes have combined to create a photochemical smog. We have our reason to reduce auto travel for the next few days. If we believe in the fight to end pollution let us act accordingly.

There are, of course, long-range approaches to fighting this problem. However, this is an emergency and there is the possibility of this situation occurring again in the future.

We institute one side of the street parking and limited city travel when our cities are faced with emergencies prompted by traffic problems or snow. Our citizens have always responded and thus helped to ease the emergency.

If we are to eradicate the blanket of smog that is covering our cities let us voluntarily limit our travel to cities for the next few days.

PANAMA CANAL: SOVEREIGNTY AND MAJOR MODERNIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade many resolutions urging retention by the United States of its full sovereignty and ownership of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal have been adopted by various civic and governmental bodies. These include the legislatures of seven States, the American Legion and other patriotic organizations. That their views have been heard is shown by the introduction in the present Congress by more than 110 Representatives of identical House resolutions opposing any surrender at Panama with respect to sovereignty over either the Zone Territory or Canal, House Resolution 593 and others.

The latest comprehensive statement on the Panama Canal question is a "Memorial to the Congress" prepared by competent and experienced experts on the subject, which was quoted by me in an address to the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1970, and by Senator STROM THURMOND in a statement to the Senate in the RECORD of July 16, 1970.

A second crucial issue in the complicated canal subject is the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal, which would be provided under current identical measures now before the Congress: S. 2228 introduced by Senator THURMOND and H.R. 3792 introduced by myself.

In an article in the August 1, 1970 issue of Human Events, Senator THURMOND comments at length on the previously mentioned memorial emphasizing that our Government should not even be thinking about negotiating basic new canal treaties for the Panama Canal. With this view, I believe that I reflect the position of many Members of the Congress who oppose any surrender at Panama.

Because of their pertinence to the current hearings now being conducted by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I quote the previously cited memorial and identical measures as parts of my remarks:

QUALIFIED EXPERTS UNITE TO DEFEND PRESENT PANAMA CANAL

(By Senator STROM THURMOND)

Many members of Congress are disquieted by the recent appointment of Ambassador Daniel W. Hofgren as a Special Representative for Panama Canal negotiations [see *Human Events*, July 11, page 8]. Hofgren is a young man (33), and a former White House aide. He will be the principal assistant to Robert B. Anderson, the former secretary of the treasury who has handled Panama Canal negotiations since the talks began in 1964.

But Hofgren's personal qualifications are not so much the issue. The real objection is to the fact that the talks are being reopened at all.

To put it bluntly, the Nixon Administration should not even be thinking of negotiating basic new treaties, after the debacle brought about by President Johnson.

The Johnson draft treaties were referred back for ratification in 1967, but neither country would accept the work of the negotiators. Panama said that they didn't go far enough; but from the American point of view, they were a surrender of our sovereignty and our necessary control over the canal.

In the resulting storm over the treaties, I managed to get copies of the secret text from sources in Panama and printed them in the *Congressional Record*. Hundreds of congressmen led by Rep. Daniel J. Flood (D.-Pa.), went on record against the proposals. As a result, President Johnson did not even dare submit the drafts to Congress.

The discredited Johnson treaties ought to be scrapped in their entirety, along with the whole negotiating team. Anderson, who devised the 1967 treaties, is still in charge of the negotiations. He is also in charge of the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-Oceanic Canal Study Commission, which is supposed to be making an independent study of the best routes and the best methods for a new canal.

The Study Commission, like the negotiating team, starts out with the assumption that we need a new canal and new treaties. When the commission reports in December, we may expect a biased conclusion, based upon these assumptions. Ambassador Anderson is engaged in an apparent conflict of interest in sitting as chairman of both the Study Commission and the negotiating team.

But at the very moment when the State Department seems to be reopening the discredited treaty issue, a group of experts has come forward to denounce the idea that our sovereignty in the Canal Zone is negotiable. Two weeks ago they announced the formation of the Committee for the Continued U.S. Control of the Panama Canal.

What makes this committee so different from most such organizations is that every member is especially qualified in some aspect of canal affairs. It is easy to get "big names" for a committee, but usually such big names are sounding off in an area far removed from their field of expertise. In such cases, their opinion is no better than the ordinary citizen's.

The Panama Canal, however, is a complex issue involving engineering, navigation, diplomacy, international law and commerce, economics, ecology and, most important, national defense. The committee reflects all of these fields of competency, and others as well.

Dr. Karl Brandt, for example, is a former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and continues to write widely in the field of the economics of Central America and other underdeveloped regions. Dr. Lev Dobriansky, a professor at Georgetown University, is also an economist and in addition is a noted expert on Soviet imperialism.

Dr. John C. Briggs, who is chairman of the Department of Zoology at the University of Pennsylvania, similarly has pointed out the unresolved difficulty of rockslides in the unstable substrata of the Isthmus of Panama.

Engineers of the panel include William B. Collier, of Santa Barbara, Calif., Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, and Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel. Gen. Vogel is a former deputy governor of the Panama Canal Zone. Also included is a naval architect, Cmdr. Carl H. Holm, an aviation executive, Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, and William E. Russell, the publisher of a respected maritime journal.

Other authorities are the noted historian and authority on Latin America, Dr. Donald M. Dozer, of the University of California, who has written several articles on the canal for *Human Events;* Prof. Richard B. O'Keeffe, of George Mason College; and Harold Lord Varney, who is also chairman of the Committee on Pan American Policy. Dr. Walter D. Jacobs, the professor of Government and Politics from the University of Maryland who made an incisive on-the-spot report from Panama at the time when the treaties were revealed, has also joined the group.

The strategic naval value of the canal is a prime consideration in any discussion of its future. The committee includes two officers of flag rank, Rear Adm. Charles J. Whiting, and Vice Adm. T. G. W. Settle. Adm. Settle was formerly commander of the Amphibious Forces in the Pacific.

The list is completed by two more distinguished professors, Dr. Leonard B. Loeb, a physicist from the University of California, and Dean Edwin J. B. Lewis, of George Washington University, who is also president of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C.

The conclusion of these experts is that the most reasonable plan for the future is the major modernization of the present canal facilities according to the so-called Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, a proposal embodied in my bill, S. 2228. This enlargement of the present facilities could provide all the capacity needed without disruption of traffic or negotiating new treaties.

The Administration should heed these experts, and break off the discussions about new negotiations.

H. RES. 593

Whereas it is the policy of the House of Representatives and the desire of the people of the United States that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; and

Whereas under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between Great Britain and the United States, the United States adopted the principles of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 as the rules for the operation, regulation, and management of said canal; and

Whereas by the terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, between the Republic of Panama and the United States, under the authority of the perpetuity of use, occupation, control, construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection for said canal was granted to the United States; and

Whereas the United States has paid the Republic of Panama almost $50,000,000 in the form of a gratuity; and

Whereas the United States has made an aggregate investment in said canal in an amount of over $5,000,000,000; and

Whereas said investment or any part thereof could never be recovered in the event of Panamanian seizure or United States abandonment; and

Whereas under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, the power to dispose of territory or other property of the United States is specifically vested in the Congress; and

Whereas 70 per centum of the Canal Zone traffic either originates or terminates in United States ports; and

Whereas said canal is of vital strategic importance and imperative to the hemispheric defense and to the security of the United States; and

Whereas, during the preceding administration, the United States conducted negotiations with the Republic of Panama which resulted in a proposed treaty under the terms of which the United States would shortly relinquish its control over the Canal; and

Whereas there is reason to believe that the present dictatorship in control of the Government of Panama seeks to renew negotiations with the United States looking toward a similar treaty; and

Whereas the present study being conducted by the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission may result in a decision to utilize the present canal as a part of a new sea level canal; and

Whereas any action looking toward an agreement with the Government of Panama which would affect the interest of the United States in the Canal would be premature prior to the submission of the report of the Commission in any event: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of the United States maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over said canal and that the United States Government in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights or jurisdiction to any other sovereign nation or to any international organization.

H.R. 3792

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

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 "Panama Canal Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of not less than one hundred and forty feet by not less than one thousand two hundred feet by not less than forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks capacity at Gatun, raise the summit water level to its optimum height of approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at an estimated total cost not to exceed $850,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Governor of the Canal Zone may act and exercise his authority as President of the Panama Canal Company and may utilize the services and facilities of that company.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experi-

enced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations there in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of $200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Services or the President of the Panama Canal Company, or both, shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 13. Any provision of the Act of August 11, 1939 (54 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), or of any other statute, inconsistent with any provision of this Act is superseded, for the purposes of this Act, to the extent of such inconsistency.

LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE THE OPEN DATING OF PACKAGED FOODS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, last November, I introduced H.R. 14816, legislation to require the last date a food can safely be kept on a grocer's shelves to appear on the label of all perishable, semiperishable and canned foods.

Early in April, I released the results of two surveys of District of Columbia supermarket dating practices which uncovered large amounts of out-of-date food being sold in area stores. Such practices are, unfortunately, not limited to the District of Columbia; but exist throughout the country. The large number of articles on local food coding practices which have appeared in newspapers across the country, document this.

I have previously inserted in the RECORD a few of these articles. They include on page 11689 of the April 14 RECORD the feature by Marguerite Kelly, which appeared in the Potomac section of the Washington Post of October 19, 1969; on page 12580 of the April 21 RECORD, the Washington Post April 20 editorial endorsement of my legislation; and on page 14503 of the May 6 RECORD, the April 4 and 7 Cleveland Plain Dealer feature and editorial endorsement.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD several other articles which appeared on food dating in newspapers in Washington, D.C.; Detroit, Mich.; Rochester, N.Y.; Richmond, Va.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Denver, Colo.; New York City; Camden, N.J.; Louisville, Ky.; and Chicago. Tomorrow, I intend to insert a three-part series which appeared in the Miami, Fla., News.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1969]

CODED DATES

(By Peter Weaver)

WASHINGTON.—Supermarkets and food manufacturers are weaving an intricate web of number code so they can tell the date when a product, like packaged cheese or luncheon meat, might be ready to rot but you, the customer, cannot.

These coded dates are on almost every perishable and semiperishable food product you buy but usually are stamped on a corner or on the back of the package so you won't notice them.

Next time you go shopping, take a pad and pencil and start looking at things like yogurt, ricotta cheese, packaged baked goods and plastic packed turkey slices. You'll discover some have purplish-blue numbers or letters stamped on them. Others have the numbers indented in the plastic and are even harder to spot.

Let's say the coded number on a packaged bakery product reads 0926. That's a simple one. The 09 means the ninth month, September. The 26 means the 26th. To the store's bakery department manager, this indicates that the product should not be sold after that date.

Now that you've mastered the simplest of codes, how about trying some others that are harder? Pick up a package of bacon. It could have a little number stamped such as 3047. Stamped? Just add the first and last numbers. That gives you 10 which equals October, the 10th month. The 04 is the 4th.

Further down, you might pick up a metallic cup of cream cheese and find the number 89. Is it the eight or ninth day of August or September? Can't be, unless that's awfully stale cheese.

Aha! You've just hit onto the third basic code system—calendar subtraction. Subtract 89 days from Dec. 31 and you get October 4, the date the cheese should be removed from the shelf.

Most of these coded numbers are stamped on packages by manufacturers or outside packers. The supermarkets often use letters such as C or I stamped in front of the price. If it's a really perishable item, C stands for Wednesday, the day it's brought in. If it's a long shelf-life item like coffee, the I stands for September ninth month, ninth letter.

The stores also use those little twist things, that seal bread in plastic wraps, as a color code. For example, a red twist is Monday, white twist Tuesday, blue twist Wednesday. If you run against a new puzzler, ask the store manager. Once he knows you know what's going on, he'll probably reveal the key.

It's obvious from all this tangle that they don't want you to know when the food might be nearing the time to be thrown out. But it's vital that you know the date because, on occasion, out-dated food is left on the counters or in the coolers and you unwittingly pick it up. It could harm your health or, more likely, leave you with mysteriously spoiled food a couple of days after you bought it.

These dates are essential information that the shopper has a right to read in plain English—Oct. 4, not a cryptic 89 or 3047. Yet a Food and Drug Administration spokesman says: "No federal agency requires dates on foods . . . if they were required, the (food) companies claim nothing would move except products with the latest dates."

Nonsense. Film manufacturers have been putting "stale date" deadlines on film boxes for years, and some food companies already clearly mark dates on such products as refrigerated rolls in tubes and Liederkranz cheese. Some states require clearly stamped dates on milk, bread and eggs. The New Jersey Assembly recently passed a bill which would require labels to indicate the date food was frozen and the maximum time it should be kept.

These coded dates are an important area of food packaging and labeling that Congress apparently overlooked when the Truth in Packaging Act was passed. They should be looked into now. If you agree, write your congressman or senator.

Meanwhile, armed with pencil and calendar, you'll have to do your own undercover crytography work.

[From the Washington Post, February 8, 1970]

CONSUMER

(By Peter Weaver)

Q. Baking companies identify the day bread is baked for a store by attaching colored, twist clips at the end of the loaf. What is the color code used? I wrote several large baking companies but so far no replies.—W. A. B.

A. Every bakery uses its own code. One popular code is: Monday—white, Tuesday—blue, Wednesday—pink, Thursday—grey, Friday—yellow. Saturday—green. Others switch these colors around. Safeway says it is doing away with stale bread codes and will have bread delivery dates plainly marked on each loaf. Other supermarket chains may be forced to follow suit.

Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D-N.Y.) has introduced a bill to force food manufacturers to print all food dates plainly on each package or can. Your letter has been passed on to him. Anyone who wants to support Rep. Farbstein's food-date decoding efforts should write to him c/o Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

[From the Detroit Free Press, March 2, 1970]

TO TEST FOOD FRESHNESS, CRACK THE GROCER'S CODE

(By Trudy Lieberman)

Quick now. What do 21, 21049, 2B1, and 2210QA mean?

Answer: They mean Feb. 21 in those secret supermarket codes which consumers aren't supposed to understand.

These codes, stamped on most food you buy, are especially important on perishable products. The codes indicate either "pull date," the day food is to be removed from the shelf, or the day the food was packaged.

Grocers and food industry spokesmen maintain that it's not necessary for consumers to know what the codes mean since they exist only to help the store with product rotation.

In a grocer's rotation system, the fresher items are pushed to the back of the shelf while the not quite so fresh ones are in front.

Says one local supermarket manager, "Codes are a way of ensuring that customers get a fresh product."

Codes are not uniform—there are hundreds in the supermarket and they change from time to time. And some codes are more or less standard—like the Supermarket Institute code, the calendar subtraction code and the day of the year code.

I broke the codes at a local Farmer Jack with the help of the store manager and his department heads.

We started with bread, most commonly coded by the color of the tie on the end of the wrapper.

The color usually indicates the day bread was brought into the store. For example, red is for Monday, white for Tuesday, yellow for Thursday, orange for Friday and green for Saturday. This Farmer Jack gets no bread from this bakery on Wednesdays.

Bread has a two-day shelf life so a yellow tie (Thursday) loaf ought to be offered at a reduced price on Saturday.

At a Wrigley's, I found yet another bread code. Taystee bread was marked A19 and Mel-O-Crust was coded 1902 and 193. Since I was shopping on Feb. 16, I concluded these loaves should be out of the store by the 19th.

The pick-up date is usually used on bakery sweet goods. Cherry rolls marked "21" should be out of the store by Feb. 21. Some other kinds of snack items marked 2B3 should be out by Feb. 23. The "B" in this code means February.

At the Farmer Jack meat counter, I found bacon coded with the date it was packaged. Each company code is different.

Swifts 0192 means Feb. 19; Rath's 2100 translates to Feb. 10 and Tennessee Brand's 213 means Feb. 13.

"We try to get the bacon out of the case a week to 10 days after it was packed," the meat manager explained.

Chicken was coded F23 meaning it should be pulled out of the case on the 23rd. The "F" indicated the employe who packed the food.

Fresh meat is coded with letters. NW might mean the meat was packaged Wednesday, W indicating the day of the week and N indicating the employe.

At another store, Monday is indicated by a KK.

"However, people aren't supposed to know these," one reluctant meat manager said. "I wish instead you'd tell your readers that we don't let any meat stay in the counter more than 48 hours."

The produce counter has the fewest codes and the most easily understood ones. Vegetables like tomatoes, lettuce and celery aren't coded at all because they have a rapid turnover. Retailers say coding them doesn't pay.

Some bags of fruit like oranges, lemons and apples are marked with a single number like "3" indicating the fruit was packaged on Wednesday. In this code, Monday is "1," Tuesday is "2" and so forth. Some packages might be marked with the day of the month, for example one stamped "17" means it was packaged on the 17th day of the month.

Coding in the frozen food case is simple, too. Retailers maintain that frozen food lasts a year in the case and is designated by a letter standing for the month it was put in the case. An "A" means January and so on.

Processed meats like bologna and sausage follow the Supermarket Institute's four digit code. The month is indicated by the total of the first and last digits. The middle two numbers designate the day. Bologna stamped 1240 means it was packaged Jan. 24.

But another company's bologna stamped 1281 meant it should be pulled off the shelf by Feb. 28.

Sometimes you can't tell whether the numbers are the pull dates or packaging dates. Bologna coded 1240 might have been very stale. But here's where the store manager comes in handy. Ask him if you're not sure.

Milk codes are hard to spot. They are generally numbers indented into the wax at the very top of the carton. A 24 would mean the milk was supposed to be off the shelf by Feb. 24.

Sour cream coded 306 means it is good until March 6. A carton of Fairmont cottage cheese had a more complicated code—0925. The nine was the quality control number, the 25 meant the carton was to be removed by Feb. 25.

Many food processors complicate the codes by throwing in quality control and plant numbers. Manufacturers claim the additional numbers help them find products that should be taken off the market because of manufacturing deficiencies.

Kraft's Cracker Barrel Cheese reads 028–CGO. The 028 is the day of the year the cheese was packaged, C stands for the Chicago plant, G is the vat number and O means it was made in 1970.

Another coding system uses numbers 1 to 365 to indicate the day of the year food was packaged or should be pulled. W3301 on a can of Borden's Frosted Shakes means it was packaged on the 301st day of last year. The W3 are quality control indicators.

Eggs often are marked with the day of the year they were handled and packaged. A carton with a 43 on the side means the eggs were packaged on the 43rd day of the year.

This method could be confused with the calendar substraction system. Suppose you see a package marked 308. It might mean Feb. 28. To unlock this method, you'll need to substract 308 from Dec. 31, giving you Feb. 26.

Consumers Union and other consumer spokesmen long have advocated open dating and abolishing codes in favor of plainly readable dates like the ones used by film makes and some frozen biscuit companies.

I found some brands of eggs plainly marked "exp. Feb. 3." I was shopping on Feb. 13 and realized that these eggs weren't very fresh.

Some congressmen think there should be a law requiring open dating. Rep. Leonard Farbstein of New York has introduced an amendment to the 1966 Truth-in-Packaging Act which would require perishable foods to be clearly marked with the date they should be taken off the shelf.

Farbstein's staff has conducted surveys in the Washington, D.C., area and report quantities of food kept beyond the expiration date.

"We found that some meat managers are paid bonuses based on gross sales. So it is to their advantage not to reduce food prices commensurately with age," a staffman said.

Indeed, Consumers Union, the non-profit testing organization, found a store selling a brand of fish sticks that had been discontinued two years before.

Consumer Federation of America (CFA) is supporting the Farbstein measure and urges consumers to write their congressmen to support the open dating.

CFA and Farbstein's office hope to set up a code bank. Shoppers who succeed in breaking codes would feed this information would then be available to everyone.

In Detroit, a city ordinance once required milk cartons to show an expiration date. The ordinance was repealed in 1966 when the Michigan Grade A milk law went into effect.

Proponents of open dating argue that America is already 20 years behind European countries on food dating.

A few years ago Consumers Union received the following letter from a reader of Consumer Report:

"We recently visited a supermarket where the freshness of all articles was really controlled. The packages were dated when they were received in the store and set out for display. I suggest that this practice become a more general one.

The supermarket was in Ljubipana, Yugoslavia."

MORE DATA ON LABELS PREDICTED

WASHINGTON.—Growing consumer pressure will force processors to put more information on labels of food containers, an Agriculture Department official has predicted.

Pressure for more informative labeling and more grading of foods is expanding because the woman of the house "wants to know exactly what she is buying, and what effect it will have on her family's diet," said Roy W. Lennartson.

Lennartson, administrator of the Agriculture Department's Consumer and Marketing Service, told the Department's annual "Outlook" conference:

"Without question, the marketing system will either respond voluntarily or be induced to respond to many of the recommendations made at the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health.

"I am reasonably certain that we will see more descriptive labeling . . . more official grading and grade-labeling of foods."

Lennartson's agency operates several food inspection and grading programs.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, March 9, 1970]

YOU CAN CRACK THE FOOD CODES—MARKINGS ON PERISHABLES

(By James R. Blakely)

Almost all perishable items sold in grocery stores bear stamps indicating when they were packaged or when they should be taken off the shelf.

But except in rare instances these dates are in codes which all but defy the uneducated to determine if he is getting fresh eggs or year-old cheese.

Why is this? Why don't they simply stamp on the product, "packaged March 5, 1970?" Or "remove from shelf on April 15, 1970?"

Consumer advocates, Consumers Union and various Congressmen would like to have it this way through an amendment to the 1966 Truth-In-Packaging Act, and legislation to do just this has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Rep. Leonard Farbstein of New York.

Manufacturers and the grocery industry oppose the idea on the ground that consumers would always try to buy the newest items, thus defeating the normal rotation of "first in, first out."

But with a little bit of coaching the average consumer can get some idea of how old or fresh things are. With help from supermarket managers at a Star market and a Wegman store last week, I made my first attempt to crack the supermarket code.

Here's an easy one for openers. On the bottom of a one-pound carton of Bison Brand creamed cottage cheese is the number 0310. What does it mean?

That's right. You got it. It means it should be removed from the shelf no later than March 10, third month, 10th day.

A bit more complex code is found on milk cartons which translates into a very simple explanation once you know it. On the tab at the top of a carton of All Star chocolate drink are stamped (look closely because it is pressed into the wax, not printed) the following—B10.

This means the milk was packaged in the 10th week of the year on Tuesday or March 3. A is for Monday, B is for Tuesday, etc. Single letters on highly perishable items usually designate the day of the week. But on items which have a long shelf life, such as coffee, the letter may mean the month, hence H would be the eighth letter of the alphabet and the eighth month, or August.

Let's try another simple one. Items packaged by Wegman's such as meat and cheese have the week of the year they were packaged stamped on the label.

A package of sliced cooked salami was marked 09 or the ninth week of the year. I bought a Wegman-packaged medium sharp cheddar cheese stamped 07, which means it was packaged the second week in February.

How about 1022 on a package of Tobin's First Prize bockwurst? It gets a little more complex here. The manager wasn't sure what the code meant, but in all likelihood it is the Supermarket Institute's four digit code.

You add the first and last digit, in this case 3 or the third month or March. The middle two digits are the day of the month, or in this case March 2, the date it was packaged.

Most all bread is also coded for the day it was baked. Bakeries use different colors for the plastic-coated wire twists used to seal the ends of the plastic wrapper bread comes in. A different color is used for each day.

I encountered a wall of opposition from bakeries in my efforts to find out what code was in use here. The plant manager of one of our largest bakeries told me:

"I have no authorization to give out that information. These codes are for our use to insure that bread is fresh. It is a matter of policy not to give out the coding system, not even to our customers."

Another bakery insisted that I call the chief legal counsel for his bakery in New York City.

However, the bakery manager for Wegman's was kind enough to explain the color coding system in use for Wegman-baked white bread. (Special variety breads have varying codes). Their code is as follows:

Monday, red twist; Tuesday, white; Wednesday, blue; Thursday, yellow; Friday, orange. Consumer reporters in Detroit and Los Angeles report that exact same codes are in use in those cities, so the code probably is in general use here.

Code dating gets more complex as we move down the supermarket aisle. Consider 0506HM on a package of Food Club (Star market) sliced country swiss cheese. A Star executive, who helped me unscramble the code, noted that this was another variation on the four digit-type code.

The first two numbers indicate the month—May in this case—and the second two, the date, or the sixth. In plain language, this cheese is good until May 6. The letters indicate the factory where the cheese was produced.

Calendar day of the year dating is sure to stump the uninitiated. For instance, try 029GO on a 10-oz. package of Kraft Cracker Barrel cheddar cheese. Think hard.

The first three digits are for the day of the year starting with 001 for Jan. 1 and the last digit is the last digit of the year. This translates into Jan. 29, 1970, the date the cheese was packed. The G stands for the plant.

Calendar subtraction can stump the experts. You may find a 56 stamped on a product. That's not May 6 or November (by adding the two numbers to get the 11th month). It means you have to subtract 56 from 365 to arrive at the fact that the product was packaged on the 309th day of the year. Or maybe that was the date the product should be removed from the shelf. Frequently store managers are woefully ignorant of code dating translations. And even if they can read the code, sometimes it's hard to decide if the date is a package date or a "pull date", the date the item should be removed from the shelf.

Certain salad dressings and many vegetable oils use slash mark cuts on the edges of labels to indicate dates. Beer bottles also carry this type of code. I called Genesee Brewery to ask what all the marks meant and quickly found out.

On the left side of the label were nine slash marks. I learned that this code indicated the day of the year the bottle was filled. The first series of three indicated 300, the next series of four marks indicated 40 and the last series of one small mark and a fat one indicated six, which all added up to 346, the day in 1969 the bottle was filled.

The first series is a "hundreds" series, the second is for tenths and the last series is for single number. Double width slash marks indicate five.

A Genesee executive said, "We want our customers to know the age of our beer . . . we have nothing to hide." He explained that it was "almost impossible" to stamp the date on the labels because of the volume of bottles handled.

"We use these slash marks because they are cut by the thousands at a time and it is far more economical," he said.

The shelf life of domestic beer is around six months and Genesee says any beer that is still in the case by that time is pulled out of sale.

Then I came upon a package of Borden's Camembert cheese which bore the simple printing "Apr. 9," the date the cheese is to be removed from the shelf. Simple? Most consumer advocates are seeking legislation to require most of all perishable items to be labeled in this simple fashion.

Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal of Long Island is presently conducting a formal study of code dating with a view to hearings on the matter before his special consumer inquiry subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. A staff member said, "We've had complaints from a fairly sizable number of consumers that they have purchased food products which have gone bad shortly after purchase because they were left on the shelf too long. We've had some meetings with industry and food manufacturers have acknowledged that there is a problem.

"I don't know why, but some of these manufacturers guard their codes as secretly as the CIA guards its codes."

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 29, 1970]

BUYING SLEUTH CRACKS FOOD "PULL" CODE—A SPECIAL REPORT ON THE METHODS OF FOOD CODING

(By Estelle Jackson)

Ever wonder how fresh the food you buy really is? Ever suspect that the food you're eating may have been standing overly long on the grocery shelf?

The answer to your question is probably marked right on your grocery packages.

Most perishable food products found in supermarkets are marked with a date, either the date of packaging or the date the item is to be withdrawn or "pulled" from the store counter or shelf.

The problem is that most of the dates are in code—and most of the codes are secret.

What's more, the food industry prefers to keep them that way. Industry spokesmen say that codes help food retailers guarantee fresh food for the customers, but they maintain that the codes are not the customers' business.

Many housewives have long realized that

older merchandise is placed in the front of the counter, so that it will move out of the store first.

SIGNIFICANCE OF NUMBERS

But what is the significance of the numbers marked in purple or black on the undersides of boxes and cans?

In an effort to find the answer, I visited stores of several supermarket chains in Richmond during the past several weeks. I found some help and encountered some resistance. But I did manage to crack quite a few codes.

A carton of potato salad, one of my first targets, was coded in a fairly common, but baffling, manner. The numbers on the underside of the container read 2081. The manager of the store told me to add the first and last numerals together to learn the month—the third month, March. The "08" represented the day of the month, he said. So, I concluded, the package should be pulled March 8.

"Is that package still back there on the counter?" suddenly asked the manager, and he took off as though both Virginia H. Knauer and Ralph Nader were in hot pursuit. The date, you see, was March 11.

During my days of sleuthing, there were times of great excitement, like the day I cracked the codes for two brands of bread on my seventh visit to a bakery department.

The bread is coded by means of colored plastic ties on the ends of the loaves. A bakery department clerk told me that both bakeries delivered every day except Wednesday. Therefore, I was able to figure out their color coding for delivery days: one bakery had red for Monday; yellow, Tuesday; orange, Thursday; green, Friday; and white, Saturday. The other bread was coded as follows: red, Monday; white, Tuesday; yellow, Thursday; orange, Friday; and green, Saturday.

MILD DEPRESSION

There were also times of mild depression, as when I thought I would never be able to decode the meat symbols in one store. It was a Monday, and the code on the meat package label simply read, "AA." A clerk came to my aid, although very reluctantly ("I'm not supposed to tell this to anyone") by explaining that the second "A" stood for Monday, "B" would be Tuesday and so on. The first "A" referred to the current week, which was the week of March 16.

Meat codes vary from chain to chain. They vary from store to store within the same chain. They even vary within the same store of the same chain.

A friendly meat department manager at one store freely explained his coding system to me. Fresh meats were marked "23." The "2" stood for the man who wrapped the meat, my informant said, and the "3" represented the day of the week—Wednesday—the meat was wrapped.

Another store also had a simple coding system—or so it seemed after a butcher explained it. The meat is coded by the day it's wrapped. "3M" stands for the third Monday of the month, "3T" the third Tuesday, and so forth.

The chicken at one chain was another roadblock for a code-breaker. A meat-cutter at one store denied any knowledge of the meaning of markings on chicken packed outside his store.

"We have our own coding system, and I don't know what these packages mean," he said. But the meat manager of another store told me all of the chain's meats and chickens are coded by their expiration dates.

Fresh meat with a code reading "311," for example, is to be pulled on the 31st day of the month. The last digit in the three-figure series represents the wrapper. A mysterious chicken package turned out to have another code: a package that reads F17 will be pulled on the 17th. The "F" represents the wrapper.

MILK CARTON CODE

Finding the codes on a milk carton can be a strain on the eyes, as they are usually embossed colorlessly on the lip of the wax container. Most milk is coded by pull date—"31" would indicate the carton will be withdrawn on the 31st. One brand codes by the bottling date, a deliveryman told me. A letter represents the week, and a number indicates the day. "B4" means the fourth day of the second full week of the month, for example.

There were few codes to break in the produce department. Few fruits and vegetables are coded, since grocers theorize that the merchandise turns over rapidly, eliminating the need for time markings. A bag of kale was stamped 3A11, and a clerk told me that meant that the packing date was March 11, 1970. The "A" represented this year, he said. At another store, the produce manager told me an "04" marked on a package of celery hearts indicated March 4 was the packing date. Bags of carrots had numbered tags tied around their openings, and the same produce manager said these numbers—"5" and "14"—meant the packing day was March 5 or March 14.

Eggs packed in cartons generally bore clear markings of their expiration dates. "Exp. 3 16" or "Exp. March 16" had a message loud and clear. To a decoder whose head had begun to whirl slightly, refrigerated baking powder biscuits and other packaged rolls were also a relief—as their cans were imprinted clearly on the metal ends with expiration dates, sometimes by numbers, as in "324," or, more explicitly, by "March 24."

Codes can contain more than dates. Some codes also contain symbols representing cities, packing plants, vat numbers and even shift numbers. Processors say this must be done to identify specific batches for checking the validity of consumer complaints, as in cases where food products must be recalled.

One coding system uses the numbers 1 to 365 to indicate the day of the year the food is packaged or to be withdrawn. The marks W3327 on one dairy product means the food was packaged on the 327th day of the year. The W3 is a quality control indicator.

LETTER CODES

Letter codes can really be perplexing. One technique is to employ a six-letter word, like NEWARK, in which no letters are repeated. Using NEWARK, an "N" could represent Monday, "E" Tuesday and so forth. Some manufacturers prefer a 10-letter code, using a word combination like NOURISH EAT. When they reach the end of the 10-day cycle with a "T," they can simply start all over again with an "N."

Easily understood codes, in which the packaging or expiration dates are written in plain English, fall into the category of "open coding."

And open coding is what various consumer organizations want. It would be mandatory if a bill now before Congress is passed.

Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D-N.Y.) is the author of the bill, an amendment to the Fair Labeling and Packaging Act, which would make open coding on all packages and cans mandatory. The bill, which has 47 sponsors in congress, includes provisions for open dating by uniformly using the products "pull" or expiration date.

Preliminary results of surveys made for Farbstein's office by women investigators in the Washington area were disclosed by Ellis Levin, the congressman's legislative assistant.

"Everything sold is not stale, but a significant amount of food is older than the codes say it should be," said Levin. "We're finding this especially in milk, bread and meat. The greatest abuse is in low income areas. However, middle-income area housewives are concerned, too, about paying a lot of money for stale food."

A number of consumer organizations are committed to the principle of open coding. Consumers Union, the nonprofit product testing organization has repeatedly urged compulsory dating in closely legible form on perishable foods.

Food industry spokesmen maintain that open coding would add to the cost of food and contend it is not necessary because the purpose of coding is to help stores rotate products.

S. Frank Straus, executive vice president of the Virginia Food Dealers Association, says that coding would "create more problems than it solves, and would destroy the basic food store principle of first merchandise in, first out. Consequently, prices would rise."

NEWEST AND FRESHEST

"Housewives would buy things with the newest and freshest dates," he said. "The last merchandise in would be the first out. This would create a vast problem in that much merchandise would have to be destroyed and credited. Imagine what that would do to the cost of food.

"Housewives would paw through the food, looking for the newest, and we would have a terrible mess . . . It's just not a real practical approach to achieve what they want to achieve."

Straus continued, "Everybody makes mistakes. And if once in a while you do find food that isn't quite fresh, you take it back and get your money back. I doubt if we can outlaw errors by passing a law in Congress."

An official of the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Commerce also questioned the benefits to the consumer of open coding of perishable food. The department has no jurisdiction over coding.

Proponents of open coding counter industry arguments by saying that open dating would not be an extra cost, since the industry is already coding food. They argue that open dating has existed for years in some European countries.

[From the State Press, April 7, 1970]

THIS PRIVATE EYE SPYS SPOILED FOOD

(By Bill Young)

Fast cars. Fast women. Imminent danger. A murder, rape or a theft of the Queen's jewels. Right there is enough—quite enough—to serve as a season's material, with variations, for a television show about a private investigator.

But then there's the case of Arthur McBrayer.

McBrayer, a prelaw student and candidate for state senator, is a private detective.

This private detective drives a 1952 Chevy, which is not exceptionally fast, has a family and is not in any particular danger.

Milk, bread and other perishable foods are the targets of McBrayer's investigation.

True, this may be disillusioning to a generation that grew up with 77 Sunset Strip and watched the tides go in and out for Troy Donahue at Surfside Six.

Yet, McBrayer's investigation into a couple of food stores in South Phoenix has inspired The Arizona Republic to run a series, the first story appeared Thursday, on the sale of bad merchandise, especially perishables, in Valley stores.

The understaffed State Health Department is seemingly unable to control the situation. McBrayer quoted them as saying, "We have no one working on Pure Food Control. We handle emergency cases only."

McBrayer feels the discovery of unhealthy food conditions in South Phoenix may indicate a Valley-wide problem, including Tempe.

"Arizona State students are possibly the most uneducated consumers," McBrayer said. "Many are away from home for the first time and many are on limited budgets."

Last Thursday, McBrayer went to two Tempe food stores. At a surplus bread store, a loaf of bread was found with the letter "d" on it. The "d" means that this loaf was baked on a Friday. State law requires that any bread sold over three days old must be labeled "stale."

"This is an example of state laws not being enforced," McBrayer said. "I hope someday

the actual date of the day a food product should be pulled from the market will be clearly written on the package."

[From Newsday, April 9, 1970]

STALE FOOD SOLD, LAWMAKER SAYS

Washington—Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D-Manhattan) said today that two recent surveys of supermarket practices show that consumers are sold food that is stale and unfit for human consumption.

Surveys conducted by his own staff and by the Democratic Central Committee of Washington, D.C., showed, he said at a press conference, that 15 of 18 supermarkets here belonging to the Safeway, A&P and Giant food chains were found to be selling stale food. Staff shoppers checked 10 items, including milk, eggs, cottage cheese, chicken and bread, and found that seven stores had one stale item and eight had between two and five. Two successive trips to one store yielded $100 worth of stale items. The staleness was determined by checking each item for the code numbers which instruct store managers when a product should be removed from the shelves because it is no longer fresh.

"The results of the two surveys demonstrated that many of the current food codes are subjectively determined and provide the consumer with little if any guarantee of food freshness," Farbstein said. "One store manager said he ignored the codes and removed poultry from the shelves when it began to smell or changed color or developed growths." Farbstein said he believed that such practices were common in all areas of the country. "This means," he said, "that the consumer is getting food that is unfit for human consumption, that has lost nutritional value, smells and tastes bad or is unhealthy."

Stale items were found in stores regardless of the income levels of nearby neighborhoods, he said.

Clarence Adamy, president of the National Association of Food Chains, said that Farbstein's surveys "do not make sense." He said, "There is no reason for us to want to sell stale stuff, because the only way we can keep our customers is to sell fresh goods. It's very seldom a problem." Adamy denied that any health hazard existed.

Farbstein introduced legislation last fall to require food packages to be marked clearly with the cutoff date for freshness. Food packages are marked with such "pull dates," as they are called, but only in the form of codes which can be read by store personnel. Farbstein's staff was able to decode the dates on the items checked (which were all store brands) but was unable, for example, to figure out the 10-digit code numbers on Kellogg's Corn Flakes.

Adamy said that he opposed the legislation, which is expected to be the subject of hearings soon. "It would create an immense amount of waste," he said, "because customers would pick out only the freshest items to buy, and that would increase the cost to everyone."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 12, 1970]

HOW TO KNOW WHETHER YOU'RE BUYING FRESH FOOD

(By Carol Schlageter)

It's a little like playing spy.

Your mission: To crack the codes that tell the age of products on the grocery store shelf. The codes are on slews of products, and range from simple to nearly Pentagon-proof.

Men at the three major Philadelphia chains contacted—Penn Fruit, A&P and Acme—say they don't see what all the secrecy is about anyhow. Snorted one: "I don't know why in God's world we don't put 4–14–70, because it would ease the problem with everybody."

Spokesmen for all three chains were candid about the codes—but occasionally were baffled themselves. One executive was a month behind the times and didn't know his stores had changed codes.

And in one center city market, a novice detected packages of luncheon meat that should have been pulled from the shelf a week before.

Why bother with it all? Code-cracking is a way you can make sure the product you're buying hasn't outlived the grocery shelf life, and won't go bad the day you get it home. That knowledge is particularly useful if you're buying an item you don't plan to use for a week or so.

Virtually every national name-brand product goes by its own code—resulting in a maze of cryptic symbols. Local stores add their own codes. In addition, after you crack a code there's the problem of figuring out whether it was the date it went on, or should be taken off the shelf. But to start your translations, here are the codes put on items in the local chains.

If you're shopping Penn Fruit, you should know about their perishable code. You'll find it on produce and meat items particularly.

They use A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J and AK to indicate the first ten days of the month—in that order. You're right, the letter I is left out.

For the next ten days, they put an A in front of every letter. And for the third ten days they put a B in front of every letter. If the code on your hamburger or bottled orange juice says A, that means it was put out the first day of the month, AA means it was put out the 11th and BA means it was put out the 21st.

There's another little matter to contend with—sometimes on meats a K is put before the code. In that case, ignore the K and proceed.

B-R-E-A-Dt is the secret to freshness on Penn Fruit's own brand goods. If there's no code letter on the label, that means it went on the shelf Monday, B stands for Tuesday, R for Wednesday and E, A and D for Thursday, Friday and Saturday in that order.

When it comes to Penn Fruit's milk, get out your bifocals. The dates are pressed, not printed, into the wax at the top of the carton. The numbers 413 means—you guessed it—that the shelf life expires April 13.

LUNCHEON MEAT

At the top of Oscar Mayer brand luncheon meat you'll find a number. The 26 means it's good until the 26th of the month . . . good for the grocery shelf, that is.

The expiration dates refer to grocery shelf life—and are based on the idea that you'll be keeping most things at home for additional refrigerator life. For example, milk is good several weeks—22 days, one grocer said—after the grocery date expires.

So much for the easy codes. A Penn Maid Cottage Cheese container had A2102 stamped on the bottom. Forget about that A. Add the next two digits and you get 3. That stands for the third month—March. Reverse the next two digits and you get 20. That means it went on the shelf the 20th day of March.

COULDN'T TRANSLATE

There were others that the Penn Fruit man couldn't translate. He pointed to a jar of salad dressing coded 0044K. "I have to depend on the Pfeiffer salesman to pull it off the shelf on time," he said.

"There's no excuse to have something go stale on my shelves," he added, explaining that most companies will give a market full refund for products that live on the shelf to old age.

He favors what some products already do and what legislation introduced in Congress would have all products do: Tell it in English. Items including hair colorings, dinner rolls in tubes and an occasional cheese wear their expiration dates proudly.

SINGLE CODE

At A & P, Ann Page products—including some 185 items from meat tenderizer to mayonnaise—have a single code. That 3B2 on the tenderizer, for example, means March 2, 1971—the date the product should be taken from the shelf. The 3 stands for 1971 (1970 is A under a system using A through J to denote each year in the decade) and the 2 stands for the day of the month.

A & P milk is coded the same way—the 4A13 pressed into the waxy carton top means the grocery shelf life expires April 13.

REAL DAY

Items like bread, cake and cupcakes have a code on the label—say 0409. It stands for the fourth month, ninth day—and April 9 was the date marking the end of the shelf life.

Items including coffeecake or pie have the day—the real day, such as "Wednesday"—printed on the label.

A & P doesn't code meat because, a spokesman said, "meat gives itself away" by its appearance. "If you don't have a bright red color you have an old piece of meat." If you do spot a number on the label of A&P meat, it identifies the meat man who packaged it. Produce also is uncoded at A & P, under the theory that its freshness speaks for itself.

At Acme, pre-packaged meats such as luncheon loaf and dried beef have a four-digit code. The secret to unraveling it is to add the first and last digits to come up with the month and the middle ones to get the date. If the code reads 4041, the month is the fifth, May, and the date is the 4th. And May 4 is the expiration date.

DECODER SURPRISED

One novice decoder was in for a surprise with Acme's own Lancaster brand olive luncheon loaf. At least a dozen packages of the product on shelves of the store at 15th and Spruce sts. bore the expiration code 2012 last Wednesday. That means, shelf life had expired April 1—or eight days before the shopper cracked the code.

The reaction of a meat section employe at the store was that the code isn't always accurate—that the luncheon meat had come in that same morning. The reaction of an executive at Acme headquarters was "I'm quite embarrassed—or chagrined." He said a quality control man was on the way down to check it, and said that even if meat is coded wrong it will be removed from the shelf on a better-safe-than-sorry basis.

Acme's own meat, like A&P's, isn't dated on the grounds that "onces the bloom gets off" it gives itself away. If you see letters on the meat label, they's the initials of the meat man who packaged it.

TWIST OF WRIST

Acme's own bread is closed and coded with a twist of the wrist. Those twists are color coded: Red, white, blue, green yellow and black for Monday through Saturday in that order.

Produce, including apples in see-through cellophane packages, has a code on the price tag indicating expiration date—A through F for Monday through Saturday. And the Virginia Lee baked goods line is coded with a P (for Philadelphia) and a number from 1 to 31 indicating the day of the month it should be removed from the shelf.

A milk carton with 0411 pressed into the wax has a shelf life ending April 11.

And, said an Acme spokesman, they're working on a five-digit code: 13–31–0 would mean, simply, March 31, 1970. Some of their cheeses already are dated 5–23–70 in a similar approach.

Said the Acme spokesman:

"You don't sell a customer stale merchandise more than twice. He just won't come back."

If you're ready to try your hand at cracking a code at the supermarket, the first step is easy: Ask.

[From the Denver Post, April 13, 1970]

SO THAT'S HOW THE COOKIE CRUMBLES

Some consumer problems have such obvious solutions that their existence seems ridiculous. Take the matter of stale food. Why can't produce be labeled with the date beyond which it's no longer fresh?

The fact is that many major chain stores do date their food—but in code to keep it a secret from the innocent shopper.

Rep. Leonard Farbstein, D-N.Y., has introduced a bill—with 44 co-sponsors—that would require food to be marked clearly with the last day it's safe to eat or aesthetically pleasing.

Farbstein's legislative assistant, Ellis Levin, told The Post that the National Association of Food Chains defends the codes as an economy measure: if they can't sell aging food, prices will go up. But impartial marketing experts say that experienced store managers know how much they can sell of each item. Overstocking is due to incompetence, which the public shouldn't have to pay for.

There's no consistent national coding system. Some chains mark the "pull" date, when food should be taken off the shelf. Others, use the "push" date, when it was packaged. Farbstein's office reports that many stores ignore the codes, and some even repackage food that's out of date but still looks and smells palatable. A buyer who plans to serve it later in the week is out of luck.

Levin and others studying the problem broke some codes, and found a complex variety. A major chain embosses the simplest one on its milk and egg cartons. If you see "409," the "push" date is April 9. (Another chain marks the "pull" date.) On the inside overlap of the hamburger wrapper at the same store, "00094" means April 9 again—reading this time from the right.

Meat varies from store to store even within the same company. The ghettos predictably get the worst bargain—12 days of shelf life isn't unusual. But Levin stresses that abuse is universal; in a store patronized by congressmen, he bought bologna that should have been disposed of a month earlier.

Farbstein has received nation-wide support for his bill, and not just from consumers. A member of a small food store association said he and his colleagues were interested because the big outfits won't explain their codes to them. These merchants, unblushfully ignorant like the rest of us, often get stuck with stale food. Let's hope plain English wins the day.

[From the New Republic, Apr. 25, 1970]

SMELL IT, THEN SELL IT

Supermarkets depend for their profits on clearing the shelves of merchandise whether it is fresh or not. Store managers get bonuses for high turnover and are docked when they have to throw away bad meat or return goods whose shelf life has elapsed. Unsold food is money lost, so it is to their advantage to sell everything. Grocers, therefore, customarily put fresh merchandise behind the older stock on the shelves. And they keep the true age of foods a carefully guarded secret so that customers can't discern freshness for themselves. Nearly all food products are coded in some way to show their shelf life, the date beyond which they are unsafe to eat, or the date they were packaged.

The number "606" on a carton of milk in one store, for instance, means that the milk should not be offered for sale after June 6. The code "5121" tells when a package of hamburger will likely be rotten. (Add the first and last digits to get the month; the middle digits represent the day. The expiration date on the ground meat is June 12.) The codes get complicated. The number "031" on pork chops in the store may indicate that they will be good until the first of the month and that they were packed at 3:00 p.m. May 30 on a carton of eggs reveals that they were packed on that date; their shelf life is seven days. A red mark on a loaf of bread means it was baked on a Monday or a Thursday. White means Tuesday or Friday. Blue signifies Wednesday or Saturday. "6029" on bologna means it was processed by packer number 9 and that it should not be sold after June 2.

The codes vary from product to product and store to store, even within a chain, and grocers claim that sometimes even they are in the dark about what the cryptic messages mean. In such cases manufacturers' or distributors' representatives come around now and then to decipher the codes and, presumably, remove the old stuff from the store.

The food industry does not want customers understanding the codes, because then it would not be possible to unload the stale food. Clarence Adamy, the president of the National Association of Food Chains, said recently that if customers could read the codes they would "tend to buy only the freshest products and that would create monumental waste." If housewives got picky, Adamy says, there would be a substantial increase in costs, hence prices. He feels the stores should be the sole judges of what is fresh enough to market. Should they?

New York Congressman Leonard Farbstein and the District of Columbia Democratic Consumers Action Committee have just completed a survey of stores belonging to the three major chains operating in Washington (Safeway, Giant and A&P). Some of the stores are in poor black neighborhoods, some in principally white suburbs and upper middle class areas. Eighteen stores were monitored. Ten products were watched, including milk, eggs, bread, ground beef and chicken. On the days the survey was conducted all but three of the stores were offering for sale merchandise that was by their own standards too old to sell.

Ignoring code dates, one store manager said he discarded chickens only after they began to smell, "turn reddish or yellowish or when little growths began to appear." Another manager said that when a package of ground beef begins to look too old he "reworks it and repackages it." Only if it looks "too bad" does he throw it in the garbage. A third store manager kicked the survey team out.

One market, during the survey, changed its bread code so that it indicated not the date it was stocked but a date two days hence. One store put too-old beef on sale at half price, while it sold equally antiquated pork (cheaper meat thought to be bought more often by poor customers) at full, original price. Lunch meat in one place was found to be two months past its "pull date." Some meat products were found recoded with new dates after original pull dates had passed. Pork one place had an anticipated life of two days. The same pork in another store was considered saleable for four days.

Although conditions seemed worse in some of the slum stores, there were abuses in all but three of the surveyed supermarkets, in affluent neighborhoods and poor alike. Safeway plans to experiment in certain stores with "open dating" which could be read with understanding by customers as well as supermarket cryptologists. Rep. Farbstein, sensibly, has introduced legislation, cosponsored by 52 members of Congress, that would compel open dating.

[From the Arizona Republic Forum, Apr. 30, 1970]

PROBE INTO THE COMPLEXITIES OF FOOD CODING: BREAD, MILK, AND MEAT

(By Frankie Manley)

The interest in coding of such foods as meat, bread and milk follows a rash of inquiries nationally and locally about the freshness of such foods and the possible need for consumer-protection legislation.

Rep. Leonard Farbstein, D-N.Y., three weeks ago introduced a bill in Congress which would require supermarkets to state the spoilage date on every food item subject to deterioration. (New York law presently requires dating on all milk sold in the state.)

Such a system would do away with the present, rotating "employes-only" code which is purposely created to keep shoppers from knowing or assessing a product's freshness.

Farbstein said two surveys taken by his staff and by the national Democratic Consumer Action Committee indicate that supermarkets "deliberately deceive consumers."

He said many store managers ignore the codes dates on meat and poultry and make personal decisions on when to remove items.

"The food industry appears to hold the belief that ignorance is bliss," Farbstein said.

Phoenix company spokesmen point out codes were devised as a consumer protection measure, a company key to stock rotation. The product has two or three days of use left after the date runs out. If customers knew the code, they'd shuffle the merchandise, always taking the freshest, a county health director said.

In a Women's Forum probe, bread was found in a major market that was a week old—in contradiction to State law which requires bread over three days old to be marked and sold as stale.

This reporter, calling as a consumer, asked Phoenix milk and bread companies for the codes and their interpretation. There is no uniformity of codes and any conformity from company to company is accidental, because one reason for codes, is, as one spokesman said, "to fool the competition."

Local bread companies responded as follows:

Serv-Us Bakers.—"It's company policy not to give out that information."

Sunbeam-Baird.—"We don't give our codes out to the people."

Rainbow.—"We change that code around regularly. I'll tell you the color for tomorrow (Wednesday.) It's blue. We have no more than two colors (of wire closures) on a shelf at a time—to make sure our bread is no older than 24 hours."

Holsum.—"We'll be glad to give you the code: A blue wire closure means the bread was baked Monday; white, Tuesday; red, both Wednesday and Thursday, and green, Friday."

Milk companies were cooperative with the exception of Foremost Milk.

Foremost.—"That information isn't given out. We have one code for Basha's and one for Lucky. Our milk always has five to seven days' life left. We make four deliveries per week."

Sarival.—"The number on the gable of the carton indicates the day of the current month. A number 28 has 8 days left, meaning the company should pick it up May 6."

Meadow Gold.—"The number indicates the day of the current month, but the numbers are far apart, example 1: No. 3, for May 13."

Shamrock.—"ABC hyphenated with a number, skipping the letter I and proceeding through nine more letters of the alphabet. Example: A10 means January 10 is the pick-up date."

Cow Palace.—"The codes change often. I know A was for January, but I don't even

know what letter has been chosen for May. The code, as most are, is imprinted in the gable of the carton."

Carnation.—"We use ABC for January, February and March and then start over with A standing for April, then the day of the month. Example: A10—April 10. This is the pickup date. The milk was processed 10 days prior to this date."

Borden.—"The 02 is for Arizona, the next 2, the plant number and the last number, the day of the current month. Ten days may be subtracted from this number to find the processing date. Example: 02.2—12 means Arizona—Borden Plant No. 2—May 12 (the pickup date.)

The Maricopa County Health Department, the meat inspection division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and other bread and milk companies refused to comment on how perishable foods are dated for shelf-life length.

The complex "codes aren't considered public information," said Dr. Donald Ford, supervisor in the meat inspection division of the USDA.

"Meat freshness is also determined by appearance, unbroken seals and other things," he said.

Robert Greene of Maricopa County Health Department's sanitation division has 27 inspectors, whose number hasn't been increased since 1963.

Besides 6,000 restaurants and 2,200 licensed retail food stores in the county, the same men are responsible for inspecting septic tanks, hotels, motels, meat markets, ice manufacturers, food caterers, warehouses and a variety of other places. The time they have available to check for product freshness is obviously limited.

Greene refused to reveal the food dating codes: "It's a confidential code and is printed to tell the company when stock needs rotating."

"Milk lasts up to 30 days because of a new pasturizing process," Greene said, adding that temperature of 45 degrees F. must be maintained to insure this type of freshness. Routine opening and closing the refrigerator could thus hamper temperature constancy.

"Bread is not really coded," Greene said. "Often companies add vitamins to prolong shelf life. If word got out, customers would shuffle things around and always take the freshest dated product and leave the oldest to die on the shelf."

Larry Sherry, sanitarian in the State Department of Health, said, "We have no copy of food codes and currently have nobody in charge of pure food control."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1970]

FIFTY-FIVE MEMBERS OF HOUSE SPONSOR BILL TO REQUIRE DATING OF PACKAGED FOODS

WASHINGTON.—Fifty-five members of the House joined today in sponsoring a bill to require the "open" dating of packaged foods sold by supermarkets and other retailers.

Each package, under the proposed legislation, would carry the latest date on which the food could be purchased with confidence that it was fit for consumption, assuming it had been stored under proper conditions.

Most packaged food in supermarkets already carries a coded date to guide the store manager. But the codes are meaningless to consumers. The proposed "open" or uncoded dating would give consumers the same information now available to the managers, according to the bill's chief sponsor, Representative Leonard Farbstein, Democrat of Manhattan.

Mr. Farbstein said he was introducing the bill—identical to one that he had filed earlier in the session—to demonstrate broad bipartisan support for the measure. Cosponsors of the new text include 48 Democrats and six Republicans.

"Open dating," he said in reintroducing the measure, "gives consumers personal policing power of the sale of stale food by their local supermarkets. It is self-enforcing."

TWO SURVEYS MADE

Last week, Mr. Farbstein made public reports on two surveys indicating that much out-dated food was being sold in District of Columbia supermarkets. In one store, over $300 worth of stale food, including three-month-old bologna, was discovered. The surveyors were armed with keys to dating codes.

"I believe the same situation exists throughout the country," the Manhattan Representative said. "Surveys are planned for New York and other cities in the near future."

Food industry spokesmen have expressed opposition to uncoded dating on the ground that consumers would buy only the freshest items, leaving others to spoil, and price increases would result.

Backers of the proposal contend that this could be avoided by proper store management, with items rotated from storage areas to display shelves and bins in an orderly manner. Special sales of food nearing the end of its shelf life would be stimulated, possibly resulting in lower prices on the average, they contend.

Dates for each item under the bill would be established by regulation of the Health, Education and Welfare Department. They would be based on industry criteria now used in coded dating.

A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Joseph M. Montoya, Democrat of New Mexico.

FOOD CODE GUIDE TO CLIP

Arthur McBrayer, an announced Democratic candidate for State Senator, District 8-F, has printed the following dating code in a leaflet now being distributed to Arizona housewives.

It has been made available to members of the House and Senate at the request of Bob L'Ecuyer, counsel for the Senate Democratic minority.

Other groups are using the codes in consumer education classes for low-income groups.

The codes match those assembled by Women's Forum staff writer Frankie Manley. McBrayer code was accurate at the time of its April printing.

Bread is coded, in most cases, by color of wire used to close mouth of loaf. Color tells day of week that bread is first offered for sale. Sealed loaves are coded by a capital letter. Colored plastic tab is used on buns.

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
Baird	Red	Black	Orange	Yellow	Blue	White	Orange.
Serv-us (bread)	Black	White	Blue	Pink	Yellow	Green	None.
Servus (sealed items)	T	A	Y	L	E	R	None.
Holsum	Blue	White	None	Red	Green	Yellow	None.
Baird Buns	Pink	Green	None	Yellow	White	White	None.
Orowheat (loaves)	Yellow	None	Red	Green	White	None	Blue.
Orowheat (sealed)	N	L	E	None	D	A	None.
Orowheat (muffins)	Green	None	White	Blue	Yellow	None	Red.

Carnation milk

Capital letter indicating month with numbers for day of month. A15=April 15th; A=Jan; B=Feb; C=Mar; A=Apr; B=May; C=Jun; (repeats etc.) (put on sale about 8 days before pull-date)

Shamrock milk

Capital letter followed by number for day of month. D20=April 20th A=Jan/B=Feb/C=Mar / D=Apr / E=May/ F=Jun/ G=Jul/ H=Aug/J=Sep/K=Oct/L=Nov/M=Dec

Milk put on sale 10 days before pick up date

Cottage cheese on sale 12 days before pick up date (same code)

Sour cream on sale 15 days before pick up date (same code)

Borden milk (half gallons)

First two numbers indicate state, next number is plant number, and last two numbers are pick up date.

EXAMPLE 02209 02 is state, 2 is plant and 09 is pick up date (9th of current month).

Borden (pints, quarts and ½ pints)

1st number is machine number. Capital letter is week of month.

B=1st week; O=2nd week; R=3rd week; D=4th week; and E=part of 5th week. Last number or numbers indicate day in month.

Borden yogurt

A=Jan; B=Feb; etc so on through the alphabet. The numbers show the day of month for pick up.

eg 1C7=pick up on March 17.

Note: All milk cartons are coded for pick up date by numbers and letters impressed into the gable of the carton on the top edge. Most companies use the letters of the alphabet in combination with numbers. All cartons having a small 02-5 in the corner are bottled by Shamrock.

Laura Scudder Products: All coded by day and month using numbers such as 4/20=April 20th.

Jay's frozen desert: 1016=Oct 16th & 420=April 20th etc.

Frito Lay: 112S represents Jan 12 and S is for San Jose plant. 202L represents Feb 2 and L is for Los Angeles, 3-Mar; 4=Apr; etc, thru 9 for Sept. O=Oct; N=Nov; and X=Dec.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, May 4, 1970]

SECRET DATES IN SUPERMARKETS SPOTLIGHTED: CONSUMER-FOOLING CODES MAY SNAP CRACKLE, AND POP

(By Kathleen Rowley)

Some legislators—like most consumers—are fed up with the secret messages being passed in our supermarkets.

In New Jersey, food dating, coding and labeling practices are coming under hard, cold scrutiny.

In Washington, 55 Congressmen already have joined in introducing into the House legislation that would snap, crackle and pop some supermarket secrets wide open.

Their bill—and companion legislation introduced in the Senate—would require that packaged perishable foods be stamped with a "pull" date. This means that consumers would be able to tell at a glance the latest date on which foods should be offered for sale.

Actually, some foods are labeled with that message already—but usually in codes of letters, numbers, colors, and notches which are incomprehensible to the consumer, sometimes even to the supermarket manager.

Some codes vary from food chain to food chain and are often changed, especially when somebody succeeds in cracking them.

What's more, food codes do not always flash the same message. Some codes are pegged to the date a food is packaged, some to the date the food's shelf life should be over.

The legislation introduced into the House with Rep. Leonard K. Farbstein, D-N.Y., as chief sponsor, is linked to the end of shelf

life. If that bill becomes law, the "pull" date will read "May 1" instead of "A–5–1," which to most consumers sounds like sheer gibberish.

In New Jersey, some changes in coding, dating and labeling requirements also may be in the offing.

For one thing, the results of a year-long study of consumer protection methods probably will reach the public eye early next month. The findings are expected to include recommendations to guide New Jersey health officials and legislators.

Now, New Jersey requires dating on only one product—milk—and coding on nothing though it recommends the practice.

Now nearing completion, the Rutgers University study of consumer protection methods may even recommend changing the state's controversial milk dating system, according to Francis A. Timko, chief of the state's Bureau of Food and Drugs.

Under the present system there are two alternatives: Milk may be marked with the actual day of pasteurization, or it may bear an indication that it was pasteurized in the 24-hour period ending 6 a.m. on the particular day. The day may be spelled out or abbreviated in no less than the first three letters.

Under the present system there's plenty of confusion—particularly when a milk company serves customers in other states besides New Jersey.

For example, this happened:

On April 28 a customer in Cherry Hill purchased a carton of Penn Brook milk from a vending machine. The date on the carton was 0502 (May 2). The following date appeared above the following legend:

"In New Jersey pasteurized during the 24 hour period ending 6 a.m. of day stamped on carton."

On April 29 (a Wednesday) the same customer purchased another carton of milk from the same machine. This carton has THU (for Thursday) stamped on the label.

A company spokesman said any one of a number of factors could have caused mix-up, including the fact that Penn Brook dates milk for use not only in New Jersey but in Pennsylvania and Delaware. Most likely, the 0502 is a "pull"—rather than a "pasteurization"—date and the carton bearing it was intended for Pennsylvania, the spokesman suggested.

There are also, according to the spokesman, several possible explanations for the carton marked THU. Among the explanations: the milk may be several days old; or it may have been incorrectly dated.

Other milk industry spokesmen say there are other problems created by New Jersey's milk dating requirements.

They say if a carton is marked "THU," you can't tell whether it was pasteurized last Thursday, or the Thursday before that, or the Thursday before that . . .

New Jersey milk processors would like to see the use of a yearly code of numbers ranging from 1 to 366 indicating on which date the milk was processed (with 1 standing for Jan. 1 and 365—or 366 if it's Leap Year—for Dec. 31.)

New Jersey once had that system. The state discarded it a couple of years ago because consumers complained they had to have calendars at hand to interpret the numbers.

The milk producers' second choice according to Dan Wettlin Jr., executive vice president of the New Jersey Milk Industry Association, is a system of numbers ranging from 1 to 31—with 24, standing for May 24.

There are some legislators who would like to see still another change in the way milk is marked in New Jersey.

A bill introduced into the Assembly three months ago would require that the pasteurization day on milk caps, tags, or labels be "legibly marked in dark ink."

This, explains Timko, would make it easier for consumers to read the milk pasteurization day. The way the date is stamped now, it's often difficult to see it.

Another consumer protection Assemblyman John J. Horn and James J. Florio, of District 3-D (covering parts of Camden County) and Paul Poliscastro of District 11-A (covering parts of Essex County) would make a change in frozen food labeling.

The bill would forbid retail sales of foods which have been frozen and thawed—unless the container or package bears a label stating: "This article of food was frozen and permitted to thaw."

If the bill becomes law, says * * * protected from deception. They will not be fooled into buying thawed fish fillets or thawed Thanksgiving turkeys thinking they are fresh products. Consumers would also, says Timko, be better protected because they would know that the fillets and the turkeys had been frozen and thawed—and therefore should not be refrozen.

Among consumer protection bills introduced into the 1970 legislature in New Jersey is one which would make state requirements and standards regulating processing, packaging, storage, and sale of food supercede conflicting local standards. This, says Timko, would prevent the proliferation of different good standards.

Practical politicians say this bill has more chance of passing than the others. The bill is sponsored by Assemblyman Harold C. Hollenback, a North Jersey Republican.

All three measures now are before the Assembly's committee on air, water pollution and public health.

Backers of the federal measure hope, says Ellis Levin, Farbstein's legislative assistant, that it will pass this year.

Though the Nixon administration to date has taken no stand on the bill, the legislation has, says Levin, both Democrat and Republican backers.

The bill's co-sponsors include 48 Democrats and six Republicans. Support for the measure, says Levin, is mounting. But, he adds, in Washington one can "hope" for but not "expect" a bill's passage.

The Farbstein bill (identical to one he introduced last November) now is before the House subcommittee on commerce and finance. A companion bill, introduced by Sen. Joseph D. Montoya, D-N.M., is also in the subcommittee stage. Hearings on the consumer protection proposal, says Levin, will probably start first in the Senate.

If the bill becomes law one major compromise affecting canned goods may be made in it.

Processors, explains Levin, say canned food has a long shelf life and that the condition of the can has a lot to do with food quality and safety.

Some experts also say temperatures at which foods are kept often are more important than ages.

Under the Farbstein bill, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare would establish expiration dates for each of the regulated foods. These regulations for foods which deteriorate rapidly would be based on standards now used for coded dating.

Many food industry spokesmen long have opposed use of codes and dates comprehensible to consumers. They say buyers would purchase only the freshest foods, passing up older foods that still are of good quality.

Waste would result, say these spokesmen, and the cost of the waste would be passed on in higher prices to consumers.

Levin counters with this argument: The real price of food is, he says, higher than the price marked on it.

Suppose, he suggests, you buy a food item for ten cents. Suppose that a third of the time you have to throw that food out because of lack of freshness. You are then paying, he says, more than you think you are for the food that actually reaches your table.

In Levin's opinion, you'll actually pay less in the long run if you buy the item for 11 cents and can count on its freshness.

In Farbstein's opinion, outdated foods are being sold in some supermarkets throughout the nation!

The Congressman and his legislative assistant point to two surveys recently conducted in supermarkets in the District of Columbia.

One survey, done by the D.C. Central Democratic Committee, covered 18 stores operated by three major chains. Safeway, Giant, A&P. Teams of women shoppers, armed with keys to codes, purchased ten items in each store.

The shoppers, says Levin, found that in all but three of the stores at least one of the ten items was being sold beyond the date the stores' own codes indicated sales should be halted.

The second survey, conducted by Farbstein's own staff, involved five stores. During that survey, Levin "personally" found an estimated $300 worth of "stale food—meat, poultry, cold cuts." In one store, says Levin, he found A&P chain bologna with a "pull" date of Feb. 5 on sale on April 4.

"The bologna," says Levin, "was all white."

To prevent such incidents, Farbstein has introduced the consumer protection legislation.

According to his legislative assistant, the Manhattan congressman is also mapping other strategy.

Farbstein will, says Levin, take his case against coded dating of food to the Federal Trade Commission.

The core of the case, according to Levin:

Coded food dating is a deceptive practice. It deceives the consumer about food freshness.

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1970]

TRYING TO CRACK THE "FRESHNESS" CODE IN GROCERY STORES

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

Cracking the codes printed on perishable foods in the grocery store requires more than the skill of a cryptographer.

Not all the numbers and/or letters are decipherable by the store manager himself. As in the case of processed meats, the codes are placed there by the packager who knows what colorings and preservatives his brand of bologna contains and makes an educated guess how long they will keep it fresh.

Instead of printing a "pull date" to notify the store manager when to remove the item from sale, the packager may have used a "push date."

The "push date" tells the store when the item left the packager and entered into trade. But then again, it may represent the date the packager guessed in advance the item would arrive in the meat counter of a particular store. This is the store manager's clue as to how long it has lain there.

But this is only one type of coding.

The big chain grocery stores have various methods of coding their own brands of perishables, and the coding varies from store to store within a chain.

In one meat counter, cold cuts might be marked 0424, meaning that April 24 is the last safe date to sell the package without running the risk that it will spoil before it is used in the home within a reasonable time.

At another, cold cuts might bear a four-digit designation, 2242. This also means April 24 is as late as the store should continue to offer the item for sale. The outside numbers are added to get 4 for the fourth

month, April. The interior numbers represent the day, 24.

There may also be letters representing days of the week, months of the year, or years of the decade. (In case of longer lasting foods, such as bottled salad dressing, "A" represents 1970, the start of this decade.)

Other letters simply designate the packer.

Bread may be dated on the sticker at the end of the loaf with 1 for Monday, 2 for Tuesday, or with letters, not necessarily spelling anything intelligible to the buyer. Again, the color of the twist that ties the wrapper will indicate the day the bread was first put on sale; red for Monday, etc.

The shelf expiration date of cottage cheese is usually stamped on the lid. Often the shopper is lucky enough to find it in readable form. The date on the cardboard carton of milk is less legible. It is usually embossed at the top, and may very well be white on white.

Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D-N.Y.) thinks it is important for the buyer, from a standpoint of safety as well as family finances, to be able to read the code. He has introduced a bill to require packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption as food. This is called "open date coding."

Surveyors from his office and from the Democratic Central Committee visited chain grocery stores here and found many foods that were over the hill as far as codes were concerned.

Worse, they found a common practice of repackaging chicken and putting on a new code label. Some of the chicken had been soaked in a solution to freshen its appearance. One way to tell it from the fresher poultry was that it bore no U.S. Department of Agriculture seal.

They also found repackaged meats, from which unattractive parts had been trimmed before new code dates were added.

They think they have proof that nearly obsolete food is ending up at ghetto stores—and not at reduced prices.

The chain-store grocers claim that spoiled goods seldom seep through to the consumer. They say that the cost of "open date coding" (Exp. 4–24–70) for all of the thousands of perishable items they sell would increase food prices. At a HEW employees' session Wednesday, one of them likened it to using atomic power "to squash a mosquito."

[From the Long Island Press, May 16, 1970]

"FRESH GROCERIES" MAY BE ANYTHING BUT

(By Patricia Agnew)

WASHINGTON.—Those "fresh" groceries you just purchased may include:

Eight-day-old milk.

Chicken repackaged several times but considered edible because it has not yet turned green or begun to sprout growths.

Month-old processed meat.

Re-ground ground beef that wasn't picked up the first time around but offered once again at regular prices because it didn't smell too bad.

Alarmed consumer groups report that all of these abuses—and many more—are common in the chain grocery stores where most housewives, concerned about getting quality food at reasonable prices, do their shopping.

Under current practices of monitoring the freshness of perishable foods, even the most careful consumer has little or no way to avoid them.

Most perishable foods contain freshness codes purportedly designed to advise store employes when an item is unfit to be sold for human consumption.

But evidence is mounting that the confusing array of codes is deliberately contrived to hide the true age of a spoilable food item from the consumer, to permit the packager to make "educated guesses" about the lifespan of his product and to allow retail store employes to do as they wish.

A bipartisan "open dating" bill, introduced by Rep. Leonard Farbstein, D–N.Y., and co-sponsored by 58 House members, would give the confused consumer a fighting chance, its supporters believe.

The Farbstein bill, to be taken up in hearings this summer, would require that perishable food contain a package label specifying simply and clearly the date after which it must not be sold for human consumption.

It practically takes the skill of a cryptographer to get that information today.

Three surveys—two in Washington, D.C., and another in the Chicago area—have uncovered a variety of freshness codes in common use. Many of these change as rapidly as the public "gets on" to them.

Some codes indicate the date of spoilage as determined by the market (the "pull" date), while others were assigned by the packager as his estimate of when the product would get to the store and how long it would last (the "push" date).

In one Washington chain store, milk was coded "406"—which meant the fourth month, sixth day, or an April 6 "pull" date. At another grocery on April 2 "pull" date was indicated by the code "0402."

One grocery used colored plastic ties on loaves of bread to indicate the day they were baked. On the week a survey team visited, a red tie meant Monday or Thursday, white Tuesday and Friday and blue Wednesday and Saturday.

"Contrary to consumers' popular belief that bread is delivered fresh in the morning and sold by evening," the team said, "it was learned that bread is considered a two-day item, and that bread delivered any morning is considered fresh until the close of business the following day."

The "pull" dates of cottage cheese at two stores were variously labeled "406" (April 6) and "0405" (April 5).

One of the D.C. surveys was conducted by staff members for Farbstein and the other, a more extensive investigation of 18 chain stores, by the democratic consumer action committee of the D.C. Democratic Central Committee.

The D.C. Central Committee concluded that the codes overall "are clearly designed to prevent the ordinary housewife from ascertaining when products should have been removed from the shelf.'"

That study found from one to five of the 10 basic product lines surveyed—milk, eggs, cottage cheese, ground beef, pork chops, chicken, bologna, hot dogs, national brand sausage and bread—to be out of date in 15 of the 18 stores.

Further, the survey team found the freshness of some food products, especially poultry, subject to the guess of the store manager.

"One manager," the survey team reported, "referring to all types of meat, stated that he daily looks at the meat and pulls whatever does not look good. When his attention was called to some greenish tinted meat, he admitted to not having inspected the meat that day.

"This same manager stated that he did not reduce the price of ground beef—if he thinks it is bad he pulls it out of the case, reworks it, and re-packages it. 'If it's too bad' he throws it away."

Other findings included a store that did not code its meat or poultry at all and several store managers who ignored coded dates and substituted their own judgments of freshness.

The Farbstein bill would have the Department of Health, Education and Welfare determine the safe lifespan of perishable foods.

A legislative aide to the congressman said the only objection from the food packaging industry was that the bill would encourage shoppers to select only the freshest products, even though many foods can last several days and weeks.

"The way we see it, the aide said, "if a store manager is doing his job, he'll be rotating his foods to maintain freshness anyway. The bill would only cause trouble to the lazy manager who is not doing his job.

"We think the bill would encourage store managers to offer older foods at lower prices."

He said Farbstein was "confident" the measure would become law. The mail response has been "extremely favorable," he said.

"We got a letter the other day from a lady in New Orleans," he added. "She said she had just bought a jar of baby food and found out it had been manufactured in 1961."

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, June 4, 1970]

F08 3163 2W OV 3S: TO CRACK THE GROCERY CODE. YOU HAVE TO LEARN THE ALPHABET

(By Irene Nolan)

Nearly every item in a supermarket has a code stamped on it—a series of numbers and/or letters that have nothing to do with the price or weight.

The codes are put there by the manufacturer, the distributor or the store for their own information. They tell them what a lot of consumers would like to know—when the meat was packaged, whether the cottage cheese (or the milk or sour cream) is at the beginning, near the end or past its shelf life.

Some codes indicate the "pull date," the day the item should be removed from the shelf, others represent the packaging date. Grocery industry representatives maintain that how to read the codes should be known only to them. And in the case of many canned goods, the store manager does not know what the code means. Periodically he receives a list of code numbers from the manufacturer telling him which cans to take off the shelf.

"They (the customers) tear up things bad enough now," said the manager of a Louisville A&P store. "If they could read the codes they would tear the whole stack up to find the freshest."

And a representative of the National Association of Food Chains in Washington said that if the codes were general knowledge, food prices might go up. The consumer would choose the freshest items, which would lead to increased spoilage and higher prices, he said.

There are no laws or regulations governing how long an item may remain on the store shelf.

The consumer is protected, said several store managers, because stock boys or deliverymen rotate the items and remove the items with expired code dates. In this age of advanced processing and storing, there is little danger of spoilage, and, they say, the customer can always return the item and get it replaced or get her money back.

SHOPPERS WANT TO KNOW

But most grocery shoppers would like to have a clue as to how old a product is when they buy it, particularly the more perishable dairy items and meat. This helps them determine how long they can safely keep it after they get it home.

The codes can provide that clue, and I set out to find out how to read them.

I visited 16 supermarkets, including Kroger, A&P, and Winn-Dixie, GES, A Mart, and Giant. Some stores were visited twice. I began at the meat counters.

At the Kroger stores, I found meat to be stamped with a number and then a letter.

I visited the Kroger store on a Tuesday and the meat was stamped 1M and 1T. It seemed safe to assume that the meat had been cut on Monday and Tuesday. I asked

an authoritative looking figure in a white apron if this were the case. He confirmed the theory so I felt safe asking him about the numbers.

He said that Kroger divides the year into periods. The weeks in each period are numbered 1, 2, 3, etc. Thus 3W would mean the meat was cut on Wednesday of the third week of that period. A package stamped 2S, would indicate the meat had been cut on the previous Saturday.

I meant to ask how many weeks were in each period, but at this point he was beginning to look suspicious so I thanked him and left. I found the same system of coding in five other Kroger stores in the Louisville area.

Next was the A&P. The first store I visited had three numbers on its packaged meat. It was Tuesday and the majority of the meat was coded 023. I just rang for the butcher and asked what the numbers meant.

The butcher was very obliging. He told me the second number was the day of the week and the last number was the person who weighed it. He didn't tell me about the first number and I didn't push my luck.

At another A&P I found only one number on the package. This was just the day of the week—1 for Monday, 2 for Tuesday, etc. At another store I found two numbers on the package. The first, the butcher said, was the day of the week and the second was the person who weighed the package.

Winn-Dixie has a tough code to crack . . . and some secretive butchers. Finally I did find a butcher who was willing to share his secrets.

The days of the week are represented by the letters S T O P V X for Monday through Saturday. The weeks of each period are also lettered S T O P V X. Thus Monday of the first week of a given period would be SS. Tuesday of the same week would be ST.

The butcher also volunteered that the distributor stamps his own code on some of the chicken. This code is just a date such as 29 for May 29. He said the packer guarantees the chickens for eight days after arrival in the store, but he wouldn't recommend I keep it that long at home.

A Mart codes its meat in the same way that the A&P stores do. At Giant, an employe told me that 100 was for the first day of the week, Monday, 200 for Tuesday, through 600 for Saturday.

Among the stores visited, GES has the most confusing meat code. I couldn't see a pattern nor could I find a cooperative employe. When a code is uncrackable, it seems a good bet to look at the code on the hamburger, which you can see being freshly ground, and then choose meat with a similar code date.

At the groceries with prepackaged produce, I usually found the same code used for the meat applies to the produce. However, at Giant a stock boy said the produce is marked with the month and the day it was put on the shelf. Apples with a 525 on them meant they were put up for sale on May (fifth month) 25.

At all stores, luncheon meat, bacon, and hot dogs seemed to be stamped with a series of either three or four numbers. To crack most of the four-number codes, add the first and last numbers for the month. The middle numbers are the day of the month. A package of Fischer's luncheon meat stamped 2293, for example, would be May 29. The numbers 3013 on a package would be June 1. With three-number codes, the first number was usually the month and the last two the day of the month. For example, 611 would be June 11.

Clerks at several stores said that these numbers were the pull date or date that the luncheon meat should come off the shelf. However a spokesman for the Fischer Packing Company said that the numbers actually represent the last day that the company will guarantee the vacuum container in which the meat is packed. On the 2293 meat, the company guarantees the vacuum from the day it goes on the shelf until May 29. After that date, he said the store is on its own. The meat will remain fresh in the vacuum for many months, the spokesman added.

A merchandiser for the Kroger Company said that in the Louisville area, most retail grocers buy items with "guarantees." That is, if the product becomes outdated it is returned to the manufacturer. In some cases, items reaching the end of their shelf lives are reduced for quicker sale—especially baked goods, produce, and meat.

DAIRY COUNTER IS EASIER

At the dairy counters, most of the codes are easier to figure out. For example, the milk code is usually at the very top of the waxed carton. It is not in ink, but colorlessly embossed and usually hard to read. One side has a long series of numbers, and the other side has two or three numbers.

The long series, one clerk said, is "the plant where it was processed or something." The shorter series is of more interest. In the case of most of the milk it is the date the milk should be pulled from the case. For example June 5 could be just 5, 05, or 6 05.

Such products as sour cream and cottage cheese are also in most cases stamped with a pull date. Sealtest stamps its products on the bottom 5 15, meaning May 15 the item should be removed. Kroger stamps it on the top. A code date of E 15, a clerk in one Kroger store said, means that that item should be removed on the morning of May 15. A&P codes are just a date on the bottom, such as 26 for May 26.

A clerk at one A&P store said that the number stamped on the cheese was the day it was made. But, she said, don't worry about it. The manufacturer sends lists periodically of which packages should be pulled. Some cartons of eggs and refrigerated biscuits or coffee cake mixes are legibly stamped with an easily read code, such as May 29.

The bakery products at the A&P are plainly marked with the day the item was baked. Other stores and bakers mark their bread with a different color sticker or plastic twister for closing for each day of the week. For example, the twisters on the end of Rainbo bread are red, white, blue, green, yellow and orange for Monday through Saturday.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, June 4, 1970]

OPEN CODES WOULD HELP CONSUMERS

After I had learned to read some of these codes, I began taking note of how old the items in the cases really were. For the most part, no store had an abundance of items with expired codes, but at each store I found some items that should have been pulled. In each case, I pointed out the item to a clerk, who studied the numbers and then apologetically began removing the items.

In almost all stores, most of the meat in the cases had been cut that day. However, in all of them, there was meat that was several days old—sometimes four or five days old.

The one exception was a Kroger store in the western part of Louisville. It was a Thursday, May 21. There were perhaps a dozen pieces of meat coded 1 Th, meaning it had been cut fresh that day. Most of the beef was 1W, and most of the pork was coded 1M and 1T. Also there seemed to be a larger number of expired dairy products than in other stores. I asked a clerk if the products were outdated. He said they were and began removing them as I left.

The manager of this store was later contacted by telephone. He had no comment.

In fact, most of the local store managers when contacted for their comments on outdated items or codes in general had no comment.

Those who did comment, attributed outdated items to carelessness.

"We're not always perfect, but we try to be," one manager said.

To help the consumer know how long she may keep a product, some consumer organizations advocate a system of open coding in grocery stores. Open coding means that the codes would be written in plain English.

WANTS FRESHNESS KNOWN

Mrs. Oscar Sowards, chairman of Gov. Louie Nunn's Commission on Consumer Affairs, said that the commission has been planning to take up the matter of codes for some time and probably will soon. However, she said, she is in favor of open coding so that the "freshness will be spelled out clearly for the consumer." She said she believes this information is vital to the consumer.

Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D–NY) has introduced a bill in the Congress that includes provisions for a system of open coding that would use the product's pull date. The bill was introduced last November and re-introduced in April. It has 59 cosponsors, and hearings are pending.

Ellis Levin, the congressman's legislative assistant, said that a survey of the major food chains in Washington showed a large amount of food being sold beyond the expiration date of the code."

Levin said that most abuses took place in stores in poverty neighborhoods. In the stores serving middle class areas, he said, the codes had four, five, or six days left. In the low-income areas, the items had zero shelf life (day of expiration) or were out of date.

Levin said that several European countries already have open coding and the system is working successfully. He doesn't feel such a system would cause prices to rise.

This is not necessarily so, says Kemp Christensen, vice-president of the National Association of Food Chains. The association, he said, is not "opposing" the open coding bill. It is just trying to raise some questions about the feasibility of such coding.

"If you put in open codes, the customers would take the very freshest. There would be a certain amount of loss due to pawing over of items. Older items wouldn't sell as well. There would be extra cost involved, and we think the customer might have to pay. We are asking: 'Is it worth it in light of the quality of product the customer gets now?' "

REFUNDS ARE GIVEN

Christensen said that most stores are eager to please customers and keep their business. This means, he said, most managers are careful about code dates and willing to give refunds for spoiled merchandise.

Most codes do take into account, he said, that there has to be a shelf life after purchase for the customer. For example, if milk is coded to expire June 5, that date takes into account that the milk might be in a home refrigerator for a time after that date.

Shelby Johnson, director of environmental services for the state Department of Agriculture, said that there are no state regulations governing codes or the length of time a product may remain on the shelf. A. P. Bell, director of environmental services for the Louisville-Jefferson County Department of Health, said that before pasteurization Louisville did have a law regulating the shelf life of dairy products. With improved processing methods, he said, there was no longer any need for such a law.

Johnson said that with the better quality product, better marketing, and better distribution there is no need for legislation governing codes.

Levin says that the outlook for the open coding bill is very good. Christensen says that consumers "should put the pressure on the merchants, not the legislators."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, July 10, 1970]

JEWEL DECODES SYSTEMS FOR DATING FOOD

(By Camille Jilke)

Jewel Food Stores announced Thursday it will translate the codes that food companies use to indicate the freshness of a product.

Joseph F. Grimes, Jewel's vice president of sales, said customers would be able to determine for themselves whether food was outdated. He said Jewel would discard any outdated food customers found.

An aide to Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D-N.Y.), who has introduced legislation that would require simple dates, said Jewel is the first major food-store chain in the nation to translate the codes for customers.

Grimes said the codes of some of the most popular items in the fresh meats, processed meats, dairy and snack departments will be explained on signs in the stores.

He said books listing the codes of all products sold at Jewel will be available to use at customer service desks.

The codes indicate to retail stores the date a food product was manufactured or the date it should be taken off the shelf.

For example, a Nabisco pretzel box that has "1L103" written on it was manufactured by shift 1 at plant L on the 103d day of the year, or April 13.

For Jewel Maid bread with "kwik-lok" seals, the color of the seal indicates the day of delivery.

The symbol "0057" on a Hillfarm milk carton means the milk should be taken off the shelf at midnight on the fifth (05) day (middle two digits) of the month in Chicago or the seventh (07) day (first and fourth digits) in the suburbs.

At a press conference at Jewel headquarters, in Melrose Park, Grimes said Jewel has strictly observed the codes even though they were unknown by the public.

Grimes said he did not expect translation of the codes to result in the sales of only the freshest merchandise.

Farbstein's proposed legislation would require labels on all food that could deteriorate to have clear letters and numbers announcing the last day the item would be safe to sell.

Ellis Levin, Farbstein's legislative assistant, said the legislation would cost nothing to enforce because consumers would enforce it.

Levin said his investigation showed outdated food is sold throughout the country to all socio-economic levels.

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1970]

BREAKING THE FOOD CODE SYSTEM

(By Peter Weaver)

Wouldn't it be nice if the bacon or cottage cheese you buy had this vital information printed on the package: not for sale after—July 24.

As you may already know, the removal date is printed on most food packages but it's in code. I broke a number of these codes in a column last year, hoping it would bring some action.

Unfortunately, the number and complexity of the code systems are increasing. The most common one, used by members of the American Meat Institute and others, employs four numbers such as 3244. You add the outside numbers to get "7" which stands for the seventh month, July. The two inside numbers "24" stand for the 24th day—July 24.

Some companies use the number of the day of the year which would make "205" into July 24. Others use letters for months—A for January, G for July. Still others use color codes on packages or make little marks over their brand name letter to indicate removal dates. The list is endless.

There are some faint signs of hope, however. Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal (D-N.Y.), chairman of a special consumer inquiry on the House Government Operations Committee, has collected an extraordinary pile of detailed, coded date systems from some 20 major food processors. He's preparing to launch a national survey, probably to be done by Department of Agriculture shoppers, to see how well—or how poorly—our food dating and marketing system is working.

Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D.-N.Y.) introduced a bill last fall which would require food removal dates marked in plain English. The bill has been stymied so Farbstein has asked the Federal Trade Commission to take direct action.

State legislatures in California, Delaware, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York have all been bombarded with bills proposing that food dates be plainly marked. No laws yet, but pressure for "open" food dating is mounting.

Theoretically, supermarket or packer employees are supposed to police counters and shelves to remove products which have gone beyond coded removal dates. Sometimes this works, sometimes it doesn't. If consumers had a chance to see plainly marked removal dates, they could take over much of this policing job themselves.

Almost all the food companies are opposed to the "open" dating idea. They claim consumers would always pick products with the latest date, letting perfectly usable food go to waste. According to a top USDA food plant inspector, the companies could solve this problem with "block dating" and a system of discounts by dates.

On highly perishable items such as poultry and meats, for example, Monday and Tuesday packing dates could be lumped into a system with one "block" removal date. This would be continued through the week. On less perishable items, even a week's production might safely be lumped into one removal date.

Food companies usually put on removal dates to give the consumer anywhere from a few days to two weeks use of the product even if it's bought on the last day before removal.

A bacon processor, for example, knows his product is good for, say, 30 days after packing. So, using block dating, he would put a removal date on three days' production for 23 days from the first day's production. This gives plenty of flexibility for his marketing system and still protects the customer.

In the store, when a customer is faced with the choice of two or more plainly marked removal dates on packages of bacon, the discount system could be used. If the customer wants to use the bacon over a period of two weeks, then the package with the latest removal date could be selected at the regular price or even a premium price.

If the customer knew that the bacon would be used within the next couple of days, then an earlier dated package (one nearer the removal date) could be selected because the price would be lower.

With education and promotion, this system of plainly marked food dates would give us a choice based on our needs and would insure that our food can be readily used before it spoiled. At least one major supermarket chain will soon try this kind of plainly marked food dating on an experimental basis. Hopefully, others will follow.

MRS. HELEN ROGERS REID

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I take note of the death of Helen Rogers Reid. Mrs. Reid was a great lady and a great American.

I will not take the time of the Members to recount the facts of her long and full life and many achievements, which were duly recorded in the New York Times article which I shall append at the end of my remarks.

I do want to express to the members of her family, including particularly her sons, our colleague, the gentleman from New York and Mr. Whitelaw Reid, both of whom have been my friends for many years, the profound sympathy of my wife and myself. The end of a life is never easy to accept, even when it comes, as in this case, many years after the allotted Biblical span.

I have only the fondest personal recollections of Mrs. Reid. Among her many active interests was her great involvement in the activities of young people. Mrs. Reid twice gave me the opportunity to serve as an occasional correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, a very great newspaper, writing articles for the Sunday edition on youth movements in Germany, Italy, and the Soviet Union in 1935, and on conditions in Japanese-occupied China in 1938.

Helen Rogers Reid will be sorely missed by a host of friends in New York and around the world.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1970]

MRS. OGDEN REID IS DEAD AT 87; EX-PRESIDENT OF HERALD TRIBUNE

Mrs. Helen Rogers Reid, former president of The New York Herald Tribune, died of arteriosclerosis yesterday at her home, 834 Fifth Avenue.

Mrs. Reid, who was 87 years old, was the widow of Ogden Reid, president of The Herald Tribune until his death in 1947.

In her 37 years on The Herald Tribune and its predecessor, The Tribune, Mrs. Reid was an unflamboyant but powerful force in the newspaper world and in the city's civic and social life.

Her business acumen, first displayed as an advertising salesman, and her editorial judgment, in making the paper attractive to women and suburban readers, helped to transform The Herald Tribune into a modern newspaper.

Entering journalism as a byproduct of her marriage to Ogden Mills Reid, whose father, Whitelaw, had acquired The Tribune from Horace Greeley, its founder, Mrs. Reid gradually established herself as a newspaper personality in her own right. Never overtly aggressive, she won her reputation by quiet tenacity, dowagerlike charm, and a clear and orderly mind.

There was little in Mrs. Reid's appearance to suggest the influence she wielded, nor the force of her character. She stood only an inch over 5 feet; and she looked as fragile as a piece of expensive china. Her hair, at first brown, then gray and later white, was a fine soft fuzz that curled close to her head. Her large green eyes, however, were alert and probing. According to advertising salesmen who dealt with her, they could be quite unnerving.

In dress Mrs. Reid was feminine but not fancy. Her taste ran to bright colors, with various shades of purple predominant. Day in and day out she wore a plain beret-like hat embellished with pearls, a diamond clip, sequins, flower petals or feathers.

Although she was pleasant and informal in conversation in the office or at dinner, her talk did not run much to chit-chat, and she did not encourage it in others for long. For many years Mrs. Reid included her editors and columnists at luncheons, dinners and

weekend parties she gave for guests notable in national and world affairs.

A gathering might include a Presidential aspirant, an international statesman, a best-selling author, an economist, an editor and a few couples from the Reids' social circle on the upper East Side. With dessert, Mrs. Reid would swizzle a glass of champagne with a piece of melba toast and throw out a general question on current affairs.

DINERS SUMMONED TO SPEAK

Going around the table, she would call on the diners, one by one, for their views. According to one account of these affairs, some gave their opinions seated, but a number were wont to rise and address Mrs. Reid as though she were a public meeting.

Mrs. Reid's interest in the political and economic forces that shaped the world about her was reflected in the establishment, in 1930, of The Herald Tribune's annual Forum on Current Problems. Although the Forum was at first a promotional device aimed at clubwomen, it was expanded to include the public generally.

With Mrs. William Brown Meloney, the Forum director for many years, Mrs. Reid took a hand in choosing and obtaining prominent speakers, many of them from abroad. She presided at the big sessions in the Waldorf-Astoria, and published the proceedings in a special supplement for high school and college students.

Mrs. Reid's own politics were Republican, but the forums were nonpartisan and dispassionate presentations of world news and issues. They were discontinued after 1955, for emphasis on the paper's Youth Forum.

At The Herald Tribune Mrs. Reid raised her voice for moderate Republicanism and for internationalism. In 1952 she supported Dwight D. Eisenhower for the Presidency; she had backed Thomas E. Dewey in 1948.

Mrs. Reid was a leader in civic affairs. She served for nine years as chairman of the board of trustees of Barnard College, her alma mater. A dormitory built in 1963 with funds she helped to raise is named for her. She was a trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. She was active in the New York Newspaperwomen's Club, and she was president of the Reid Foundation, established by her husband in 1946 to give fellowships to journalists for study and travel abroad.

NEEDY CHILDREN HELPED

Another of Mrs. Reid's civic interests was her newspaper's Fresh Air Fund, which raised public contributions to send needy children to summer camps and homes in the country.

As a society figure Mrs. Reid was far less formidable than her mother-in-law, a vigorous matriarch who died in 1931. Mrs. Reid's style in entertaining was informal—and indefatigable. There was a constant round of guests at her 15 East 84th Street apartment, a 30-room Ophir Cottage in Purchase, N.Y., at a summer place in the Adirondacks and at a hunting lodge in North Carolina.

To those who sought to assay her career, Mrs. Reid appeared as a Cinderella who became Queen Helen. She was born in Appleton, Wis., on Nov. 23, 1882, the youngest of 11 children of Benjamin Talbot Rogers and Sarah Louise Johnson Rogers. Her father died when she was 3. Although the family was not poverty stricken, she was obliged to earn part of her way through boarding school and then through Barnard, which she entered in 1899.

EARNED DEGREE IN ZOOLOGY

She enrolled to study Latin and Greek and perhaps to become a teacher, but she shifted her interest in zoology and took her degree in that. She established a reputation among her classmates as a crisp, attractive, enterprising girl who could even turn a profit on the senior yearbook. The class poet summed her up in this quatrain:

We love little Helen, her heart is so warm
And if you don't cross her she'll do you no harm.
So don't contradict her, or else if you do
Get under the table and wait till she's through.

In June 1903, when Helen Rogers received her Bachelor of Arts degree, she heard that Mrs. Whitelaw Reid, one of the city's grande dames, was seeking a social secretary. She applied, was accepted and went to work in the Reid's sumptuous Florentine fortress on Madison Avenue, across from St. Patrick's Cathedral. Mrs. Reid, who had a dinner table seating 80 people and the wealth to festoon it with elegant viands, never lacked for social engagements; a secretary to handle this facet of her life had few idle moments.

SECRETARY FOR 8 YEARS

Helen Rogers was in Mrs. Reid's employ for eight years, dividing her time between the United States and London, where Whitelaw Reid was Ambassador to the Court of St. James's from 1905 to his death in 1912. During this time she met the Reid's only son, Ogden Mills Reid, fresh out of Yale. The couple were married in Wisconsin March 14, 1911.

Tall, handsome, genial and convivial, Oggie Reid was deeply interested in swimming, tennis, shooting and sailing—activities in which his wife learned to excel by putting her mind to them.

She at first took only a passing interest in The Tribune, which her husband inherited on his father's death. In the first six years of her married life she devoted herself to her children, Whitelaw, Elisabeth, who died in childhood, and Ogden. Her chief outside concern was women's suffrage. She helped raise $500,000 for suffrage campaigns in New York.

"When I was at Barnard, working my way through," she explained later, "the necessity for complete independence of women was borne in on me."

JOINED PAPER IN 1918

Mrs. Reid's newspaper career began in 1918, when she became an advertising solicitor for the palsied Tribune, into which the Reid family was reported to have poured $15-million since 1898. "Come down to the office," Ogden Reid asked his wife, "and work the paper's success out with me." Within two months she was its advertising manager, a post she held under slightly different titles on The Herald Tribune until she became its president in 1947.

Immensely loyal to the Reid name and eager to make The Tribune a great, self-supporting paper, Mrs. Reid channeled enormous energy into advertising salesmanship. Between 1918 and 1923 the paper, competing in the morning field with The Times, The World, The American and The Herald, more than doubled its linage.

Then and later she was relentless in pursuit of space buyers.

"She had the persistence of gravity," an associate once remarked. She called on advertisers or had them to luncheon. Banter, deft flattery and an array of voluminous and precise facts constituted her arguments.

ADVERTISING STAFF DRIVEN

She was as unsparing of the paper's other ad solicitors as she was of herself. "You get so you sneak up the back stairs rather than confess you're not a wonder boy," a member of her harried but admiring staff once said.

On The Herald Tribune in the nineteen-thirties and forties, Mrs. Reid was accustomed to hold advertising staff meetings on Mondays at 9 A.M. sharp to get an accounting of each salesman's work. At one point she presided from a platform decorated with a cardboard apple tree and red cardboard apples. Each apple represented an account the paper was seeking.

She called up the salesmen by turn, and whenever one announced a new account she would remove the appropriate cardboard apple from the tree with a ceremonious flourish to the accompaniment of the assemblage's applause.

By means of this and other encouragements to salesmanship, including at one time impromptu choral singing, Mrs. Reid kept the advertising flowing in. For her doggedness and for her conviction that The Herald Tribune was the finest advertising medium in the city she was much admired by her sales staff.

INFLUENCE ON PAPER STRONG

Mrs. Reid had a pervasive influence on the paper's news and editorial content, although its precise demarcations were a matter of speculation.

One story is that Mrs. Reid once protested to her husband about a news article and that he retorted:

"Helen, will you get the hell back to your department and run it while I run mine."

She is said to have departed meekly.

Mrs. Reid always denied the story. "In the first place," she once explained to an interviewer, "my husband wouldn't speak to me that way. In the second, I wouldn't leave meekly. Besides, nothing like that ever happened."

Actually, when Mrs. Reid put her mind to it, she usually got her way. One exception was in trying to make the paper dry during Prohibition. On this point her husband was unyielding.

SPURNED DEAL FOR HERALD

Mrs. Reid's editorial presence was felt especially after The Tribune, at her prompting, acquired Frank Munsey's Herald in a $5-million deal in 1924.

Shortly after the purchase, The Herald Tribune moved uptown from Nassau Street to quarters at 230 West 41st Street, and began to expand its news coverage and increase its circulation.

Mrs. Reid was generally credited with being responsible for its concentration on the suburban, middle-class field of circulation. She frequently suggested story ideas and advised on coverage of others. The paper devoted, under her stimulus, much space to the news of gardening and allied interests of suburban dwellers and women.

STAFF MEMBERS RECRUITED

Mrs. Reid's influence was also reflected in the appointment of the late Mrs. Irita Van Doren as editor of Books, the Sunday literary supplement, and of the late Mrs. Meloney as editor of This Week, the Sunday fiction and articles supplement. She added the late Dorothy Thompson and Walter Lippmann, the commentator, to the staff. She was also responsible for the paper's Home Institute, a widely known experimental kitchen that devised and tested recipes for publication.

When Ogden Reid died in 1947 his widow succeeded him as president of The New York Herald Tribune, Inc. She became chairman of the board of directors in 1953. Her elder son, Whitelaw, who had joined the staff in 1940 and had been named vice president in 1947, succeeded to the presidency.

In 1955, at the age of 72, Mrs. Reid resigned as chairman but continued as a member of the board. Whitelaw succeeded her as chairman, and her other son, Ogden, who had joined the staff in 1950, became president, publisher and editor.

RETIRED IN 1958

For some time The Herald Tribune had not been gaining sufficient circulation and advertising in a period of rising costs and intense competition. A loan of $2.5-million from the Massachusetts Life Insurance Company in the fall of 1954 proved insufficient to restore the paper to prosperity. In September of 1957 John Hay Whitney, the financier, invested $1.2-million in the paper with an option to buy. He took up the option a year

later, leaving the Reid family with a minority interest. Mrs. Reid retired at that time from the board of directors.

Mr. Whitney ran The Herald Tribune until 1966, when it merged with The Journal-American and The New York World-Telegram and The Sun. The new paper, The World Journal Tribune, expired in May, 1967.

In retirement Mrs. Reid lived quietly in her apartment at 834 Fifth Avenue, entertaining her friends and members of her family and venturing out socially from time to time.

Many organizations honored Mrs. Reid. In 1935 she received the medal of award of the American Women's Association "for professional achievement, public service and personality." The Cuban Red Cross gave her the Comendador Cross of the Order of Honor and Merit for her "helpful understanding of world problems and friendliness toward Latin America."

At the annual dinner of the Hundred Year Association of New York, an organization of business institutions with more than a century of unbroken existence in New York, she was awarded a gold medal in 1946 for services in behalf of the welfare and prestige of the city. The 1949–50 seal of the Council Against Intolerance was presented to her for "outstanding service in the cause of tolerance and equality."

ELECTED TO ARTS ACADEMY

She was elected by the editors of "The Book of Knowledge" as one of 12 women who are "inspiring examples of intelligence and accomplishment." She was one of four women elected fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1950. In 1951 she was listed among 10 notable women in industry, communications, labor and the professions in New York State.

Mrs. Reid was also the recipient of a number of honorary degrees, and she was a member of the Colony Club, the Women's City Club, the Women's University Club, the New York Newspaperwomen's Club, the River Club, and, in Paris, of the University Women's Club.

She is survived by her sons, Whitelaw Reid and United States Representative Ogden Reid of Westchester, and by 10 grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Thursday at 10 A.M. at St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Fifth Avenue and 53d Street.

WCBS–TV EDITORIAL

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it happens now and again that television editorials are noteworthy for their incisiveness and their exposure of the truth. Just such an editorial was aired by WCBS–TV of New York City on July 8, 1970. I think the content of that editorial should be made available to all those who were not privileged to hear it when it was telecast. With the permission of the House, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

LOYAL OPPOSITION

People in politics have long recognized the importance of television as a means of reaching the people. But not until recently have our national leaders displayed much mastery over the medium. President Nixon, for one, has shown great skill in using film clips to buttress his televised claims about the success of the Cambodian adventure. And last night, the Democrats showed off their video virtuosity with an elaborate electronic rebuttal starring anchorman Lawrence O'Brien, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

While we were impressed by the technical skill displayed, the message by Mr. O'Brien was a narrow partisan one for the most part, overblown and underdeveloped. Despite the clever use of videotape footage, what the Democratic National Committee had to say was about as novel as what party stalwarts normally hear at those rubber-chicken dinners.

On the big issues, Mr. O'Brien soared to rhetorical heights, sometimes into thin air. The divisions in our society, he said, were greater now under the Republicans than they had been 18 months ago under the Democrats. Divisions remain great, of course, but the current administration inherited national polarization from previous administrations. President Nixon has moved steadily—although too slowly—in reducing American combat forces in Vietnam, thus lowering the level of bitter conflict over the war in this country.

And the O'Brien message was disappointing in other regards. On Cambodia, he seemed to suggest that everything was going well there before the combined American-South Vietnamese invasion, a serious distortion of the facts. On the question of reordering national priorities, he gave a Democratic Congress credit, ignoring the fact that House Democrats, particularly those from the South, are the chief champions of bloated military budgets.

Our point here is not to suggest that the Nixon Administration should be above criticism. There is a great need for effective criticism from the opposition through a national forum. But the quality of debate offered by the opposition must be better than that offered by Mr. O'Brien last night. The Democrats should worry less about the medium and more about the message.

TESTIMONY BY HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER BEFORE COMMISSION ON CAMPUS UNREST

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was givern permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 our colleague, Rep. WILLIAM STEIGER, of Wisconsin, testified before the Scranton Commission on Campus Unrest. Mr. STEIGER made an excellent statement, which I feel would be of interest to all Members of the House. With the permission of the House, I include Mr. STEIGER's statement at this point in the RECORD. The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM A. STEIGER BEFORE THE SCRANTON COMMISSION

Chairman Scranton, distinguished members of this Commission, I am honored to have the opportunity to appear before you this morning, you are charged with examining a very serious crisis facing our nation—the alienation of many young Americans—as reflected on our college and university campuses. This situation is part of a larger crisis involving divisions among our people—divisions strengthened by misunderstanding and fear, divisions that inspire the unfortunate episodes of violence that we have witnessed on our campuses and in our cities in recent years.

On June 17 of last year, along with twenty-one of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I presented a task force report on campus unrest to the President. I preface my remarks by noting that while I quote extensively from this Campus Task Force Report my statement, with the exception of direct quotes taken from the Report, does not necessarily represent the views of the 21 other members of the Task Force. I was not notified that I was scheduled to appear this morning until 6:15 yesterday evening and thus had no time to confer on this statement with my colleagues. This report was the product of a volunteer tour of over fifty American campuses which occurred as a result of our "desire to know and understand the factors which appear to threaten the destruction of many of our most respected institutions and the alienation of many of this nation's finest students."* The "report reflects our impressions of students attitudes and problems, along with some proposed solutions applicable at local, state and national levels." (Copies of this report are included with this statement and I hope would be made a part of the record.)

The keynote conclusion of our report was that the "critical urgency of the problem cannot be overstated." Today, one year after that report was released and while we still have fresh in our memories the tragedies of Kent State and Jackson State, we can appreciate that "critical urgency."

I should like this morning to discuss my feelings about this problem we face, in light of the conclusions of the Task Force Report and the subsequent events on our campuses.

The problems on our campuses go far beyond the efforts of organized revolutionaries. While there is a small group of dedicated anarchists who do contribute to the unrest and disorder I am persuaded that these men and women (both students and non-students) are not the primary cause of the problem. Within the past year, I have been impressed anew, as the Task Force members were, by the "candor, sincerity and basic decency of the vast majority of students" attending college in this country. These students are for the most part deeply concerned about their campus and their society—wishing to find solutions to the problems of both without resort to violence. But many of these same students, because of the frustration of their attempts to work through channels which they view as unresponsive, have been attracted to confrontation as a last resort in implementing the change they deem important.

While I do not claim to be able to identify each and every cause of campus unrest, I can with some certainty identify many external and internal factors which are important. I should like to discuss first the internal factors contributing to campus unrest:

1. COMMUNICATION

On many campuses there are not adequate channels of communication between the three elements within a university community, i.e., students, faculty, and administration. The students, though a transient element in the university community, believe that they are an integral part of that community and therefore should be given the opportunity to express their opinions and affect the processes by which their university is run as well as the type of education they receive. "Operating within a large bureaucracy, administrators find it easy or necessary to avoid definitive answers to student inquiries." "Charges of communication gaps are leveled against faculty, administrators, and governing boards alike." "Many students charge that there is no attempt by these groups to consult with students in any decisions, including those decisions which directly affect the students."

Faculties are criticized for being cloistered by the "publish or perish" doctrine which prevents them from having, or in some cases affords them the opportunity not to have,

*(Unless otherwise noted, the quotes are from the Campus Task Force Report, Congressional Record, vol. 115, pt. 13, p. 17409, W. E. Brock.)

contact with students. The task force concluded that "the non-teaching activities of some faculty members, particularly in large universities, are excessive."

2. RESPONSIVENESS

In many cases this lack of communication between the three elements on a campus causes a lack of responsiveness to student opinions. This situation is further "aggravated where there is a lack of agreement, or a shared perspective, between administration and faculty." Thus, one may see a situation develop where the three elements are all fighting each other—causing polarization of interests and alienation of individuals. The result, in some instances, is protest and confrontation.

3. INTOLERANCE

Student intolerance is a factor in campus unrest. "Frequently students are strong in framing ideal solutions and weak in analyzing the factors involved in the problem and in its solution. Some demand immediate solutions and failing that, reach into confrontation as the 'only alternative course.' They may resort to 'non-negotiable demands.'" In the past year, we have seen the unfortunate success of such tactics.

4. HYPOCRISY

Students complain of the hypocrisy of the university today—preaching "academic freedom" and "neutrality" while involved with the so-called "military-industrial complex," preaching social concern while expanding into ghetto neighborhoods through programs students call "urban removal;" preaching a commitment to the pursuit of knowledge while its faculties make efforts to reduce teaching loads in order to have more time for research. These paradoxes are apparent to students today, and they have, in some instances, relevant grounds for complaint.

Many students believe that a university must be a committed progressive social force within the community. They see this sentiment lacking on the part of the administration and faculty. They see their universities cloistered and parochialized—unresponsive to the needs of the nation. The student seems to demand the university take a stand on nearly every issue of the day. One sympathizes with the demand for commitment, but I would suggest perhaps we all need to realize the serious risk. The university, if it is to propagate and expand knowledge with true academic freedom, must necessarily maintain a certain neutrality. If I may digress here for a very personal opinion, I would add that I frankly do not like the concept of politicizing the university. In my view that presents a very real danger to the needed "sifting and winnowing" of all views which is essential for a college or university if it is not to be simply a place for the presenting of what is fashionable today.

5. OVERREACTION

The student today voices deep concern over the methods used to respond to student confrontation. "Many feel that the university has over-reacted with excessive force." The use of local police and National Guard on our campuses—and the resultant tragedies—clearly indicate a need for reform. In some cases administrations have not even explored alternative methods of dealing with confrontation. This over-reaction in many cases causes a radicalizing of otherwise moderate students.

Solutions to internal factors contributing to campus unrest must be, by their nature, unique to each campus, but certain guidelines can be generalized:

1. There must be increased attempts to open channels of communication. Students have a right to have their opinions heard and their suggestions acted upon with regard to policies which affect them as citizens within the university community.

While college administrators have made strides in recent months to provide appropriate channels for communication, more can, I believe, be done. It's vitally important for college administrators, faculty and students to take steps at the very beginning of the school years in September to determine how communications can be improved. Student concerns should be identified and possible courses of action to be taken should mass demonstrations or violence occur freely discussed.

Students should have a clear idea of how the university decision making process operates and how certain situations will be dealt with—they should know their rights and responsibilities. Administration and faculty should take great pains to be open and available to students. In short, these three groups should work together from the beginning to avert crisis situations and should carry on a continuing dialogue.

I would suggest the following possible mechanisms, realizing that each campus must develop a plan which suits its needs best:

a. certain hours when ranking college officials are available to students to discuss problems;

b. greater access to faculty, include evening and weekend sessions;

c. seminars on campus and national problems focusing on how to bring about constructive change;

d. referendums on major campus issues. It is most desirable to have campus-wide discussion of issues before with particular consideration to the rights of the minority to express its views.

2. Students must appreciate the decision-making process at their universities. They cannot do so, however, if information regarding such processes is not made available to them. Perhaps this knowledge and clear assurance of their ability to make their views heard at various levels of decision-making will help to dissuade students from resulting to confrontation tactics.

3. Positive contact between the campus community and the community-at-large should be encouraged: "increased social action programs, volunteer projects and similar activities" can be beneficial supplements to classroom activities—rejuvenating a curriculum and making courses more relevant for the students.

A closer relationship between courses and societal problems should be encouraged as well. Today's student wants the tools to help him in finding solutions to the problems of his society. The university can help to provide these tools.

4. Many students have suggested that university involvement with the military-industrial complex, i.e., campus recruitment by defense-oriented corporations, ROTC programs, military research on campus—be replaced with new commitments to support urban improvement and the extension of civil rights. I seriously question the assumption that this must be an either/or situation. Would the nation's interest really be served by replacing all university defense effort study and research with in-house Pentagon efforts? It would however seem fully justified if we insisted that a commensurate commitment to solving our social ills, including urban problems, be made by both government and the university.

5. Whenever possible, alternative methods to police force should be employed on campuses if disturbances occur. One such alternative that has met with some success is the ordering of a court injunction against occupation of a building, and the peaceful and quiet arrest of demonstrators by the use of a court order. Violent confrontation must be avoided.

It is important to note, however, that the campus is not an isolated society. It exists within a city, a county and a state. It should be obvious that responsible officials at all levels must be aware of the universities action blueprint in case of problems. Agreement as to proposed actions seems essential as does cooperation.

Finally, it is not, I think too much to ask that students assume greater responsibility for the avoidance of violence. Too often, it has seemed a campus "silent majority" has existed—and has failed to use its voice to stem a radical outburst.

6. It is also clear that we must reassert the fact that violence "is not a legitimate means of protest or mode of expression—and that it can no more be tolerated in the university community than in the community at large." Clearly there are administrations and faculty members who appear to justify violence both by students and the police. I urge this commission to recommend appropriate measures to insure proper training for policemen and National Guardsmen so that if they are required they will be fair, even-handed, and use only that force which is appropriate to the situation.

Students, however, must also be cognizant of the fact that the campus is not a sanctuary and actions which break the law will be punished.

Now I should like to discuss the external factors contributing to campus unrest:

One cannot deal with external forces impinging on academic unrest without mentioning at least briefly the television media. It can give instant graphic coverage to any event, simultaneously linking the entire nation in the realization of this event. Given the necessary limitations of time, television also is a great force in favor of the instant, necessarily simplified reply—as any good politician who has perfected the 45 second answer for the evening news show can testify.

Finally, it can and does iconize the individual, freezing one voice or image as a prototype for a viewpoint for better or worse.

Such larger than life force and speed has had a galvanizing effect on campus ferment. This is not to judge or to criticize but to suggest it may be time to focus on this effect and to make clear its limits as well as its strengths.

To move on to more specific and less nebulous factors, college students today are for the most part "better educated and more vitally concerned with contemporary problems in our country than at any previous time in our history." A result of this reflective concern is a profound despair over the paradox of promise and performance in America.

There are numerous issues facing our society which trouble young and old alike:

1. POVERTY-HUNGER-ILLITERACY

The student knows that ours is a society of affluence which has within it hungry and illiterate children—a society that has the resources to cure disease, feed the hungry, teach the ignorant—yet a society that appears to lack the commitment to solve these problems.

2. RACISM

America is a society which promises equal rights and opportunities to all its citizens and dignity to the individual. The student perceives many unfulfilled promises and is impatient.

3. MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL-UNIVERSITY COMPLEX

Many students are deeply disturbed by a seeming alliance between business, education and the military. They see us as a country voicing dedication to the highest values, yet dominated by a complex which is building the implements of destruction of life rather than finding solutions to human needs.

4. FOREIGN POLICY

To the student, ours is a government that has too often neglected to even attempt to understand the cultures and values of other

peoples of the world; a government that has in fact taken actions which reject the significance of those factors. He sees a foreign policy controlled by economic interests rather than humanitarian interests—a foreign policy that unwittingly condescends to other nations of the world.

5. UNRESPONSIVENESS AND LACK OF INFLUENCE

The student today believes he lacks sufficient and effective impact on the processes which govern him. He feels a remoteness from those processes and believes his governmental leaders are isolated. The appeal to work within the system has lost much of its strength because many young people have rejected the system which works they feel so tediously and is based on what they perceive to be compromise of principle.

6. POLICE STATE

The student claims that ours is a society where "official violence" is increasingly sanctioned and even praised. "As violence grows, and as counter-violence escalates, the student views his relationship with both the university and the outside world as increasingly beset by the police and National Guard." The student perceives himself as a target for repression.

7. VIETNAM AND THE INDOCHINA WAR

Our involvement in Vietnam and increased involvement in Indochina is "one of the major factors in radicalizing students." "Many consider the war to be immoral and unjust," and not in the interests of this country. "An increasing number vow to take any steps necessary to avoid military service."

8. SELECTIVE SERVICE

There is the related issue of the draft. As students enjoy student deferments, they view the impact of an action in Vietnam on their peers. This, I believe, produces a double edged sword of a sense of guilt and a sense of injustice as a result of the selective service system.

9. EDUCATION

To paraphrase John Gardner—a society which values mediocre philosophy above plumbing will discover that neither its philosophy nor its plumbing will hold water.

We are perilously close to this discovery right now. If this commission does nothing more than explode the myth of the necessity of college education for all, it will have performed a great national service.

There are many students in our universities who should not be there. This mismatch of ability and educational opportunity is I believe very relevant to the problem of academic ferment.

We have failed miserably as a nation first to accord well deserved dignity and status to skilled blue collar jobs, and secondly to provide high quality education for such work.

Until we are willing to finance a full range of educational choices and offer counseling to all students regarding these opportunities we will have failed in preparation for the future. More importantly, we will, indeed, have failed the children of a democratic society.

Many of the young, then, are questioning the whole fabric of our society. They see misplaced priorities, lack of commitment to human needs, pre-occupation with rhetoric, hypocrisy, inaction, complacency. All of these ills are overstated by the young—but the obvious paradoxes of this society *do* stand out against equally obvious ideals. The distance between our goals and our realities are, indeed, facts of life with which we must deal. We must attempt to understand and appreciate the student perspective. If we do not, their distillusionment and their frustration with the system will continue to grow, as will confrontation and division.

What are the solutions to this multiplicity of external factors contributing to campus unrest?

In a representative democracy we find individuals of opposite points of view on many issues facing the society. In such a system progress can be made only through compromise—a slow process. Solutions take time. Many of our young people do appreciate that fact. If we are to hold on to those who are willing to work in the struggle and reattract the alienated we in government must demonstrate at least a vigorous commitment to solutions, not rhetoric.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, let me add a caveat. There are those who might exploit the issue of academic unrest for short term political advantage. Such a course is in my view wrong and would result in further polarization and alienation. Political parties and candidates should welcome the participation of young people in the political process and heed the negative result of driving intelligent young men and women away from the process of change.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, let me say we must manifest: a humanitarian commitment to solve the problems of poverty, disease, hunger, illiteracy.

A moral commitment to fulfill the ideal of equality through law and justice.

A technological commitment to re-balance the environment we have neglected.

A compassionate commitment to listen to the young and the minorities of this society—rejecting repression and unresponsiveness.

In light of the crisis of campus unrest, our task force, one year ago, presented a number of policy proposals to the President:

We rejected repressive legislation against universities as penalizing innocent and guilty alike. We stated that the "fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community."

President Nixon deserves high praise for his direct and forceful refusal to empower the federal government as the policeman of the nation's campus. I would hope that this Commission would support President Nixon and the Task Force in this position.

We called for the lowering of the voting age and the reform of the draft.

While the Congress has passed a statute to lower the voting age to 18, there remain serious Constitutional questions. I believe the Congress should commence action on a constitutional amendment to accomplish this goal.

Reform of the draft is coming slowly, but I'm pleased that President Nixon has initiated the lottery and recommended ending deferments. I would hope this Commission would support the findings of the Gates Commission on the advisability of ending compulsory military service and instituting a volunteer army as one means of alleviating student unrest.

We encouraged student participation in politics.

The students have responded vitally by mobilizing to meet with elected officials, to work in political campaigns, and to institute dialogues with people in all facets of our society. I do not think it necessary to ask this Commission to join us in encouraging such participation.

We recommended the establishment of a National Youth Foundation which would create models of community involvement by young people—taking advantage of their desire to improve their society.

To date no action has been taken on this recommendation, but I would request your careful consideration of the concept.

We recommended the establishment of a Student Teacher Corps to provide the opportunity for youth to work with the disadvantaged.

Such a program has been passed and begun to be implemented, but not to the extent that we had hoped.

We recommended increasing Congressional support of the College Work-Study Program, National Defense Student Loan Program, and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program—all of which were budgeted far below authorization levels.

As educational costs rise, it is imperative that more funds are made available particularly to low income students if we are to offer equality of educational opportunity.

We recommended the establishment of a central office in the Federal Government to coordinate all national youth programs . . . providing continuity of purpose.

This recommendation has not been acted upon. However, the Task Force is continuing its study of federal agencies in order to fully ascertain the policies and programs of the Federal Government which pertain to youth.

Finally, we recommended the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Higher Education to include students, faculty, and administration together with the general public—a Commission which would help create rapport among the members of the academic community as well as the community at large. Today we look to you for help in the establishment of such rapport.

Alfred North Whitehead said:

"The art of a free society consists first in the maintenance of the symbolic code and secondly in the fearlessness of revision. Those societies which cannot combine reverence for their symbols with freedom of revision must ultimately decay."

The balance between revision and reverence is at best tenuous and delicate. Assuming, as I do, that the young in America are a powerful and hopeful force for fearless revision, I must add a word for the other end of the tightrope—reverence for our symbols.

I do not mean blind, uncritical faith—none can ask that—but I do mean that both old and young must through tolerance and compassion learn to allow for fallibility and retain faith at least in our goals.

To enjoy freedom—academic or national—the students will have to allow it to others. Ours is a government by majority. Faith in the ability of the minority to influence the majority toward the pursuit of the highest goals is the strongest and most important tool the student can have. Respect by the majority, by the leadership for the views of those who question and challenge and protest is equally essential. The minority must be given justification for such faith.

It would be well to add a further note in conclusion. I cannot agree with those who say ending the Vietnam war will end academic ferment. I have tried to suggest that its sources are even farther reaching. They touch the fabric of our society and the direction of inevitable change.

The solution to one problem—however major—will not see ferment evaporating. We face years of strain ahead on the balance between revision and reverence. It would be my hope that we could begin now to provide the channels for change we will need—not just today, but for generations to come—if we are to endure as a people in a democratic society.

THE NEED FOR A REAPPRAISAL OF OUR CHINA POLICY

(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, as Congressmen, we will be called upon to discuss and offer our opinions about the final direction of our policy toward China. Because of the importance of this matter, within the next few months, Congress will be undertaking a major review of American foreign policy. One

of the most important areas of our policy which will come under this review will be U.S. relations with China.

Several vital questions must be raised as to the nature of our China policy. Should we extend diplomatic relations to mainland China? Should we admit the Chinese into the United Nations? Should the United States continue arms shipments to Taiwan?

I would like to acquaint you with some of the specific issues involved, and with the positions I am considering on these issues.

American relations with China have remained virtually unchanged for the last 21 years. Since 1949, we have followed a policy of containment, isolation, and military encirclement of mainland—Communist—China. This containment policy had its origins in the obsessive anti-Communist concern that developed in the McCarthy era of the early 1950's. At that time, we established the Truman Doctrine, which advocated containment of the Soviet Union in Europe. Under the Truman Doctrine, the United States supplied aid to the Greek and Turkish Governments in their successful struggles against Communism. Later, the Truman Doctrine provided a basis for the establishment of NATO as a permanent barrier to Soviet expansion in Europe.

When the Communists triumphed in the Chinese revolution of 1949, the United States attempted to apply the methods and assumptions of the Truman Doctrine to the situation in Asia. Adhering to a policy of containment and isolation, we refused to extend diplomatic relations to the Chinese government, and refused to allow China's entrance into the United Nations. This policy is still in effect today, and for the last 21 years we have had official negotiations, talks, or other diplomatic contact with the Chinese.

The policy of isolation has also been carried over into economic areas, and as a result we have not engaged in any trade or commerce with China since 1949.

A third major facet of the containment policy has been the military encirclement of mainland China by American forces. The Korean war, and American involvement in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos have all been outgrowths of the policy of military encirclement.

Presently, the United States has over 800,000 men stationed in military bases on the borders of China. On the eastern and southern border, from Japan to Thailand, the line of American bases stretches from Okinawa through South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

The United States has attempted to augment the policies of political isolation and military encirclement by officially recognizing and supporting the forces of Chiang Kai-shek on the island of Taiwan—Formosa. Congress has given $2.7 billion in military aid to Chiang since he was exiled to Taiwan. Among the most modern weapons we have entrusted him with are several squadrons of F–5A supersonic jet fighters, and the new Bell Uh-1H—Huey—helicopters. We are also building a helicopter factory for Chiang in central Taiwan.

In addition to the aid we have officially given to the Nationalists, the Pentagon, without public knowledge or congressional consent, has unofficially given to Chiang—free of charge—millions of dollars of surplus American equipment. Last year alone, these "gifts" totalled over $157 million, and included four destroyers, a Nike-Hercules missile battery, 35 F–100 Super Sabre jets, 20 F–104 Starfighters, 30 C–119 Flying Boxcars, 50 medium tanks, 120 howitzers, and thousands of rifles and small arms.

Furthermore, the U.S. 7th Fleet continuously patrols the Taiwan Straits, and provides logistical support for the Nationalists on Quemoy and Matsu.

Thus, the situation and our analysis seems to have changed very little from 20 years ago when our original China policy was established.

There has, however, been some talk on the part of the Nixon administration as to a change in this policy. As an indication of good faith, the President has reduced the Taiwan Strait patrol of the Seventh Fleet. Yet, a I previously pointed out, the administration continues its policy of unlimited military assistance to Formosa. At this time, approximately 10,000 American troops remain on Taiwan, and there are repeated rumors that a large American air base is being secretly built on that island.

Several Congressmen, mostly from the ranks of the Republicans and conservative Democrats, favor continuing our present 21-year-old China policy. Advocates of this course claim that because mainland China is a Communist nation, she must be cognizant of American strength at all times. Such a policy of confrontation has entailed continued military encirclement of China, continued political and economic isolation, and continued support for any and all governments in opposition to the Communists—even dictators such as Chiang.

This entire policy of containment, isolation, and encirclement is based upon the premise that as a Communist nation, China is naturally aggressive, and if left unchecked, will expand at the expense of her neighbors. This theory may have been valid 21 years ago. However, the world situation has changed greatly since 1949. No longer is "communism" considered a monolithic menace, threatening to devour the entire world. There are now tremendous differences between the Communist parties of the various "red" nations. Prime examples of these differences are the ideological split between Russia and China, and the independent, liberal stances taken by the Communist parties of Yugoslavia and Rumania.

Recent military studies have shown that China in particular is not in a position to conduct a war of aggression against any of her neighbors.

There has been no sizable shift in China's deployment of troops in the last few years. Those troops that have been moved have been transferred to the Sino-Soviet frontier. Approximately one quarter of the army is deployed on the coast between Shantung and Hong Kong in anticipation of an attack from Taiwan. Another quarter of the army is located along the axis of the Canton-Wuhan Railroad. The third quarter of the army resides in Manchuria and around Peking. The fourth quarter of the army is divided between Tibet—three divisions—Sinkiang—four divisions—Inner Mongolia—four divisions—Hainan Island—three divisions—Western China—11 divisions—Szechuan and Yunnan—12 divisions. There are approximately eight to nine additional divisions not included in the above figures which are situated along the Sino-Soviet border.

It is generally agreed that the Chinese forces are deployed in a basically defensive manner, and would have great difficulty mounting an offensive, especially on more than one front.

In addition, the Institute for Strategic Studies' Military Balance for 1969–70 states:

> China's conventional arms industry would be in no position to produce weapons on a scale needed for war; neither could Chinese-produced nuclear arms be a substitute for them.

Furthermore, prominent members of the Nixon administration have indicated that China's foreign and military policy over the last few years has been very cautious, and essentially one of nonintervention. Although the Chinese have supported various wars of liberation, at the present time they do not have troops involved in any foreign wars. In a famous 1965 speech, Marshall Lin Piao advocated not direct involvement in foreign revolutions, but only generalized support—logistical and moral.

Thus, while the Chinese Government has engaged in some violent revolutionary rhetoric, its actions have been of a much more passive, defensive nature.

No one is more repelled by the totalitarian nature of the Chinese Government than I am. However, we must face the facts, and realize that whether we like it or not, the Communists are the rulers of China, will remain the rulers of China, and must be dealt with as such. We must make an effort now to peacefully settle the differences between our nations before the violent rhetoric of China has a chance to become violent actions. This means establishing diplomatic relations with the Chinese, sitting down at the bargaining table, and beginning immediate negotiations.

American policy toward Taiwan also deserves close scrutiny. Our present policy of unlimited military support is based upon the theory that Chiang's regime is, and should be the ruler of all the Chinese people. Such an assumption, however, seems to be quite unrealistic.

In his memoirs ex-Secretary of State Dean Acheson described the decay and exile of Chiang's government:

> Chiang Kai-shek had emerged from the War (World War II) as the leader of the Chinese people, opposed by only one faction, the ragged, ill-equiped small Communist force in the hills. Chiang controlled the greatest military power in Chinese history, supported and given economic backing by

the United States. Four years later, his armies and his support, both within the country and outside it had melted away. He was a refugee on a small island off the coast . . . The most inexhaustible patience of the Chinese had ended. They had not overthrown the government. *There was nothing to overthrow. They had simply ignored it.* The Communists were not the creators of this situation, this revolutionary spirit, but had mounted it and ridden to victory and power.

In other words, for 4 years after World War II, Chiang was the ruler of China. During those 4 years, however, he did so little for the Chinese people, that his popular support dwindled to nothing. He was then exiled to Taiwan, and the Communists took control of the Chinese mainland.

Thus, it is self-deluding and foolish for the United States to insist that Chiang still rules China. We are, in effect, recognizing a government that no longer exists, and not recognizing one that does.

As I have pointed out, we have given over $2.7 billion in military aid to the Nationalists. Little of this money has been used to help the people of Taiwan. Most of it has been used to support Chiang's delusion that someday he will return to the mainland. It is time to stop wasting the American taxpayer's money on the personal fantasies of Chiang Kai-shek.

It must also be made known that Chiang's regime on Taiwan rules as a military dictatorship. There have been no free elections, and Chiang has declared himself ruler for life. The extremely large amount of our previous military support to Taiwan has caused us nothing but trouble in our relations with other Asian nations. Such unlimited support must be substantially modified and reduced.

President Kennedy, in his famous address at the American University in 1963 quoted a Chinese saying:

A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step.

It is time to break with the past, and take that one bold step along the path of reconciliation between two great powers—the United States and China. Peace in Asia, and peace in the world make it imperative that we move now.

I am, therefore, proposing a five-point program for the reordering of our relations with China:

First. Immediately extending diplomatic and economic relations to the Chinese Government.

Second. Admitting China to the United Nations.

Third. Immediately moving to organize formal peace talks between the United States and China.

Fourth. Restricting military aid to Taiwan to the sale of purely defensive weapons.

Fifth. Strictly prohibiting gifts of military supplies by the Pentagon without the consent of Congress.

I am hopeful that this program will provide the one bold step that will lead to peace in Asia.

VIETNAM AND THE MIDDLE EAST: A STUDY OF WHAT IS WRONG WITH AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(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, while the crisis in the Middle East continues on an explosive course, there is growing recognition by all policymakers in this country that the Russian offensive threatens the existence of Israel as well as the achievement of any peaceful solution to the crisis.

The Nixon administration continues to express its strong support for Israel's efforts against the Arab and Soviet aggressors. But, at this point in time, deeds rather than words are required. America's verbal commitment to the preservation of Israel as a free and independent nation must be acted on. I believe that our deeds must include both the sale of planes to Israel as well as the pursuit of meaningful peace initiatives—initiatives that would be realistic in the context of the aims of the aggressors.

As we all know, the territorial gains that Israel made in 1967 are merely an Arab excuse for the continuation of the conflict. The cause of the conflict remains much more basic. The Arab nations with encouragement, the help, and the tactical support of the Soviet Union continue to challenge the right of Israel to exist. This real motive must be given its true weight when America considers her next policy moves.

I believe that America today requires a new foreign policy—one that is both flexible enough to meet the continuous stream of new challenges brought before it and sufficiently well-defined to enable America to pursue goals consistent with its own democratic principles. Because present policy is weighted down by policies and values relevant to yesterday's world, it has not been a useful instrument to deal with the challenges posed by the Middle East.

Our foreign policy presently teeters on the brink of two equally dangerous extremes. One extreme views America as the world policeman ready to fight communism wherever it seems to threaten in the world. The other sees America within a framework of neoisolationism. Those who subscribe to the latter seem unwilling to come to the aid of any country no matter what the circumstances. This attitude is an overreaction to the ill-conceived and prolonged American involvement in Southeast Asia.

In this country, a new group has advocated that America abandon its support of Israel. The new left, in ill-defined rhetoric and shortsighted interpretations of the crisis, wants America to abandon the only democratic nation in the Middle East. They wish to capitulate to the forces that represent the antithesis of freedom—forces that will settle for no less than Israel's destruction. They ignore the fact that it was the Arab States—Egypt, Syria, and Jordan—that first began the aggression. They ignore the fact that these states are unwilling to settle the conflict in any peaceful manner. I say that we must ignore the rhetoric of the new left while redefining and rethinking our own goals.

The existence of these extremes in American foreign policy reflects a more pervasive malaise: the unwillingness or the inability of the United States to reexamine and redefine its goals in the world. There is need to recognize that goal selection involves considering and defining basic values. For too many of our policymakers, an ambiguous discussion of an ill-defined "American interest" has been sufficient.

Because we have tended to view opposition to communism as the only goal of American policy, we have continued to have an unduly negative foreign policy. Armed with only this conception as a guide, the United States has become a "reactor" in a world that requires a positive "actor." In the process, the reputation of America as a protector of the rights of man has been lost. We may have fought communism where we found it, but in the process we have supported military dictatorships or equally undemocratic regimes. The tragedy of the Vietnam war revolves around this very fact.

At this time, the situation in the Middle East poses new problems and challenges. Our policy of watchful waiting for that area cannot be deemed a true policy alternative. We have watched Israel, the only democratic country in that area, fight a war for her own survival on three fronts. We have watched and patiently waited while the Soviet Union has armed the Egyptians and sent their own troops to operate the equipment. The time is ripe for American reappraisal of the situation.

Yet, today, American policy is hamstrung by discussions of parallels existing between our Indochina involvement and the present Middle East situation. Many who strongly oppose our Indochina policy warn against any sympathy with the Israel cause. Tending toward the neoisolationist extreme, they warn against any further American involvement in any conflict and on any level. On the other side, many who support our policy in Vietnam point up the basic similarity of the threat to both areas. Here again is the specter of national messianism.

Both interpretations do Israel an injustice. I believe that the Middle East situation differs fundamentally from the situation in Indochina. It is not inconsistent, therefore, to oppose American involvement in Vietnam and Cambodia, and at the same time, argue that America must immediately sell Israel the aircraft she was promised.

In what follows, I would like to elaborate on the basic differences between these two situations, offer an alternative American response in terms of range and reasons for commitment, and in the process, define a new direction for American policy.

In her traditional view taken of the

world, America has refused to accept the existence of political pluralism. Despite protestations to the contrary, American action reaffirms this point. Although we have often intervened to support military dictatorships, we have continued to bill each conflict as the crucial test of the viability of American values and the true test of American will.

In Vietnam, although faced with a government that lacked the support of its own people, that imprisoned its opposition and stifled dissent, and had a fighting force that was both unwilling and unable to defend its country, America sent her own troops and 5 years later continues to fight.

America, armed with what is considered an acceptable mixture of land, military, and administrative reforms, $100 billion in weapons and supplies, and 500,000 troops to carry out its mission, intervened in what was basically a civil war among the Vietnamese people. Working under faulty assumptions about the nature of the conflict, we supported a corrupt government because it cloaked itself in the verbiage of anticommunism.

Now in the Middle East, the United States is again faced with another test of its foreign policy. The American policymakers conditioned by past experience are basing their analysis on that past experience, and our policy as a result is failing miserably.

It is here that I would argue that in our support for Israel we must break out of the shackles of the assumptions of yesterday's world and the policies that they have fostered. There must be a choice of new goals and new policies to realize these goals. These goals in turn must be examined carefully in order to insure their consistency with America's belief in freedom and democracy.

I believe the survival of the State of Israel is directly consistent with such a set of principles. Here the means and ends are not at irreconcilable odds as they are in Vietnam. Israel today is asking only that America sell her the promised military hardware so that she may defend herself against the aggressor nations bent upon her destruction. Unlike the case in Vietnam, Israel is not asking for American manpower. Rather she is asking only to buy American airplanes and hardware—hardware that we have dispensed with almost reckless abandon to countries ruled by military juntas and dictators.

We are being asked by a government that has not silenced its opposition, that has not imprisoned its detractors, but that rules in the spirit of the principles of democracy. It is a country that has welcomed all people to live within its borders.

When created in 1948, Israel gave the Moslems the option of living in peace and freedom within the borders of the State of Israel. Those who remained have been allowed to do just that. Those that left are being used as a political football by the Arab States, who have total disregard for the welfare of these people. Had they remained in Israel, peace and freedom would have been theirs as well.

We are being asked to sell arms to a nation not fighting an internal war, not a war where countrymen are pitted against one another. Rather this is a clear case of outside aggression by a group of nations bent upon Israel's destruction.

The introduction of Soviet missiles, planes, and men add a new urgency to this situation. The balance has clearly turned against the side of Israel. She is losing men and planes at a rate that endangers her survival. Her archaic equipment that remains is not up to doing battle with the latest in Soviet supplies.

Israel's well-being is crucial to the security of the United States. The Middle East is indeed the crossroads of the world. That point, of course, is crucial to the entire argument. But this fact is further strengthened by the fact that there is a clear case of aggression; unlike in Vietnam, there is a clear case of the rights of a people being endangered from outside aggression. There is none of the internal conflict that we find in the Indochina situation.

Also, if the United States is in fact anxious to counteract the spread of Soviet influence and aggression, we will be doing it in support of freedom, not at the expense of it. Here, we do not have to give lipservice to an anticommunistic, but undemocratic regime. Rather, we are dealing with a true democracy whose government speaks for the people and whose actions are completely consistent with the democratic principles that we so often talk about.

At this point in time, America has the opportunity to strike an important new note in its foreign policy. Vietnam and the Middle East are two very different situations. The former symbolizes an American policy weighted down by the nearsighted assumptions of the past. The latter can symbolize a new direction for American foreign policy free from those shackles that have bound it and flexible enough to meet new challenges that may arise. America can act in the world arena to further the implementation of humanitarian ideals. Israel provides an opportunity to translate such policy into reality.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, if we are able to complete our work today on schedule, the House will pass an historic bill, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

The bill before the House is the work product of some of our most capable and dedicated Members; it is the result of years of consideration and exhaustive analysis.

This bill is a good bill, and should be passed by the House and receive prompt and favorable consideration in the other body.

When I cosponsored the Legislative Reorganization Act nearly 18 months ago, my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26, 1969, outlined the following goals for this legislation:

First. More penetrating and effective congressional review of important legislative business.

Second. More comprehensive, thorough, and manageable control over the fiscal affairs of the Nation, through increased use of electronic data processing equipment, and modern management techniques.

Third. A qualitative and quantitative improvement in the information available to Members of Congress as a basis for important decisions which must be made by Congress alone.

Fourth. Improvement of Congress as an institution, through the establishment of a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, the removal of postmasterships and rural mail carriers from the patronage system, appointment to service academies on a merit basis, and other measures appropriate at this time.

Fifth. Increased supervision of lobbying activities involving the work of the Congress, and the transfer of lobbying records and responsibility for their publication to the General Accounting Office.

Some of these reforms, particularly the removal of the Post Office from politics, have been accomplished in other legislative or executive action taken in the recent past.

The legislation before us today moves to further additional worthwhile reforms, for it establishes improved staffing procedures for the committees of the House, legislative oversight and program analysis assistance for the Congress, improved data processing service to the Congress, procedures for adequate review of important reports and hearings by each Member before he must cast his vote, and many other important reforms.

This bill provides for a free tour of the Capitol Building, available to all citizens when they visit the Nation's Capital.

ON THE RECORD

Important reforms have been adopted on the floor of the House in the nature of amendments to the bill. The most important reform, which I sincerely hope will survive to enactment, provides for record votes to be taken on all important floor amendments to bills.

The system of teller votes, which amounts to secret voting on important amendments, is a practice which has endured throughout the history of the House of Representatives. Yesterday, by voice vote, this body committed itself to going on record when as many as 20 Members so demand.

Currently, no amendment defeated in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union can be put to a record vote later in the House. Members may vote anonymously to kill amendments they might feel politically compelled to vote for if on the record.

Last year, the House took 73 nonrecord votes by teller. Such items as funds for the ABM, funds for the SST, and the question of continued American

troop presence in Cambodia were dispatched by nonrecord vote. The citizens deserve to know how their Representatives vote on such crucial issues; therefore, I believe the House has acted in the public interest by approving the discontinuance of nonrecord teller votes, except on wholly noncontroversial questions.

MEASURES TO RESTORE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents a dramatic, yet cautious attempt to facilitate professional competence on Capitol Hill, and promote professionalism in the discharge of the public duty. Further, this bill, through its modest initiatives, sets a course for the Congress which will lead to bolder initiatives, and ultimately to a restoration of public confidence in the Congress as a vital institution.

We have been told that these times are an era of decline for parliamentary democracy. Instant communications, the demands of society, the imponderable measure of sufficiency and proper employment of the forces of national defense, and the seemingly unlimited capacity of technology to achieve long-cherished goals in science and commerce, have all led to increased dependence on the executive branch of the Government for direction in human affairs. Congress, in contrast, has been viewed as cumbersome and inefficient.

CONGRESS IS COEQUAL YET UNEQUAL

The executive must never be permitted to retreat from the challenges of the times—everyone would agree to that. But the Congress, by the same token, should not be permitted to fail in its constitutional responsibility as a coequal branch of the Government of the United States. By failing to provide itself with the means to maintain the historic balance as an independent, coequal partner, the Congress has in effect fallen short of its constitutional duty.

This failure is exemplified by a review of the most basic congressional prerogative: control of the Nation's fiscal affairs. The White House has at its command the most modern management cost-control techniques, electronic data processing, and a host of other tools to aid in preparing the budget. The Congress, in whom is vested the responsibility of appropriation for the public welfare, has no comparable machinery for review of that same budget.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, as a practical matter, that the Federal budget is sufficiently complex to frustrate any individual Member's systematic analysis. Members of Congress can only grasp at straws in their review of Presidential requests for funds.

Corporate executives could not manage modern business without fully competent personnel for assistance and advice, nor could they manage private enterprise without the aid of management technology.

Coequal, yet unarmed, the Congress enters the contest each year at hopeless disadvantage. The President, his advisers, and the vast machinery of the executive branch represent our competitors in determining the proper level and direction of Federal expenditure. Without staff or equipment to advise realistic alternatives, and without the capacity to exercise fine-tuned management control, the Congress can only react with quill-and-ledger crudeness to the electronic data sophistication of the executive advocates.

If it has not been in the national interest for the Federal budget to have increased 500 percent in the past 25 years—and I do not think that it has been—the Congress must bear the constitutional responsibility for the increase. That the Executive has advanced these requests with persuasiveness is irrelevant. The simple fact is that the Congress has been incapable of responding to the requests of the Executive with well-developed, constructive, convincing arguments in the alternative.

Congress must bear full responsibility, as the Founding Fathers intended, for review and control of the spending policies of the Federal Government. But the dominant influence of congressional opinion on the fiscal policies of the Nation has diminished because Congress has neglected to equip its Members with the proper administrative weapons for their tasks.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 will provide the management tools Members must have to do the job.

CONGRESSIONAL VITALITY MUST REFLECT NATIONAL VITALITY

No doubt those Founding Fathers of imaginative mind and boundless spirit, such as Jefferson, Washington, and Franklin, who were scientists and engineers as well as statesmen, could foresee the possibility—at least—of the modern technological explosion. The vast western expanse of the land, the restless imagination and industry of the people, and the evident national desire to create an empire on the North American Continent, could never be expected to become stagnant.

One crucial institution adopted at the Constitutional Convention was the Congress. That body was to reflect the habits and ambitions of the people, and provide a national atmosphere of energy and commitment to just causes for all time. It was further to provide a check upon the executive branch, through elected representatives of the people. The Founding Fathers of this Nation no doubt believed that the people would never be disappointed in the Congress as an institution, for the Congress was made continuously responsible to the people.

Today, we cannot permit ourselves to frustrate that historic purpose through failure to adopt reforms which will facilitate the reestablishment of our proper congressional role.

Mr. Speaker, the essence of congressional responsibility is fiscal control. Today, we cannot adequately perform that task, and that is the most compelling case for adoption of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM CAN INSPIRE THE NATION

Many young men and women in this Nation and abroad are disillusioned. They feel the institutions upon which society is based cannot provide a forum for the debate of their most heartfelt views.

Perhaps if Congress were to initiate substantive reform, and thus demonstrate that institutions can perfect themselves from within, the lesson would not be lost upon the community at large. With evolution, not revolution, lies our best hope for meeting the challenges ahead.

Those that truly love their country, and its cherished system of government, will surely applaud efforts to perfect that system. Static government stagnates, and the restless energy of the people will not long tolerate such inaction. These are pressing problems to be resolved.

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to a series of five television programs dealing with the American commitment to Southeast Asia, to be aired over channel 14 in Washington from 8 to 9 p.m. on Tuesdays beginning August 4. I think Members of the House would find viewing of these programs worthwhile. Charles A. Moser of the Department of Slavic Languages, George Washington University, is the series coordinator. The complete schedule for the series is as follows:

August 4: "Southeast Asia in Constitutional and International Law." Robert H. Bork (Yale Law School), John Norton Moore (University of Virginia Law School).

August 11: "The Issues in Vietnam." Dolf Droge (AID, detailed to National Security Council).

August 18: "Dissent and the Vietnam War." Morton Kaplan (University of Chicago).

August 25: "Cliches of the Southeast Asian Debate." Charles Stephens (American Youth for a Just Peace).

September 1: "Prospects for the Future in Southeast Asia." Frank Johnson (American Security Council).

PARTNERSHIP CORPORATION ON PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE—A BILL TO CREATE THE FEDERAL CITY BICENTENNIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, joined by the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, I am introducing today a bill to establish the Federal City Bicentennial Development Corporation, to provide for the preparation and carrying out of a development plan for certain areas between the White House and the Capitol, and to further the purposes for which the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site was designated.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that I have

been downright cold to the idea of creating another group, commission, organization, or amalgamation to have anything to do with Pennsylvania Avenue in the District of Columbia. I have been critical—some would say that is a mild term—of the activities of the President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue, appointed by President Kennedy, and the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, appointed by President Johnson.

The record will show that my opposition to the activities of those two amalgamations was predicated mainly on their "tear it down and hang history" attitude toward the national historic sites lying within the boundaries of the proposed national square. My opposition was also based on the heretofore total disregard for the economics of development within the Federal City and the assumption that private investment capital would freely flow on the basis of a prettily packaged group of models, plans, studies, and press releases. Investment decisions are not made of such stuff in the private arena and as a consequence, the area under consideration has steadily deteriorated.

The bill which Chairman ASPINALL and I are introducing today seeks to make a partnership of the planning and development of the area. The new public/private corporation will cover the spectrum of opinion and experience in the Federal and District governments and in the private investment community. The Corporation would seek to develop the area from the viewpoint of need and practicality.

Plans and development for the revitalization of the Pennsylvania Avenue area which takes into account the needs of the Federal Government, the Federal City, the citizens of the immediate area and the Nation, and which, at the same time, works from a basis of economic reality, is necessary if Washington, D.C., is to achieve the realization of a 200-year-old dream in time for the celebration of the bicentennial in 1976.

Chairman ASPINALL and I believe that the means to such development is embodied in the language of our bill to create the Federal City Bicentennial Development Corporation and we urge its adoption. We are confident that, after public hearings and public discussion, the new partnership Corporation can lead the way to the realization of L'Enfant's dream for the Nation's No. 1 city.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 18677

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 "Federal City Bicentennial Development Corporation Act of 1970."

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares—

(a) That the bicentennial of the founding of this country as an independent Nation provides a fitting occasion for undertaking to restore the area adjacent to Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House to a condition befitting the most historic and significant area of the Capital City;

(b) That it is in the national interest that this area, most of which was designated on September 30, 1965, a National Historic Site under the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), be developed, maintained and used in a manner suitable to its ceremonial, physical and historic relationship to the Legislative and Executive branches of the Federal Government and to the governmental buildings, monuments, memorials and parks in or adjacent to the area;

(c) That a portion of the area adjacent to Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House, because of its blighted character, imposes severe public, economic and social liabilities upon the District of Columbia as the seat of the Government of the United States, thereby impeding its sound growth and development and constituting a serious and growing threat to the public health, safety, morals and welfare of its inhabitants;

(d) That to insure suitable development, maintenance and use of the area and the elimination of blight, it is essential that there be developed and carried out as an entirety plans for this area which will specify the uses, both public and private, to which property is to be put, the programming and financing of necessary acquisitions, construction, reconstruction and other activities;

(e) That the recommendations of the President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue as developed by its successor, the President's Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, having been approved in principle by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts and other interested departments and agencies, shall be seriously considered as a guide for such development plans;

(f) That such development plans can best be developed and carried out by vesting the requisite powers, duties and responsibilities in a Federal corporation which can take maximum advantage of the private as well as the public resources which will be necessary;

(g) That the powers conferred by this Act are for public uses and purposes for which public powers may be employed, public funds may be expended, and the power of eminent domain and the police power may be exercised, and the granting of such powers is necessary in the public interest; and

(h) That the area thus to be developed, maintained and used in accordance with the provisions of this Act (hereinafter referred to as the Development Area) shall be the area bounded as follows:

Beginning at a point on the southwest corner of the intersection of Fifteenth Street and E Street Northwest, thence proceeding easterly along the southerly side of E Street to the southwest corner of the intersection of Thirteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest;

Thence southeasterly along the southerly side of Pennsylvania Avenue to a point being the southeast corner of the intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street Northwest;

Thence northerly along the east side of Sixth Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of E Street and Sixth Street Northwest;

Thence westerly along the north side of E Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of E Street and Seventh Street Northwest;

Thence northerly along the east side of Seventh Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of Seventh Street and F Street Northwest;

Thence westerly along the north side of F Street to the northwest corner of the intersection of F Street and Ninth Street Northwest;

Thence southerly along the west side of Ninth Street to the northwest corner of the intersection of Ninth Street and E Street Northwest;

Thence westerly along the north side of E Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of E Street and Thirteenth Street Northwest;

Thence northerly along the east side of Thirteenth Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of F Street and Thirteenth Street Northwest;

Thence westerly along the north side of F Street to the northwest corner of the intersection of F Street and Fifteenth Street Northwest;

Thence southerly along the west side of Fifteenth Street to the point of beginning being the southwest corner of the intersection of Fifteenth Street and E Street Northwest.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the Federal City Bicentennial Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation").

(b) The Corporation shall be dissolved upon completion, as determined by the Board of Directors, of its implementation of the development plan provided for in section 5 of this Act. Upon dissolution, assets remaining after all the obligations and indebtedness of the Corporation have been fulfilled and paid or satisfied shall be the assets of the United States.

(c) The powers and management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of 21 members, as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior;

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury;

(3) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(4) The Secretary of Transportation;

(5) The Chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee;

(6) The ranking minority member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee;

(7) The Chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee;

(8) The ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee;

(9) The Administrator of General Services;

(10) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia;

(11) The Chairman, District of Columbia Council; and

(12) Ten appointed by the President from private life, at least five of whom shall be residents and registered voters of the District of Columbia, who shall have knowledge and experience in one or more fields of history, architecture, city planning, retailing, real estate, construction, or government: *Provided, however,* That none shall be or have been members or employees of the President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue or its successor, the President's Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.

(d) Each member of the Board of Directors specified in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (c) may designate another official to serve on the Board in his stead if unable to serve in person.

(e) Each member of the Board of Directors appointed under paragraph (12) of subsection (c) shall serve for a term of six years from the expiration of his predecessor's term; except that (1) any director appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the directors first taking office shall begin on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall expire as designated at the time of appointment, two at the end of two years, three at the end of four years, and five at the end of six years. A director may continue to serve until his successor has qualified.

(f) The President shall designate a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among the members of the Board of Directors, chosen from private life.

(g) The Chairman, upon his appointment, shall invite to serve on the Board of Directors as non-voting members the following:

(1) The Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts;

(2) The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission;

(3) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution;

(4) The Director of the National Gallery of Art;

(5) The Architect of the Capitol;

(6) The Archivist of the United States;

(7) The Chairman of the District of Columbia Commission on the Arts; and

(8) The Chairman of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

(h) Members of the Board of Directors who are officers or employees of the Federal or District of Columbia Government shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Board. Other members of the Board, when engaged in the activities of the Corporation, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the daily equivalent of the rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule, and travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703(b)-(d) and 5707) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(i) The Board of Directors shall meet at the call of the Chairman, who shall require it to meet not less often than once each three months. A majority of the voting members of the Board of Directors (or their designated alternates) shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board of Directors shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation and duties of an Executive Director and such other officers and employees of the Corporation as may be necessary for the efficient administration of the Corporation; the Executive Director and two other officers of the Corporation may be appointed and compensated without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service and chapter 51 of subchapter 53 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) Administrative services shall be provided by the General Services Administration on a reimbursable basis.

SEC. 5. (a) The development plan for the Development Area shall include, but not be limited to: (1) the types of uses, both public and private, to be permitted; (2) criteria for the design and appearance of buildings, facilities, open spaces and other improvements; (3) an estimate of the current values of all properties to be acquired; (4) an estimate of the relocation costs which would be incurred in carrying out the provisions of section 8 of this Act; (5) an estimate of the cost of land preparation for all properties to be acquired; (6) an estimate of the re-use values of the properties to be acquired; (7) a program for the staging of proposed development, including a detailed description of the portion of the program to be scheduled for completion by 1976; (8) a determination of the marketability of such development; (9) an estimate of the development costs, both public and private; (10) a thorough study of the economic impact of such development; and (11) the procedures (including both interim and long-term arrangements) to be used in carrying out and insuring continuing conformance to the development plan.

(b) The development plan provided for in subsection (a) shall be prepared with the cooperation of the Department of the Interior, the General Services Administration and the District of Columbia Government with the maximum feasible use of their staffs and other resources on a reimbursable basis by the Corporation.

(c) The development plan shall, to the extent practicable, conform to the comprehensive plan for the National Capital proposed pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952.

(d) After the development plan has been completed and approved by the Board of Directors of the Corporation, the plan shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Government. The Secretary of the Interior shall notify the Coporation of his approval, disapproval, or recommended modifications from the standpoint of the plan's compatibility with his responsibilities for the administration, protection, and development of the areas within the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site. Both the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Government shall hold public hearings on the plan and each shall notify the Corporation of its approval, disapproval, or recommended modifications: *Provided*, That, in the event that the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission or the District of Columbia Government has not notified the Corporation of approval, disapproval, or recommended modifications of the plan within 60 days after the date of transmittal, he or it as the case may be shall be deemed to have approved the plan.

(e) Upon approval by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Government, the Corporation shall transmit the development plan to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Following the expiration of 60 days after the date of such transmittal, the Corporation may proceed with the execution and implementation of the plan as authorized by the other provisions of this Act.

(f) Activities under the development plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved development plan. The Corporation may alter, revise or amend the plan, but any such alteration, revision, or amendment which is a substantial change from the approved development plan shall take effect only upon compliance with the procedures set forth in subsections (d) and (e) of this section.

(g) To avoid duplication and unnecessary expense the Corporation shall, to the maximum feasible extent in conducting its operations, utilize the services and facilities of other agencies, including the Department of the Interior, General Services Administration, the National Capital Planning Commission, the District of Columbia Government, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its powers and duties, the Corporation shall have all necessary and proper powers for the exercise of the authorities vested in it;

(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name. All litigation arising out of the activities of the Corporation shall be conducted by the Attorney General;

(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws, rules and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

(5) may acquire (by purchase, lease, exchange (within the development area), gift, condemnation (except personal property) or otherwise), hold, maintain, use and operate, and may sell, lease or otherwise dispose of, such real and personal property and any interest therein as the Corporation deems necessary for the carrying out of the development plan; and may lease, repurchase or otherwise acquire and hold any property which the Corporation has theretofore sold, leased or otherwise conveyed, transferred or disposed of: *Provided*, That prior to acquiring any property there shall be a finding of assurance of adequate replacement housing consonant with the requirements of section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1455(c)(1);

(6) may enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, the several States, or the District of Columbia or with any person, firm, association, or corporation (including agreements with private utility companies with respect to the relocation of utility lines and other facilities in the Development Area) as may be deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of activities authorized under this Act;

(7) may establish (through covenants, regulations, agreements, or otherwise) such restrictions, standards, and requirements as are necessary to assure development, maintenance, and protection of the Development Area in accordance with the development plan;

(8) may borrow money from the Treasury of the United States in such amounts as may be authorized in appropriation acts. The Corporation's borrowings shall have maturities agreed upon by the Corporation and the Secretary of the Treasury but not in excess of 40 years. Such borrowings may be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Borrowings shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the obligations of the Corporation. The interest payments on such obligations may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury but any interest payment so deferred shall bear interest. Said obligations shall be issued in amounts and prices approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. The authority of the Corporation to issue obligations hereunder shall expire June 30, 1980, except that obligations may be issued at any time after the expiration of said period to provide funds necessary for the performance of any contract entered into by the Corporation, prior to the expiration of said period. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued under this paragraph and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction of the United States the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Loan Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Loan Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations under this paragraph;

(9) may invest any funds held in reserve or sinking funds, or any moneys not required for immediate use or disbursement, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, in obligations of the United States Government, or obligations the principal and interest of which are guaranteed by the United States Government: *Provided*, That this authority shall not extend to moneys obtained by borrowing from the Government or through appropriations to the Corporation;

(10) may procure insurance against any loss in connection with its property and other assets and operations;

(11) may contract for and accept any gifts or grants or property or financial or other aid in any form from the Federal Government or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or from any State or any agency or instru-

mentality thereof, or from any source, and comply, subject to the provisions of this Act, with the terms and conditions thereof;

(12) may determine the character and necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed and paid, subject to provisions and laws specifically applicable to wholly-owned Government corporations;

(13) may prepare or cause to be prepared plans, specifications, designs and estimates of cost for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, improvement, alteration or repair of any project, and from time to time to modify such plans, specifications, designs or estimates;

(14) may acquire, construct, reconstruct, rehabilitate, improve, alter or repair or provide for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, alteration or repair of any project;

(15) may grant options to purchase any project or may renew any leases entered into by it in connection with any of its projects, on such terms and conditions as it may deem advisable;

(16) may manage any project, owned or leased by the Corporation and may enter into agreements with the District of Columbia Government or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, partnership or corporation, either public or private, for the purpose of causing any such project to be managed;

(17) may utilize or employ the services of personnel of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia, with the consent of the agency or instrumentality concerned, upon a reimbursable basis, or utilize voluntary or uncompensated personnel;

(18) shall publish and disseminate information and make known to potential users, by advertisement, solicitation or other means, the availability for development of lands in the Development Area;

(19) may execute all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its functions under this Act, and may delegate to members of the Board or the Executive Director such of its powers and responsibilities as it deems appropriate and useful for the administration of the Corporation; and

(20) shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner as the Executive departments of the Government, and shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased or bankrupt debtors.

SEC. 7. (a) Nothing in this Act shall preclude other agencies or instrumentalities of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia from exercising any lawful powers in the Development Area consistent with the development plan or the provisions and purposes of this Act; but no such agency or instrumentality shall release, modify, or depart from any feature or detail of the development plan without the prior approval of the Corporation.

(b) After the date of the enactment of this Act, no new construction (including substantial remodeling, conversion, rebuilding, enlargement, extension, or major structural improvement of existing buildings, but not including ordinary mantenance or remodeling or changes necessary to continue occupancy) shall be authorized or conducted within the Development Area except upon prior certification by the Corporation that the construction is, or may reasonably be expected to be, consistent with the carrying out of the development plan for the area: *Provided*, That if the development plan for the area does not become effective under the provisions of section 5 within sixteen months of the date of enactment of this Act, this subsection shall be of no further force and effect until such time as the development plan does become effective under that section.

SEC. 8. (a) Condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of any real property (including interests therein) which may be necessary or appropriate for the carrying out of the development plan shall be conducted in accordance with the procedural provisions of 16 D.C. Code, Chapter 13, Subchapter IV.

(b) The title to any real property (or interest therein) acquired under the authority of this Act shall be taken by and in the name of the Corporation and proceedings for condemnation or other acquisition of property shall be brought by and in the name of the Corporation.

(c) No award of compensation shall be increased or decreased by reason of any increase or decrease in the value of real property caused by the actual or proposed acquisition, use or disposition by the Corporation of any other real property for corporate purposes.

(d) The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency shall, at the request of the Corporation, develop or cause to be developed a relocation program or programs for existing businesses and residents within any area to be acquired pursuant to this section, and no property shall be acquired by the Corporation until such plan has been prepared by the Corporation or by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency at the Corporation's request. Thereafter the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency shall, at the expense of the Corporation, provide relocation payments in accordance with section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 1465, and provide relocation services as authorized by the Act of October 6, 1964, 5 D.C. Code 728, to individuals, families, business concerns and non-profit organizations which may be or have been displaced from real property by actions of the United States or of the District of Columbia. Relocation services performed on behalf of the Corporation shall be coordinated with the District of Columbia's central relocation programs.

SEC. 9. (a) In effectuating the purposes of this Act, the Corporation:

(1) shall consult and cooperate with District of Columbia officials and community leaders at the earliest practicable time;

(2) shall give primary consideration to local needs and desires and to local and regional goals and policies as expressed in urban renewal, community renewal and comprehensive land use plans and regional plans; and

(3) shall foster local initiative and participation in connection with the planning and development of its projects.

(b) The Corporation shall comply with all District of Columbia laws, ordinances, codes, and regulations in constructing, reconstructing, rehabilitating, altering and improving any project: *Provided*, That the provisions of 5 D.C. Code 428 shall apply to all the constructing, reconstructing, rehabilitating, altering and improving of all buildings by the Corporation. The construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, alteration and improvement of any project by non-Government sources shall be subject to the provisions of the District of Columbia Code and zoning regulations.

SEC. 10. (a) Since the exercise of the powers granted by this Act will be in all respects for the benefit of the people, the Corporation is hereby declared to be devoted to an essential public and governmental function and purpose and shall be exempt from all taxes and special assessments of every kind of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

(b) To the end that the District of Columbia may not suffer undue loss of tax revenue by reason of the provisions of subsection (a), the Corporation, in connection with any real property acquired and owned by the Corporation in carrying out the provisions of this Act, is authorized, empowered and directed to pay an annual amount to the District of Columbia Government equal to the amount of any real property tax which would have been payable to the District of Columbia government had such real property remained in private ownership.

SEC. 11. The Corporation shall transmit to the President and the Congress, annually each January and at such other times as it deems desirable, a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplishments under this Act.

SEC. 12. (a) The Corporation shall contribute to the civil service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission for the excess, if any, of the Government's share of the normal cost of the civil service retirement system applicable to the Corporation's employees and their beneficiaries over the agency contributions required by section 8334(a) (1) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Corporation shall include in the annual billings provided for under subsection (a) above, a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the fund, which shall be paid by the Corporation into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 13. The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred to, allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 14. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, or conversion of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation.

(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) Any person who with intent to defraud the Corporation (1) receives any compensation, rebate, or reward, or (2) enters into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 15. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting "Federal City Bicentennial Development Corporation," after "Farmers Home Corporation;".

SEC. 16. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any body, agency, situation, or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other bodies, agencies, situations, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 17. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

(Mr. BURLESON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the petroleum industry is our country's principal source of energy. It is

no exaggeration to say that without it, our commerce and industry would come to a grinding and abrupt halt. In spite of this, our petroleum industry has become the object of mounting criticism, some of it constructive, but most of it accusatory.

On Sunday, July 26, the New York Times published a story which is remarkable both for its information and its evenhandedness. I am inserting it in the RECORD and commending it to the attention of my colleagues.

U.S. OIL INDUSTRY REGRETS IT WAS RIGHT

(By William D. Smith)

If an industry could have a facial expression, the United States oil industry would be wearing a bittersweet smile.

The smile would be a result of having seen recent events prove some of its serious forecasts and urgent warnings correct.

The pleasure, however, is mitigated by the pain that the industry is nonetheless suffering from having seen its predictions come true.

Throughout the long and heated political controversy over oil imports, the industry has maintained that foreign sources of petroleum were relatively undependable and that their lower-than-domestic price levels could be quite ephemeral. For this thesis oilmen were raked over the political coals. The price of Middle East crude oil is now at least 75 cents a barrel more than domestic.

For more than a decade oil and gas producers have warned that Federally set "low" natural gas prices would dampen the incentive to look for gas and thus produce a future shortage. Again this was treated as a totally self-serving ploy.—"There is a shortage of natural gas today," Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel reportedly explained.

John Emerson, energy economist of the Chase Manhattan Bank recently went even further. "Never before in this century have we faced such serious and widespread shortages of energy. These shortages are upon us now."

The industry warned that rushing into low-sulphur, anti-pollution legislation and regulations might produce supply problems.—There appears a very good chance that there will be a shortage of low-sulphur residual fuel oil this winter, forcing cities and corporations to choose between lack of heat and power and the present practicality of recent anti-pollution laws.

Being correct, at least on the surface level, gives the industry no reason to gloat. In each instance it is costing the oil companies money. If they pass on the cost, as they probably will have to, it cuts into what little affection the public has left for the industry.

"No one will remember that Senator Kennedy or Senator Muskie and other so-called consumer representatives have advocated policies that have often ultimately resulted in higher costs. They will only blame us for rising the price of gasoline or heating oil," a vice president and counsel for a major company commented last week.

The executive's statement is probably too one-sided. The present situations are the result of many complex forces; some alterable, some not.

Nonetheless, some politicians and academicians, past and present, may have been guilty of thinking that a big desk and pet theories were a substitute for the hard facts of industrial life.

There is a very good chance that by fall the American consumer may be paying more for gasoline, natural gas and residual fuel. This means that the cost of running his car, his home and his factory will cost more.

These major impacts on the battle with inflation have not gone unnoticed in Washington although it appears that no major constructive actions have as yet occurred.

The leap in the price of overseas crude oil is a result of soaring tanker costs. Few analysts expect these costs to go down in the very near future.

But if tankers are the central reason, the Arab-Israeli war is the underlying cause.

On May 3 in Syria, the Trans Arabian Pipeline was knocked out of commission by an errant or deliberately aggressive bulldozer. The Syrian Government has not allowed its repair, preventing 500,000 barrels a day of Saudi Arabian crude from reaching the Mediterranean.

At the other end of the Mediterranean the Libyan Government cut back oil production by 15 per cent, or 500,000 barrels a day.

The loss of almost 1 million barrels a day of oil west of Suez and close to world markets has strained tanker capacity. Replacement of this oil with oil from the Persian Gulf around South Africa takes six to eight times the tanker capacity.

CHARTER RATES RISE

Spot charter rates have risen to their highest level since the 1956 Suez crisis and are more than 50 per cent higher than during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

Persian Gulf oil is now coming into the United States at about $4.50 a barrel compared with Louisiana crude delivered to East Coast refineries at $3.75.

There is no chance of a shortage, however, because Texas and Louisiana will increase their production to meet the need. There is a very real chance of consumer price increases.

The Oil and Gas Journal, a trade publication, reports that Professors Philip Areeda and James McKie, two of the chief advocates of sharply increased oil imports, have now backed off considerably from that position.

F.P.C. REGULATION UPHELD

The natural gas supply and demand controversy is a far older argument. In 1954 the Supreme Court ruled that natural-gas producers were subject to Power Commission. In 1960 the regulatory agency began fixing wellhead prices for all gas sold interstate. The Supreme Court upheld this right again in 1965 despite vigorous crys of outrage from producers who said it would kill incentive to drill.

Time has proven the oilmen right. Wildcat drilling dropped 40 per cent between 1956 and 1968. Geophysical activity fell 56 percent.

Some of the drop off may have been artificial; just to show the Government. Nonetheless the results are uncontestable. In 1969 the United States proved reserves of natural gas fell 12.241 trillion cubic feet, the largest in the nation's history.

The previous record drop was in 1968, when they fell 5.548 trillion cubic feet. These are the only declines in the history of the industry.

POSITIONS CHANGED

The F.P.C. is now trying to rectify the situation by raising prices. Some of the people who supported the lower prices several years ago are now in the forefront of those pushing higher prices.

The Interior Department is trying to speed up lease sales of suspected gas fields, but is running into opposition from Conservationists. But even if this opposition is overcome, it will take from three to seven years for these areas to begin producing.

In the meantime Canadian sources of gas can be tapped although Canadian-American relations on energy matters are at an all-time low. Liquefied natural gas quite possibly will reach this country from Algeria, Nigeria or Venezuela. Contracts have already been signed to import Algerian L.N.G., but the Algerian Government's recent nationalization of American oil company properties puts this source of L.N.G. in a very questionable position.

SUPPLY OUTLOOK TIGHT

The supply outlook for this winter is tight. Industry sources say that there will be enough to heat homes, but that the industrial market which accounts for about 50 per cent of total sales, may be in bad shape. Many distributors already have been forced to impose severe limitations on new industrial loads, and there is a real possibility that deliveries to existing customers may have to be curtailed, according to J. W. Heiney, president of the American Gas Association.

It would seem almost certain that consumer prices will have to go up, and possibly sharply.

The crude oil reserve situation is not much better, according to the American Petroleum Institute. Last year crude oil reserves dropped to 29.632 billion barrels, the lowest level in 15 years.

The A.P.I. explained the situation simply by saying that lack of incentives had led to a long and steady decline in exploratory drilling during a period of mushrooming production and consumption.

The oil industry in recent weeks seems to have won a lot of points, but through no fault of its own, it well may be losing the game.

WHO CARES WHAT PRICE I PAY?

(Mr. BURLESON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following is a poem by a 20-year-old Vietnam veteran who lost his life in battle a few weeks ago:

WHO CARES WHAT PRICE I PAY?

Take a man and put him alone,
Thousands of miles away from home.
Empty his heart of all the blood,
Make him live in sweat and mud.

This is all the life I have to live,
My soul to God I give.
You peace boys rant from your easy chair
But you don't know what it's like here.

You burn your draft cards, march at dawn,
Chant your songs on campus lawns.
You all want to **"Ban the Bomb."**
The real war is in Viet Nam.

You use your drugs and have your fun;
Then you refuse to use the gun.
There's nothing else for you to do,
And I'm supposed to die for you.

I'll hate you 'til the day I die,
Because you made my buddy cry.
I saw his arm a bloody shred,
I heard them say, "This one is dead."

It's a large price to pay,
Not to live another day.
He had the guts to fight and die,
He paid the price, but what did he buy?

He bought your life by losing his,
But who gives a damn what a soldier gives.
His wife does, his mother, his father, and sons,
But they're about the only ones.

Victor DeFoor somewhat addresses his sentiments to all of us in some degree or other. Unlike other wars in which our country has been involved, this one is different in that it is undeclared; had no beginning in any formal way; has no ending in sight—in any formal way. Most of all its purpose, its goals, and objectives are vague and not clearly identifiable.

Specifically, however, Victor DeFoor addressed the draft dodgers, the draft

card burners, the rabble rousers—who use the Vietnam war as an excuse—who would be protesting something else if it were not for the war.

It is sad that a clean-cut, loyal, and dedicated boy like Victor had to give his life for such as this—and things move on as usual. Of course the world is going to continue to turn, and its not going to slow down for any of us to get off but only the comparative few who are touched so directly by a tragedy which befell this boy really seem to know that a war is going on in Southeast Asia—and for what; for whom and for why, is past the argument stage.

It is understandable that Victor, those who grieve for his loss; those whose sons, husbands, brothers—are prisoners of the enemy—feel deeply his words: "Who cares what price I pay?"

"Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin"—the "handwriting on the wall"—should have been clear 5 years ago. We could have won this conflict then—in short order. But then we found out we were not supposed to "win" in that sense. As a result, the loss of Victor and other fine young men—needlessly.

The handwriting is still there; the warning that still others will die unless we win or tuck tail and get out. And what of approximately 1,500 prisoners we cannot abandon? We do—we must—care what price they pay.

ANOTHER TREASURY RAID?

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there follows a revealing column in the July 28, 1970, Washington News, written by John Herling:

ETHICAL CONFLICT

Joseph P. Rauh, the Washington attorney for the dissident coal miners, has resumed his charges of conflict of interest against Edward Bennett Williams and John Connolly, who have been representing the United Mine Workers Union and its officers.

Last May, Mr. Rauh raised the point in federal court that Messrs. Williams and Connolly were in conflict of interest by serving as representatives of both the United Mine Workers and the officers who are charged with dereliction of duty in connection with UMW affairs.

Because of this alleged conflict, Mr. Rauh told the court, Messrs. Williams and Connolly should be disqualified as attorneys for both the UMW officers and the union itself.

About a week later, Mr. Williams phoned Mr. Rauh and said he would like to discuss the matter of the "motion to disqualify counsel." They met on May 13. At that time Mr. Williams professed unfamiliarity with the various matters affecting the UMW and actually had never talked to Mr. Boyle, but was now going to do so.

To indicate his grasp of the situation, he said he would suggest to Mr. Boyle whose election is being contested by the Labor and Justice departments as well as by the dissident miners that the UMW consent to a new election. All he had to do was to persuade Mr. Boyle.

Because Mr. Williams believed the contested election was the jugular factor in the dispute, he thought a consent election would serve to resolve several of the problems raised in the motion to disqualify him and Mr. Connolly as counsel for both the UMW and the officers charged with misusing the union treasury.

Under such conditions, Mr. Williams implied that it might not be necessary for his firm to respond to Mr. Rauh's motion in court, or to agree to depositions which Mr. Rauh required.

On May 21, Mr. Williams informed Mr. Rauh that he had at last talked to Mr. Boyle. Mr. Williams, however, made no reference to the matters of a consent election.

At any rate, Mr. Williams said it was decided that his firm would remain as counsel for the union but not for the individuals.

Such an arrangement Mr. Rauh would not agree to. In his original motion he had foreseen such an attempt at separation of representation, and warned that Messrs. Williams and Connolly could not do indirectly what they are barred from doing directly. Mr. Rauh insisted that Mr. Connolly start preparing to make his deposition.

On June 9 Mr. Connolly said he would not consent to the taking of a deposition and filed a response in federal court to the original Rauh motion to disqualify him on charges of conflict of interest.

Mr. Rauh then served notice, on July 8, on Mr. Connolly to take deposition on July 30, but Mr. Connally responded by filing a motion to quash the motion for the taking of the deposition.

According to Mr. Rauh, this insistence on a deposition grows out of his need for "discovery", a process of disclosure which he says would prove that Messrs. Williams and Connolly are and will be paid huge sums out of the UMW treasury for legal services for the benefit of the individual defendants. Their representation of the union and its officers, he said, is not separable.

PUT THE BLAME WHERE IT BELONGS

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, my Democrat colleagues from California have been wringing their hands over the economic plight of Orange County, Calif. I do not believe their blame shifting should go unchallenged.

We are told 32,000 people are out of work in their county. I wonder if they would tell us who is to blame for the inflation whose cure has brought on unemployment in some areas.

They complain about 800 aerospace workers laid off. I wonder if they would tell us which party is demanding bigger and bigger cuts in defense and space spending.

They tell us of building craftsmen out of work. I wonder if they could tell us whose economic policies during the 1960's is responsible for that.

Mr. Speaker, there is a constant effort by the Democrats to shift the blame for their poor performances onto the Republicans. But there is one fact that all the fancy footwork in the world will not let them escape—they have been in control of the Congress for 36 of the last 40 years and of the White House for 28 of the last 38 years. They have never conquered unemployment without a war. They have put us into three wars in 30 years. And they have brought on the worst inflation in our history.

Let the Democrats defend that record.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. From 1950 to 1968 the total number of technicians, engineers, and scientists in the United States increased from 851,000 to 2,500,000. This was four times the annual growth rate for the entire employed civilian labor force.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17548, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for the independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1971:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1345)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17548) "making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 10, 11, 15, 23, 26, 28, 29, 40, 43, 44, 47, 48, and 49.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 13, 16, 20, 22, 24, 27, 32, 37, 41, 45, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,577,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$340,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$133,560,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,974,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,565,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$511,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$293,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,350,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$43,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"INTEREST ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS

"For payments to Federal Home Loan Banks for the purpose of adjusting the effective interest rates charged by such banks, as authorized by section 101 of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970, $85,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$118,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 19, 25, 30, 39, and 55.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS
(except as to amendments 17 and 38),
JOSEPH M. McDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT
(reservations on No. 44),
MARGARET CHASE SMITH
(except as to No. 44),
ROMAN L. HRUSKA
(reservations on No. 44),
MILTON R. YOUNG
(reservations on No. 44),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $47,577,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $45,800,000 as proposed by the House and $47,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $24,900,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,725,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $18,210,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $18,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $340,350,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of $335,250,000 as proposed by the House and $344,153,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $133,560,300 for construction of public buildings projects instead of $142,024,300 as proposed by the House and $120,672,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes reprogramming of $59,974,800 for construction of public buildings instead of $48,473,200 as proposed by the House and $70,512,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment reprogramming funds previously appropriated for projects at Honolulu, Hawaii, Indianapolis, Indiana, Albany, New York, and Bronx, New York, for funding of projects approved in the 1971 construction program, instead of reprogramming funds for eight projects as proposed by the House and seven projects as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to change the citations from 1964, 1967 and 1968 as proposed by the House to 1967, 1968 and 1970 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate an additional $2,694,000 for the post office and Federal office building, Augusta, Georgia.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $1,500,000 for the courthouse and Federal office building, Alton, Illinois, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates an additional $850,000 for the courthouse and Federal office building, Frankfort, Kentucky, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate an additional $2,064,000 for the post office and Federal office building, Houma, Louisiana.

Amendment No. 13: Deletes $3,076,000 for the Charles A. Buckley Post Office and Federal office building, Bronx, New York, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate an additional $1,355,600 for the post office and Federal office building, Providence, Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $1,000,000 for expenses, United States court facilities as proposed by the House instead of $1,463,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $1,215,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Administrator as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $2,565,000,000 for research and development instead of $2,500,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,606,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Administrator has flexibility to use funds as desired, including the Apollo and Skylab programs.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $24,950,000 for construction of facilities instead of $18,275,000 as proposed by the House and $34,478,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Committee of conference has added to the proposed House amount $1,250,000 for the isotope thermoelectric systems application laboratory at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory; $1,925,000 for the earth resources technology laboratory at Goddard; and $3,500,000 for the nuclear engine test stand No. 2 in Nevada.

Amendment No. 19: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate making $10,000,000 available for use at certain NASA facilities to accommodate earth environmental studies for Federal agencies on a non-reimbursable basis.

The committee of conference is agreed that not less than $1,000,000 of the funds provided for NASA shall be utilized for research, development and testing at the Arnold Engineering Development Center in fiscal year 1971.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 20: Authorizes $20,500,000 for expenses of program development and management as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $511,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $495,000,000 as proposed by the House and $520,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Inserts provision that earmarks not less than $9,500,000 for first-year graduate traineeships as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to include other programs of supplementary training within the funds earmarked for summer institutes.

Renegotiation Board

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $4,235,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,110,000 as proposed by the House.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to authorize the use of funds to complete the institutional investors study.

Selective Service System

Amendment No. 26: Deletes language proposed by the Senate for official reception and representation expenses.

Veterans Administration

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $1,857,200,000 for medical care as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,777,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Authorizes $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses as proposed by the House instead of $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $59,000,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities as proposed by the House instead of $79,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The unobligated balance carried forward from fiscal year 1970 is $78,907,000, providing a total of $137,907,000 for hospital construction by the Veterans Administration for 1971.

TITLE II

Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the language proposed by the Senate with an amendment to appropriate $1,000,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and $650,000 as proposed by the House for the Council on Environmental Quality. The committee of conference suggests that further hearings should be conducted in connection with any request for supplemental appropriations if further funds are required after pending reorganization plans are finalized.

National Aeronautics and Space Council

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $500,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $560,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Emergency Preparedness

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $5,890,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $2,000,000 for salaries and expenses of telecommunications management instead of $1,795,000 as proposed by the House and $3,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Science and Technology

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $2,100,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,175,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Appalachian regional development programs

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $293,500,000 for Appalachian Regional Development Programs instead of $291,500,000 as proposed by the House and $295,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense

Civil Defense

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $50,100,000 for operation and maintenance of civil defense instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House and $51,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $3,755,000 for emergency health activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $1,350,000,000 for urban renewal programs instead of $1,000,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,700,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate $10,000,000 for the housing for the elderly or handicapped fund instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and incorporates technical changes in language to conform with existing law.

The committee of conference directs that housing for the elderly or handicapped be given appropriate priority in allocating contract authorization provided pursuant to Sec. 236 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, so an equitable portion will be utilized for such housing where needed in conjunction with the funds appropriated for this revolving fund.

Amendment No. 40: Deletes funds proposed by the Senate for grants for tenant services. The committee of conference agrees that it is not necessary to provide a separate appropriation for grants for tenant services as adequate authority exists under present statutory authorizations to make provision for these services in low rent public housing projects.

Amendment No. 41: Provides annual contract authorization of $9,300,000 for college housing as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $43,500,000 for salaries and expenses, renewal and housing assistance, instead of $41,000,000 as proposed by the House and $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $8,000,000 for salaries and expenses, metropolitan development, as proposed by the House instead of $8,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $30,000,000 for urban research and technology as proposed by the House instead of $55,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Authorizes $1,700,000 for administrative expenses for urban research and technology as proposed by the Senate instead of $940,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46: Provides annual contract authorization of $55,000,000 for the rent supplement program instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 47, 48 and 49: Restore citations as proposed by the House and delete those proposed by the Senate, and appropriate $3,500,000 for salaries and expenses, Federal Housing Administration, as proposed by the House instead of $6,290,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees suggest that any needed counseling services can be provided by voluntary groups and existing community services, but where such services are not provided they may be made available as part of the normal mortgage insurance initiation and servicing activities.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $8,000,000 for fair housing and equal opportunity instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $11,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. No funds are provided for reimbursing local communities under this program.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $14,000,000 for regional management and services instead of $13,500,000 as proposed by the House and $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—CORPORATIONS

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendment No. 52: Provides $6,625,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $85,000,000 for interest adjustment payments to Federal Home Loan Banks instead of $250,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provides funds for the first year of this new program. A request for additional funds can be considered when there is demonstrated need for additional funding and specific plans are developed.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendment No. 54: Provides $118,775,000 for non-administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of $112,000,000 as proposed by the House and $125,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 55: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment relating to procurement of hand or measuring tools not produced in the United States or its possessions, with an amendment making it applicable only to solicitations for bids opened after its enactment. This brings government procurement policy of GSA in line with procedures prescribed for defense procurement of such articles.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS
(except as to amendments 17 and 38),
JOSEPH M. McDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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. RUPPE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONTE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOSMER, for 15 minutes, August 3.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. MORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. WOLFF, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.
Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. MAHON), to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.
Mr. BURTON of California, to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks following those of Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. CLEVELAND, and to include extraneous material immediately following his remarks during debate in the Committee of the Whole today on the Reuss and Schwengel amendments.
Mr. PHILBIN in five instances, and to include extraneous material.
Mr. PEPPER, his remarks that appear in the Committee of the Whole on Monday, July 27, immediately prior to the Committee rising, to appear immediately before the vote on the O'Neill-Gubser amendment on Monday, July 27, in the Committee of the Whole, in the permanent RECORD.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. LANGEN.
Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania in two instances.
Mr. DICKINSON in three instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. SNYDER in two instances.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.
Mr. LUJAN.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.
Mr. WYDLER.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
Mr. SCHWENGEL.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous material:)
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. OBEY in six instances.
Mr. TAYLOR in two instances.
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ.
Mr. RODINO in three instances.
Mr. FUQUA in two instances.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.
Mr. HULL.
Mr. MONAGAN in three instances.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. DORN in two instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. ROONEY of New York.
Mr. SHIPLEY.
Mr. NEDZI in two instances.
Mr. SIKES in five instances.
Mr. DENT in two instances.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. BOGGS in two instances.
Mr. BENNETT.
Mr. STOKES in two instances.
Mr. ALBERT.
Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.
The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 29, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2255. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the use of the parole authority contained in section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act during the 6 months ending June 30, 1970, and on the implementation of section 203(a)(7) of the act for that period, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15733 (Rept. No. 91–1337). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 1076 (Rept. No. 91–1338). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2455. An act to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91–1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13125. A bill to amend section 11 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) as amended by the act of May 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 150), and as amended by the act of April 13, 1948 (62 Stat. 170) relating to the admission to the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14373. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Portsmouth, State of Virginia, certain lands situated within the Crawford urban renewal project (Va–53) in the city of Portsmouth, in exchange for certain lands situated within the proposed Southside neighborhood development project; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 17695. A bill to amend section 2735 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the finality of settlement effected under sections 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737 (Rept. No. 91–1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 15937. A bill to curtail the mailing of certain articles which present a hazard to postal employees or mail processing machines by imposing restrictions on certain advertising and promotional matter in the mails, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 17548 (Rept. No. 91–1345). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Drago Miklausic; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3436. A bill for the relief of Matyas Hunyadi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14421. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States located in Lawrence County, S. Dak., to John and Ruth Rachetto; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Colorado):

H.R 18665. A bill to amend the act of June 11, 1966 (80 Stat. 199) to provide rules and regulations for the protection and management of the lands and waters covered by said act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. UDALL, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. RHODES, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. KEE, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 18666. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 18667. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 18668. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 18669. A bill to establish a commission to study the usage, customs, and laws

relating to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 18670. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 18671. A bill to amend section 700 of chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for showing disrespect for the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 18672. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to establish a procedure by which postal patrons may be relieved of the burden of receiving commercial advertisements transmitted in the mails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 18673. A bill to amend chapter 3 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to U.S. contributions to international organization and programs, to provide for a program to control illegal international traffic in narcotics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 18674. A bill to promote and protect the free flow of interstate commerce without unreasonable damage to the environment; to assure that activities which affect interstate commerce will not unreasonably injure environmental rights; to provide a right of action for relief for protection of the environment from unreasonable infringement by activities which affect interstate commerce; and to establish the right of all citizens to the protection, preservation, and enhancement of the environment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 18675. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide for the rail transportation of freight for the Department of Defense in general purpose boxcars owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 18676. A bill to prohibit brokered deposits in banks and other financial institutions, to prohibit the use of so-called giveaways in the solicitation of deposits, and to prohibit lenders from acquiring equity participations in connection with loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. ASPINALL):

H.R. 18677. A bill to establish the Federal City Bicentennial Development Corp., to provide for the preparation and carrying out of a development plan for certain areas between the White House and the Capitol, to further the purposes for which The Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site was designated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 18678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 18679. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 18680. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax revenues with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 18681. A bill to amend section 138 of title 23 of the United States Code to require certification relating to air and water pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 18682. A bill to provide protection for the fish resources of the United States including the fresh water and marine fish cultural industries against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of fish and shellfish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 18683. A bill to amend section 4216 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 18684. A bill to provide additional assistance to the State of Texas for the reconstruction of areas damaged by tornadoes occurring on April 17 and 18, and May 11, 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 18685. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAMPLER (for himself, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina):

H.R. 18686. A bill to authorize the lease and transfer of Burley tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 1330. Joint resolution to proclaim "National Good Grooming Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.J. Res. 1331. 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. ESHLEMAN:

H.J. Res. 1332. Joint resolution establishing good grooming week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.J. Res. 1333. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate November 16 through November 22 as "National Good Grooming Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa):

H. Con. Res. 692. Concurrent resolution relating to the treatment and trial of military and political prisoners in Vietnam; 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. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 18687. A bill for the relief of Henry L. Trombley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 18688. A bill for the relief of Yohko Suzuki Reifenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

432. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to housing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

558. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Village Assembly, Ie, Okinawa, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

559. Also, petition of the Village Assembly, Kamimotobu, Okinawa, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

560. Also, petition of the Village Assembly, Ozato, Okinawa, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

561. Also, petition of Herbert F. Shaysning et al., Bronx, N.Y., relative to the regulation of pornographic movies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

REGISTRATIONS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1970:

(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. John J. Adams, Suite 320, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 330 South Fourth Street, Richmond, Va.

A. Frederick K. Alderson, 40 Ft. Williams Parkway, Alexandria, Va.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Mr. George Alderson, 323 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. All-Industry Committee for Radio All-Channel Legislation, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C.

A. American Conservative Union, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. American Education Lobby, Suite 650, 20 E. Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Lobby, Suite 250, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 80 Wall Street, New York City, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.

A. Australian Trade Council, Inc., 1030 15th St. NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gary Avery, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles W. Bailey, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Aveune 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, Gottleib, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Berlin, 1910 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Berlin, Roisman & Kessler, 1910 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert L. Bevan, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transamerica Corp., Occidental Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. E. Fontaine Broun, Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cominco American Inc., West 818 Riverside, Spokane, Wash.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Co., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.

A. Jerry Bruno, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hearst Corp., 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Norval E. Carey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. James B. Cash, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Central Ohio Co., Porter, Stanley, Treffinger & Platt, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. William C. Chapman, Industry-Government Relations, GMC, 1660 L Street NW., Room 804, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Neil L. Chayet, Esq., 15 Court Square, Boston, Mass.
B. Committee for Effective Drug Abuse Legislation, Box 572, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Citizens for S–3000, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Room 200, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Interbank Card Association, Suite 3600, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clifford, Warneke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William K. Condrell, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. 111 Realty Corp., 111 Monument Circle, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Room 800, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Coultas, Room 508, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Garrett de Bell, 1738 Riggs Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Zero Population Growth, 367 State St., Los Altos, Calif.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 82d Floor Empire State Bldg., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. M. L. DuMars, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Elson, Suite 202, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph T. Elvove, Sea Pines Plantation, Hilton Head Island, S.C.
B. Savannah Sugar Refining Corp., P.O. Box 339, Savannah, Ga.

A. Thomas W. Fink, Ring Building, Room 610, 1200—18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. David H. Forester, Legislation & Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Legislation & Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Paula Frohman, Apt. 202, 2301 41st St. NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Zero Population Growth, 367 State Street, Los Altos, Calif.

A. Bernard Fuchs, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Residents & Interns, Inc., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Vance Sanders Co., Inc., 111 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Douglas R. Gordan, 901 N. Washington Street, Alexandria Va.
B. Society of American Florists, 901 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. John C. Green, 509 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne Green, Peterborough, N.H.
B. Institute of Amateur Radio, Inc., Peterborough, N.H.

A. Robert J. Habenicht, 1400 South Joyce Street, Apartment C–901, Arlington, Va.
B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor Law Study Committee, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Hamilton Associates, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean N.Y.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, Australian Trade Council, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Australian Trade Council, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dennis E. Hart, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., (Indiana) 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael D. Hathaway, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miss Lyn Hayes, 323 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ross E. Heller, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. W. Henderson, 908 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. James McI. Henderson, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Copper Fabricators Institute, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Hugh Henry, 440 National Press Building.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Rosalyn Hester, National Educational Association, Project 18, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Holt, 307 East McCarty Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Eli Lilly & Co., 307 East McCarthy Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., c/o Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. Gerald Hyland, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., 800 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Herbert Jolovitz.
B. National Cable Television Assoc., Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert Jones, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Patricia J. Keefer, Youth Franchise Coalition, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Youth Franchise Coalition, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. William S. Kingman, Sheraton Park Hotel, Suite I–340, Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Telephone Corp., 222 South Central, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Mr. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C.
B. United Transportation Union.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Lovelace, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paperboard Packaging Council, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menswear Retailers of America, 390 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. W. McClanahan, Jr., National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ian R. MacGowan, Youth Franchise Coalition, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clifford G. McIntire, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Teresa D. McLaughlin, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. MacKenzie, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Walter D. Malcolm, 1 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Bankcard Association, Inc., 150 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bekins Van & Storage Co., 1955 South Valley Highway, Denver, Colo.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Ohio Co., Porter, Stanley, Treffinger, & Platt, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federal Cartridge Corp., Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Eighth and Marquette, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bituminous Coal Operators' Association, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James M. Morris, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lynn E. Mote, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Richard W. Murphy, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J.

A. National Antipollution Committee, 184 Washington Avenue, Albany, N.Y.

A. National Association of Single Taxpayers, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lewis G. Odom, Jr., Post Office Box 521, Montgomery, Ala.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Institute, Post Office Box 978, Manila, Philippines.

A. Roy W. Olson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

A. Paperboard Packaging Council, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Parsons, Tennent & Zeidman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Franchise Association, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bruce Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. Carl Pope, 1340 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Zero Population Growth 367 State Street, Los Altos, Calif.

A. Jerry C. Prichett, 2011 Eye Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Mechanical Contractors Association of America, 2 Pennsylvania Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. Reusing, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Roberts, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. C. Richard Rogers, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter S. Rosenberry, Jr., 2510 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Hawaii-Kai, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Joseph C. Russo, Jr., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electrical Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stanley H. Ruttenberg & Associates, Inc., 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert R. Shaefer, 1400 S. Joyce Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Warren Shear, Box 807, Duncan, Okla.
B. Four Seasons Equity Corp., Oklahoma City, Okla.

A. Warren Shear, Box 807, Duncan, Okla.
B. Independent Postal System of America, 1840 West Reno, Oklahoma City, Okla.

A. Dale Sherwin, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Electronic Industries Association, Consumer Products Division, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. Gary A. Soucie, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Steinhart, Goldberg, Feigenbaum & Ladar, Crocker Plaza, Montgomery at Post, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center, Calif.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, Esq., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy W. Terwilliger, 815 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 503, Washington, D.C.

B. Medical Information Bureau, 35 Mason Street, Greenwich, Conn.

A. John H. Walker, 901 N. Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.

B. Society of American Florists, 901 N. Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Wallach Associates, Inc., 136 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.

A. Jack A. Walker, 950 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leonard Warner, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C.

B. Australian Trade Council, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Warren, 5500 Prospect Place, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. REA Express, 219 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. D. Williams, 1231 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. D. Williams, Williams & Jensen, 1231 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pinkerton Holding Corp., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association Nacionol De Cultivaclores De Cana De Azucar, P.B. 4448, Cali, Colombia.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Motion Picture and Television Producers, 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Zero Population Growth, 367 State Street, Los Altos, Calif.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1970:

(NOTE.—The form used for report 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

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW.

A. Clarence G. Aramy, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

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) $975.00. E. (9) $300.60.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,761.05. E. (9) $6,761.05.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,196.18. E. (9) $4,196.18.

A. Frederick K. Alderson, 40 Fort Williams Parkway, Alexandria, Va.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $1,650.00.

A. George Alderson, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. John R. Ale, 1701 King Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $163.73. E. (9) $7.55.

A. Willis W. Alexander, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $10,108.10.

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) $1,537.47.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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) $8,273.11.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,746.90. E. (9) $3,746.90.

A. American Education Lobby, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,524.86. E. (9) $3,693.67.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., Washington offices: 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $43,207. E. (9) $43,207.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $42,855.01.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $117,842.27. E. (9) $1,846.90.

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) $24,491.40. E. (9) $24,491.40.

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) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Aetna Casaulty and Surety Co., et al.
D. (6) $13,191.38. E. (9) $13,191.38.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,802.51. E. (9) $3,358.87.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $94,075.23. E. (9) $39,576.81.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $963.73. E. (9) $58.99.

A. American Lobby, Suite 250, 20 E. Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y.; 1612 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $155.91.

A. American Medical Association, 535 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $23,853.90.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,495.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $107,177.94. E. (9) $1,351.39.

A. American Optometric Association, Post Office Box 5147, Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,730.26. E. (9) $2,730.26.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $25.

A. American Parents Committee Inc., 21 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,684.34. E. (9) $1,923.89.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $23,089. E. (9) $9,355.

A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,986.46.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,250.

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, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $422.27.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $13,596.20. E. (9) $13,596.20.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $19,761.47.

A. American Unsubsidized Lines, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,593.25. E. (9) $1,593.25.

American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $185.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,961.98 E. (9) $3,576,37.

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) $1,207.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,937. E. (9) $37.68.

A. Erma Angevine, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consumer Federation of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

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) $3,937.50 E. (9) $1,222.18.

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.
B. Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., 6767 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $2,441.04.

A. Associated Dairymen, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $550.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. Association of American Railroads, Building, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,268.10. E. (9) $8,268.10.

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 Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $285.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $56.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1026 17th Street Street N., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o J. C. Tumblin, O.D., Post Office Box 5147, 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. Mr. Harry S. Baer, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C.
B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $375.

A. Emil F. Baker, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., Gas and Electric Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $302.35.

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. 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. Arthur R. Barnett, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $745.26. E. (9) $15.46.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Courthouse, Roseburg, Oreg.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $173.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, Suite 701, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America, Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $345. E. (9) 215.10.

A. Mrs. Dita Davis Beard, ITT Building, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., ITT Building, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,110. E. (9) $1,695.

A. Michael K. Beard, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. World Federalists, USA, Inc., 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $1,370.65.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,863.30.

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. E. (9) $279.63.

A. James F. Bell, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $122.26.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Robert L. Bevan, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $9.67.

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) $6,720. E. (9) $316.10.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. 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.

A. John L. Blake, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $25.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Bluejay Oil Co., 1108 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
S. (9) $55.

A. William Blum, Jr., 704 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, William A. Geoghegan, Esquire, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,867. E. (9) $395.52.

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) $6,875. E. (9) $30.10.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, Bogan & Freeland, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,100.00. E. (9) $70.35.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $649.99. E. (9) $10.09.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tennessee.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

A. Wayne W. Bradley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $992.19.

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, Room 122, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industy.

A. Ophalandus Brasfield, 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) $833.94. E. (9) $233.04.

A. William C. Brashares, Esquire, Peabody, Rivlin, Kelly, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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, The Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $50.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Cable Television Assoc., Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $16.50.

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) $4012.80.

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) $350.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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 Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $26,793.19. E. (9) $26,793.19.

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) $400.

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) $150.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cominco American Inc., West 818 Riverside, Spokane, Wash.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ebasco Industries, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Public Utilities Corp., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8.17.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Co., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $4.62.

A. Jerry Bruno, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $766.30.

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) $375. E. (9) $1.90.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 2 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.
E. (9) $39.04.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.00.

A. J. J. Burke, Jr., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $156.44.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $487.50.

A. George B. Burnham, 120 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Burnham Chemical Co., 120 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $125.

A. George Burnham IV, United States Steel Corp., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Steel Corp., 525 William Penn Place, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $380. E. (9) $339.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $320.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. 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) $920.

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, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $375.

A. Charles A. Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA.

A. Marvin Caplan, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,117.80. E. (9) $114.96.

A. Caplin & Drysdale, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council on Foundations, Inc., 393 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ronald A. Capone, The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C.3, England; CENSA/CES Joint Container Committee, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C.3, England.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $1,397.40.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. Sargent Carleton, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $1,346.

A. Philip Carlip, 650 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. District 2, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $175.

A. Philip Carlip, Seafarers International Union, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,475.

A. Braxton B. Carr, Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,333.32. E. (9) $243.05.

A. Albert A. Carretta, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Work Glove Manufacturers Association, 1604 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $541.60.

A. John R. Carson, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Blue A. Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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. James B. Cash, Jr., suite 1002, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $176.50.

A. Mr. Francis R. Cawley, Wilson Plaza Building, room 511, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.

B. Agricultural Publishers Association, Wilson Plaza Building, room 511, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $96.08.

A. Mr. Francis R. Cawley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80.

A. Central Ohio Co., 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,006.50.

A. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,307. E. (9) $2,307.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, 5727 Blake Road, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
D. (6) $14,000. E. (9) $3,104.73.

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. Mr. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Transportation Union.
E. (9) $300.

A. Edwin Christianson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lowell T. Christison, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Post Office Box 5147, Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $125.20.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $35,769.40. E. (9) $197.90.

A. Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., 206 Premier Building, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,029.67. E. (9) $36,954.04.

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) $1,500. E. (9) $59.84.

A. Mr. Robert M. Clark, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cabot Corp.
E. (9) $15.25.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Interbank Card Association, Suite 3600, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $18.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $400.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $63.05.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington International School, 3211 Volta Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Brands, Inc.
E. (9) $120.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
E. (9) $120.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Inc.
E. (9) $120.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris Inc.
E. (9) $120.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
E. (9) $120.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc.

A. Eugene R. Clifford, 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) $2,175.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Australian Meat Board, 30 Grosvenor Street, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8.60.

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. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $700.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Owens-Illinois, Inc., Madison Avenue and St. Clair Street, Box 1035, Toledo, Ohio.
E. (9) $3.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Realty Committee on Taxation, 299 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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.
D. (6) $17,500. E. (9) $3,500.

A. David Cohen, Legislative Representative, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220.84.

A. William J. Colley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $991.22.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C.
B. The Boston Herald Traveler Corp., 300 Harrison Avenue, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

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. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $438.44.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $750.

A. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 160 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Comac Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $93.25.

A. Harrison Combs, Jr., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,311.25.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, c/o P. W. K. Sweet, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,662.65. E. (9) $5,662.65.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $948.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $106,000. E. (9) $10,230.95.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William K. Condrell, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. 111 Realty Corp., 111 Monument Circle, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,700.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $160.06.

A. Howard M. Conner, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $960. E. (9) $609.43.

A. James T. Conner, The Madison Building, 1155 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $815. E. (9) $154.75.

A. John A. Connor, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $225.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,932.70.

A. Harry N. Cook, Suite 200, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Howard Lee Cook, Jr., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $881.65.

A. Miss Eileen D. Cooke, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 56 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $80.16.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, Suite 401, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $695.63.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, 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) $19.60.

A. Darrell Coover, 215 Watergate Building, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $586.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Metropolitan Washington Banking, 15th & H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lilly Endowment, Inc., 914 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Robert M. Coultas, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Council For a Livable World, Cambridge, Mass.; 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $44,134.80. E. (9) $27,078.96.

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $320.05.

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) $1,090.17. E. (9) $1,090.17.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Adhesive & Sealant Council, 1410 Higgens Road, Park Ridge, Ill.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Diamond Association of America, Inc., 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 156 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Casualty & Surety Agents, 83 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300 or less.

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. The James Irvine Foundation, 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

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 N.W., 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. Truck Mixer Manufacturers Bureau, 900 Spring Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $18.30.

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., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Harold L. Crosier, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. Mr. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes.

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. F. Bosley Crowther 3d, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. The Canned Meat Importers' Association, c/o Transmundo Co., Inc., Time-Life Building, Rockefeller Center, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $250.01.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16h Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,999.99. E. (9) $2,803.05.

A. John R. Dalton, 420 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 420 Merchants Bank Building Indianapolis, Ind.

A. John Jay Daly, Direct Mail-Advertising Association, Inc., 921 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $1,150.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,219. E. (9) $31.91.

A. Philip J. Daugherty.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,845.60. E. (9) $96.75.

A. John Davenport, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000, Florida Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180.

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) $300.

A. Charles W. Davis, First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Corporate Fiduciaries Association of Chicago.
D. (6) $45,132.41. E. (9) $3,514.16.

A. Charles W. Davis, First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,417.84. E. (9) $386.96.

A. Charles W. Davis, First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Ave., Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $450.12.

A. Charles W. Davis, First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trans Union Corp. 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $132.99.

A. Fred E. Davis, 918 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Assn. of Manufacturing.

A. Davis, Wright, Todd, Riese & Jones, 4200 Seattle-First National Bank Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Arctic Slope Native Association, Post Office Box 486, Barrow, Alaska.
E. (9) $730.80.

A. Charles W. Day, Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $256. E. (9) $209.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $218,79.

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. Ray Denison, 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) $4,227.50. E. (9) $306.25.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Assn., 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, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $618.36. E. (9) $193.50.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 82d Floor Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $575.

A. Lloyd J. Derrickson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, 206 Premier Building, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,730.78.

A. C. H. DeVaney, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,937. E. (9) $18.55.

A. R. Daniel Devlin, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

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) $2,338.34. E. (9) $179.34.

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) $1,701.01. E. (9) $151.01.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville Calif.
D. (6) $1,213.47. E. (9) $13.47.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexanderia Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $16,375. E. (9) $2,938.57.

A. Discover America Travel Organizations, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $206,794.67. E. (9) $682.50.

A. William H. Dodds, UAM, 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) $1,237.00. E. (9) $188.22.

A. C. L. Dorson, Room 1128, Warner Building, 501–13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Room 1128, Warner Building, 501–13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,337.66. E. (9) $235.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.
B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, David R. Bradley, Agent, News Press & Gazette Co., 9th & Edmond Streets, St. Joseph, Mo.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $498.75.

A. Thomas J. Downey, 701 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $799.46.

A. F. Raymond Downs, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Mfg. Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Robert H. Doyle, 2029 K Street NW., Washintgon, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,281.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, Union-1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,1200. E. (9) $2,333.80.

A. R. Michael Duncan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $285.

A. Roy W. Easley, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26. E. (9) $2.15.

A. Macon T. Edwards, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $270.

A. George V. Egge, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $267.75. E. (9) $95.

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) $30.74.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Self.
D. (6) $2,286.16. E. (9) $2,959.40.

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, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $4,219.74. E. (9) $693.21.

A. Joseph T. Elvove, Sea Pines Plantation, Hilton Head Island, S.C.
B. Savannah Sugar Refining Corp., Post Office Box 339, Savannah, Ga.

A. Ely, Barlett, Brown & Proctor, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Massachusetts Federal Savings Council, Inc., 11 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $1,103.29.

A. Ely and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2400 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 and Power of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 11 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,200.

A. Ely and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely and Duncan 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely and Duncan 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,060. E. (9) $4,990.

A. Richard W. Emory, Esq., 1400 Merchantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. James C. England, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Assn.

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) $894.20. E. (9) $70.80.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,575. E. (9) $27.50.

A. Richard E. Faggioli, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company, 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) $4,227.50.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $73,685.75. E. (9) $17,256.44.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1500 Guiness Tower, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
D. (6) $7,750.03. E. (9) $204.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 117 Eglington Avenue East, Toronto, Canada.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $31.

A. Francis S. Filbey, President, United Federation of Postal Clerks, 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. Thomas W. Fink, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $11.04.

A. William J. Flaherty, Ass't. Director of Legislation, Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 2725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $100.90.

A. Roger Fleming, Secretary-Treasurer, and Director, Washington Office, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,675. E. (9) $17.18.

A. Law firm of Fletcher, Heald, Rowell, Kenehan & Hildreth, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Flynn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John J. Flynn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Gene N. Fondren, Attorney, P.O. Box 192, Taylor, Tex.
B. Texas Railroads, as previously reported.
D. (6) $3,280. E. (9) $897.24.

A. James W. Foristel, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $260.20.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., and William P. Benton, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $800.

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) $150.

A. John G. Fox, Assistant Vice President & Attorney, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $95.82.

A. Walter L. Frankland, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.30. E. (9) $165.55.

A. R. Frank Frazier, National Broiler Council, 1155 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Robert M. Frederick, Legislative Director, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,125.

A. James O. Freeman, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, DC.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $124.25.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $4.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37,219. E. (9) $11,447.

A. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d St., New York, N.Y.
B. None.
D. (6) $300. (9) $300.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 821 Fifteenth Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $954.40.

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. Bernard Fuchs, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Residents & Interns, Inc., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $82.86.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $451.

A. Garrett Fuller, 777 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Steamship Company, Inc., 2300 S.W. First Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

A. James E. Gaffigan, American Hotel & Motel Association, 777 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Henry E. Gardiner, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $299.74.

A. William B. Gardiner, Asst. Director of Legislation, Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $160.10.

A. Gardner, Morrison, Sheriff & Beddow, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

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, Washington office: 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $73,600.

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) $26.81. E. (9) $0.65.

A. John H. Gilbert, 128 C Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., 1505 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,512.50. E. (9) $227.85.

A. Dave Givens, Tennessee Railroad Association, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Glassie, Powett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Thomas Arciola, Moonachie, N.J.
D. (6) $500.

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) $2.57.

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) $225. E. (9) $19.65.

A. Vance V. Goodfellow, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,825.50. E. (9) $6.38.

A. W. S. Gookin, 112 North Central, Phoenix, Ariz.

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) $279.22.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delievery Association, 900 W. Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Government Employes Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,026.23. E. (9) $5,488.08.

A. Donald E. Graham, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,404.17. E. (9) $121.52.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $31.20.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $33.45.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. George O. Gray, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $391.50. E. (9) $43.10.

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) $225. E. (9) $78.23.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $581.31.

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. William G. Greif, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bristol-Myers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Fred J. Greiner, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Evaporated Milk Association, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Griner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,941.80. E. (9) $2,614.03.

A. James J. Gudinas, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dr. Harry P. Guenther, State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $22.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association.
D. (6) $2,111.54. E. (9) $925.

A. Jerome R. Gulan.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. William Habel, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Habenicht, 1400 South Joyce Street, Arlington, Va.
B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va.
E. (9) $250.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $108.76.

A. Matthew Hale, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 815

Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $75.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West 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, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $680.37.

A. Thomas A. Halsted, 210 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Council for a Livable World, 201 Massachussets Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,749.98.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Courier Corp., 2 Nevada Drive, Lake Success (NHP–PO), N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $20.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NY., Washington, D.C.
B. Ida Cason Callaway Foundation, Pine Mountain, Ga.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.09.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor Law Study Committee, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $10.

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) $35.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paulin Publishing Co., Inc. and Leo J. Paulin, 4980 Wyaconda Road, Rockville, Md.
D. (6) $300.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $100.76.

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. Robert N. Hampton, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,416.67. E. (9) $58.22.

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) $136. E. (9) $164.20.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.
B. California Savings & Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,040.56.

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 Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturing.

A. Andrew E. Hare, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8.

A. Mrs. Mildred B. Harman, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1780 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D.(6) $825. E. (9) $404.96.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $370. E. (9) $18.79.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. F. Donald Hart, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David Hartsough, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $594.

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) $342.29.

A. Michael D. Hathaway, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38.50. E. (9) $3.76.

A. Lyn Hayes, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hays & Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $104.43.

A. Haynes & Miller, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northeast Utilities Service Co., Post Office Box 270, Hartford, Conn.
D. (6) $18,000.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $138.94. E. (9) $138.94.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $170.44.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Hedlund, 909 American Bank Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,496.36.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.

A. Ross E. Heller, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $579.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. H. W. Henderson, 908 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $288.61.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1125.00. E. (9) $476.20.

A. Hercules Inc., 910 Market Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $412.50.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 410 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Mr. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.
D. (6) $11,416.50. E. (9) $53.03.

A. Hester & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $101.95.

A. Andrew I. Hickey, Jr., 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $129.08.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Association, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $1,160.42.

A. George T. Higgins, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Teresa B. Hightower, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $120.

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. Harry R. Hinton, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $875.73.

A. Mrs. Mae Hipsley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $125.57.

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) $350.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, Room 707, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $195.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $730.

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) $1,750. E. (9) $20.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn.
E. (9) $14,371.64.

A. Thomas B. House.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

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 Cos., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,542. E. (9) $1,732.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $6,875. E. (9) $2,677.57.

A. Edward W. Hummers, Jr., 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jones, Paulson, Humphreys & Leach, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Housing Association of America, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $962.27.

A. Jones, Paulson, Humphreys & Leach, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
D. (6) $5,833.34. E. (9) $728.90.

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) $110.45.

A. James L. Huntley, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,675. E. (9) $1,466.29.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Elmer F. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Norman E. Watkins, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $304.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, New York, N.Y.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,374.56.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,264.61. E. (9) $5,264.61.

A. Harry A. Inman, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The New York Botanical Garden, Bronx Park, New York, N.Y.
A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,250. E. (9) $1,270.

A. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,394.87.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15,506.45.

A. International Economic Policy Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $466.76.

A. International Union of District 50, UMWA, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,360.

A. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,522.05.

A. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., 800 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $10,016.87.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $23,361.32. E. (9) $7,048.47.

A. William E. Isaeff, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald A. Jacks, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Property & Casualty Reinsurers, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufatcurers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $118.99.

A. Raymond M. Jacobson, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Robert L. James, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bank of America N.T. and S.A., Bank of America Center, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $21.25.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $200.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,864.51. E. (9) $86.74.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,913.73. E. (9) $252.32.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Home Furnishings 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. The Signal Companies, Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $29.12.

A. Dr. 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) $1,812. E. (9) $6,719.

A. Ardon B. Judd, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $39.

A. Frank M. Karsten, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Affiliated Government Organizations, Brooklyn, N.Y.

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. Carleton R. Kear, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Capt. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

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, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (A Delaware Corp) Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $16.75.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 E. Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.
This sum represents the outside limits of the allocation of the registrant's services that have any conceivable connection with lobbying as the term has been interpreted.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155—15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Fletcher, Heald, Rowell, Kenehan & Hildreth, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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) $192.31.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $110.20.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $4,119.98. E. (9) $2,219.03.

A. Robert F. Kennon, 356 St. Charles Street, Baton Rouge, La.
B. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $507.06.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, The Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $150.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 1108 Stuart Road, Herndon, Va.
B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $425. 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) $999.60. E. (9) $5.58.

A. Mr. Charles L. King, Suite 600, Munsey Building, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Line Pilots Association, International.
D. (6) $223.

A. Joseph T. King, 3600 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Counsel for Associated Equipment Distributors.
E. (9) $785.82.

A. Mr. William S. Kingman, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Suite I–320, Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Telephone Corp., 222 South Central, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $136.46.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 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) $1,253.69.

A. Kirkland, Ellis Hodson, Chaffetz, Masters & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $120.

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) $3,560. E. (9) $223.20.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $192.50. E. (9) $179.48.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 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) $75.13.

A. Mr. Robert M. Koch, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington D.C.
E. (9) $30.50.

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. E. (9) $396.20.

A. Horace R. Kornegay, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth S. Kovack, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,877.50. E. (9) $733.50.

A. June Kysilko Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $617.60.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,784. E. (9) $1,503.28.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,873. E. (9) $9,484.35.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11,678.04.

A. Mr. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Transportation Union.
E. (9) $150.

A. Ronald A. Lang, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Asger F. Langlykke, 1913 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society for Microbiology, 1913 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert Lannon, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longhoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,431.97. E. (9) $574.76.

A. James J. LaPenta, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborer's International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $394.64.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. Donald F. Lavanty, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., c/o J. C. Tumblin, O.D., Post Office Box 5147, Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) $230. E. (9) $281.

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) $110.

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. Charles W. Lee, Congressional Hotel.
B. Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. Legislation for Animal Welfare, Inc., 3045 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue 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) $10,999.98.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr. & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Suite 808, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Chemical Fibres Association, 3,3-Chrome, Muromachi Nihonbashi, Chuo-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr. & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Suite 808, Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr. & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Suite 808, Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

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) $13,392.50. E. (9) $7.04.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Producers of Ferroalloys and Related Products.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $10.

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) $1,250.

A. J. Stanley Lewis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,812.50.

A. Herbert Liebenson, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite No. 307, Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite No. 307, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,884.81. E. (9) $4,884.81.

A. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc. 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $70.58.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, Ninth Floor, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, Ninth Floor, Loyalty Building, Portland, Orag.
B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, Ninth Floor, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, Active Ballot Club Department, 1775 K Street NW.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,499.90. E. (9) $1,485.03.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $446.25. E. (9) $204.72.

A. Livestock Producers Committee, 2000 NBC Building, San Antonio, Tex.
B. Livestock Producers Committee, 2000 NBC Building, San Antonio, Tex.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $3,255.18.

A. Paul H. Long, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1014, Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $28.88.

A. James F. Lovett, 100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $200.

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) $2,400. E. (9) $304.89.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Donald C. Lubick, 1800 One M&T Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
B. 111 Realty Corp., 111 Monument Circle, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $850.

A. George A. Lucas, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $2,853.84.

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. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menswear Retailers of America, R. 390, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

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) $3,649.80. E. (9) $3,481.31.

A. A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $83.70.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

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 Employes Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,660.95.

A. W. W. McClanahan, Jr., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cities Service Co., 60 Wall Tower, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $54.38.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,696.25. E. (9) $134.10.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Corporate Fiduciaries of Chicago, LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Resources & Chemical Corp., 2125 Tenneco Building, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $37.31.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf & Western Industries, Inc., 437 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,595.13. E. (9) $177.54.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,765.63. E. (9) $186.44.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silberberg & Co., 50 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $4.89.

A. E. L. McCulloch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers 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) $125.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,877.50. E. (9) $550.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $141.01.

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. J. Raymond McGlaughlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Marshall C. McGrath, Director, Government Relations.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $213.36.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federal of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,277.50. E. (9) $288.35.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $2,492.34. E. (9) $463.86.

A. Clifford G. McIntire, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,708.32.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,850. E. (9) $49.23.

A. Mrs. Teresa D. McLaughlin, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,042. E. (9) $1,326.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $245.50.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,200.

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) $481.25. E. (9) $5.34.

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) $2,000. E. (9) $536.37.

A. McNutt, Dudley & Eastwood, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dredging Co., 12 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., et al.
D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $661.94.

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. John R. MacKenzie, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o J. C. Tumblin, O.D., Post Office Box 5147, Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $43.06.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Andre Maisonpierre, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1045.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,825. E. (9) $108.25.

A. Mike Manatos, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $260.03.

A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. John V. Maraney, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $207.14.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $53.65.

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) $180. E. (9) $14.

A. Paull Marshall, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $126.11. E. (9) $140.40.

A. James J. Marshall, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., 1725 Eye Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4999.40.

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) $100.

A. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., State Fair Timonium Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L 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, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizen League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, Masaoka-Ishikawa And Associates, Inc., 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz.
D. (6) $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.
D. (6) $948.19. E. (9) $102.76.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Room 603, Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 603, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,076.84. E. (9) $1,453.52.

A. P. H. Mathews, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $502.33. E. (9) $327.83.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $662.50. E. (9) $511.32.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,612. E. (9) $249.87.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,745. E. (9) $590.

A. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

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) $2,500. E. (9) $624.92.

A. George G. Mead, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Theater Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,427.37.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $12,399.42. E. (9) $3,113.01.

A. Mr. Carl J. Megel, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,100.

A. Mr. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 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) $4,277.50.

A. R. Otto Meletzke, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $55. E. (9) $.93.

A. Mr. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 200 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $360.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $200.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $812.50.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, 18th & M Streets N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,280.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting and Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $3.74.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., Gas and Electric Building, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $2.35.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bank of New York.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $15.17.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bekins Van & Storage Co., 1955 South Valley Highway, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $23.25.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. H. E. Butt Trusts.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $11.28.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Ohio Co., c/o Porter, Stanley, Treffinger & Platt, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $6.50.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 2900 Prudential Tower, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $40.26.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federal Cartridge Corp., Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Roy A Hunt (deceased).
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hercules Inc., 910 Market Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $12.50.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Eighth and Marquette, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $16.87.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research, 5200 Gibson Boulevard SE., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
D. (6) $1,960. E. (9) $36.38.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Marshfield Clinic, Marshfield, Wis.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $15.20.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Henry T. Mudd, 523 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $11.39.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James H. Orr, 75 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $109.02.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Bundy Scott, c/o Walker, Wright, Tyler & Ward, 631 Van Nuys Building, 210 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $33.06.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Elbridge Stuart Foundation, 5045 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $97.45.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Gas Light Co., 1100 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Dr. Norman Zamcheck, 63 Kenwood Avenue, Newton Center, Moss.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $11.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1950.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 First National Life Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebraska.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $908.21.

A. Hermon I. Miller, 5116 Moorland Lane, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Turkey Federation, Mount Morris, Ill.

A. Joe D. Miller, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1612 K Street NW, Washington, D.C.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $221.88.

A. Robert H. Miller, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $62.30.

A. Joseph A. Millimet, 1838 Elm Street, Manchester, N.H.
B. New England Bankcard Association, Inc., Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $582.65. E. (9) $32.65.

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. Thomas F. Mitchell, 1735 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., Post Office Box 311, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $245.

A. Mobile Housing Association of America, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $453.29.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, Post Office Box 829, Boise, Idaho.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, et al.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bituminous Coal Operators Association, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. William Moody, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 816 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

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. Albert P. Morano, 7 Mallard Drive, Greenwich, Conn.
B. Gerli Co., Manchester, Conn.
D. (6) $1,500.

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, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Morin, 520 Investment Building NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,857.02.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, 1776 K Street NW., 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. E. (9) Under $50.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) 151.35.

A. James T. Mular, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $1,190.78.

A. John J. Murphy, 33 Wilelinor 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.
D. (6) $185.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $119.37.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,019.75. E. (9) $1,019.75.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,252.31. E. (9) $1,049.21.

A. National Association of Credit Management, 44 East 23d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $65. E. (9) $42.20.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67,564.34. E. (9) $11,627.60.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33,875.09. E. (9) $37,959.89.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $11,870.59.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $764,360.05. E. (9) $69,527.79.

A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, 2511 E. 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,290.43. E. (9) $2,290.43.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $35,000. E. (9) $20,438.91.

A. National Association of Single Taxpayers, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $297.10.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $3,600.

A. National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,125. E. (9) $21,109.92.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $26,697.39. E. (9) $6,370.58.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $84,071.16. E. (9) $7,681.45.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,016.60. E. (9) $2,016.60.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $539,320.47. E. (9) $6,679.03

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, DC.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,489.08.

A. National Committee to Abolish HUAC/HISC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,537.47. E. (9) $1,537.47.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 10000 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $70,795. E. (9) $39,703.97.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $10,803.53. E. (9) $10,803.53.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,299.84. E. (9) $30,377.76.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $554.34. E. (9) $730.15.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco Instruments Corp., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $273.94.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $225.46.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York City.
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) $299,609.97. E. (9) $12,976.21.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920–922 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,496.46. E. (9) $16,496.46.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,553.14. E. (9) $3,882.01.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,941.67.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $397.50.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $259.96.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $380,760.83. E. (9) $859.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,486.40. E. $1,486.40.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,404.08. E. (9) $7,404.08.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York City.
E. (9) $938.73.

A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,974.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Realty Trust, 60 Hickory Drive, Waltham, Mass.
E. (9) $25.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,140.03. E. (9) $1,290.62.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,812.52.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $11,510.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,309.22.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $334.84.

A. National Turkey Federation, Mount Morris, Ill.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,625. E. (9) $7,716.04.

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) $5,750. E. (9) $97.60.

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) $597.26.

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.

A. Frances E. Neely, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,394.

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) $2,500. E. (9) $260.37.

A. Robert B. Neville, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,687.50. E. (9) $100.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 E. Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,833. E. (9) $63.25.

A. E. J. Newbould, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Clay Pipe Institute, 350 West Terra Cotta Avenue, Crystal Lake, Ill.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $9.

A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa.
B. Northern Helex Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,350. E. (9) $672.80.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,712.30. E. (9) $715.88.

A. James W. Nisbet, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Western Railroad Association, an association of western railroads, 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) $924.68.

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.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. 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. Frank J. O'Brien, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, UMWA, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,360.

A. Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $534.68.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,422.92. E. (9) $48.22.

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) $116.50.

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) $3,300. E. (9) $500.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Co., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $135.

A. John B. O'Day, CLU, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $40,592.93.

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. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Institute, Post Office Box 978, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $250.——

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) $1,449.43. E. (9) $63.80.

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) $1,927.95.

A. Mr. Alvin E. Oliver, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward W. Oliver, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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.
E. (9) $180.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14.75.

A. Raymond B. Ondov, 105 East Oakland Avenue, Austin, Minn.
B. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn.
D. (6) $12,680. E. (9) $1,691.64.

A. 111 Realty Corp., 620 Guaranty Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
E. (9) $2,550.

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.
E. (9) $246.51.

A. Jerry H. Opack, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

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. 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. J. Don Parel, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $362.16. E. (9) $38.

A. Judith E. Park, 1909 Que Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Que Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,548.97. E. (9) $181.19.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $301.95.

A. Parsons, Tennent & Zeidman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Housing Producers, 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $36.54.

A. Parsons, Tennent & Zeidman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Franchise Association, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

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) $141.80.

A. Patton, Blow, Verill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Boating Industry Association, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) Under $500.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, Suite 710, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc., 140 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) Less than $500.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Geothermal Resources International, Inc., 1705 Chester Avenue, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) Under $500.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000.

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) $1,000.

A. Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Computer Lessors Association, Inc., One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Denver Post, Inc., 650 15th Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $88.82.

A. Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. GATX-Armco-Boothe, One Maritime Plaza, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,300.

A. Mr. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $707.94.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Kelly, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mass Retailing Institute, 570 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $25.

A. Pennzoil United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) 2,991.34.

A. Mr. D. V. Pensabene, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., 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 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. A. J. Pessel, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $245.

A. A. Harrold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,222.51.

A. Georgette Kelley Peterson, 520½ G Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Peace in Africa, 240 Dewey Street, Buffalo, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. (9) $195.

A. Michael Petresky, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corporation, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325. (9) $250.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. (9) $172.25.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,333.33. (9) $395.82.

A. Albert Pike, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $2,666.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. (9) $129.29.

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. (9) $1,460.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex., Cotton Ginner Association.
D. (6) $92,486.66. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Fredrick T. Poole, 425 13th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $418.

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) $256.47.

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, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $31.05.

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. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13.60.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 N. Parkway, Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $540.

A. William C. Prather, 221 No. LaSalle, Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $112.

A. William H. Press, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $218.75. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Mrs. Pearl B. Price, 406 Mayrant Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. Jerry C. Pritchett, 2011 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mechanical Contractors Association of America, 2 Pennsylvania Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $414.40. E. (9) $414.40.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 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) $816.67.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 1, Box 199, Annapolis, Md.
B. Associated Retail Bakers of America, 735 W. Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875.08. E. (9) $331.83.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 1, Box 199, Annapolis, Md.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27.38. E. (9) $10.40.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $1,507.50.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York City, et al.
D. (6) $10,749.98. E. (9) $10,449.06.

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) $2,014.17. E. (9) $200.84.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $204.84.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $220.

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) $4,988.

A. Carl R. Ramsey, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. Louis J. Rancourt, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $775.39.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $150.

A. Realty Committee on Taxation, 299 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $82,500. E. (9) $75,040.38.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institute Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
E. (9) $6,562.24.

A. John T. Reggitts, Jr., Public Relations Consultant Socio-Economic Research-Socio-Politico Research, 95 Boonton Avenue, Rural Delivery No. 2, Boonton, N.J.

A. W. W. Renfroe, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association.

A. Ronald E. Resh, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wyatt & Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1250.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,562.50.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Warner Building, 13th & E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,127. E. (9) $9,261.46.

A. John A. Reusing, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,396. E. (9) $3,053.

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) $26.

A. Theron J. Rice, Continental Oil Co., 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 Company (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,284.02. E. (9) $17.40.

A. Richard N. Rigby, Jr., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oceanography Association, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $89.25.

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) $37.74.

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. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kozai Club, 3–16, Nihonbashi-Kayabacho, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperation 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 Merchants Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $178.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank, Holding Companies, 1730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Mr. C. Richard Rogers, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

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. 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) $120.73.

A. William E. Rollow, Esq., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Capital Area Council of Sportmen, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Rollow, Esq., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Skeet Shooting Association.

A. Michael J. Romig, 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. Michael P. Roudnev, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

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, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,600. E. (9) $880.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $158.33.

A. Joseph C. Russo, Jr., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connetcicut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $14.85.

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) $954.66.

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) $483.45.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,137.50. E. (9) $480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco et al.

A. Carl K. Sadler, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,323.20. E. (9) $7,956.04.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press Inc., 205 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $2,309.22.

A. Eric P. Schellin, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $328.27.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, Esquire, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. Edwin R. Schneider, Jr., Esquire, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mail Advertisers Educational Committee of the Major Mailers and Producers of the Mail Advertising, Service Association International, Inc., 425 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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) $2,669.38.

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) $75.50.

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. Margaret Bundy Scott c/o Walker, Wright, Tyler & Ward, 650 South Grand, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $5,033.06.

A. Scribner, Hall, Casey, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Scribner, Hall, Casey, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Realty Committee on Taxation, 299 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Scribner, Hall, Casey, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transamerica Corp., 701 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

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. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

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, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $249.44.

A. Robert R. Shaefer, doing business as, Leisure Time Specialists, 1400 South Joyce Street, Arlington, Va.

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) $750. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph H. Sharlitt, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mail Advertisers Educational Committee of the Major Mailers and Producers of the Mail Advertising Service Association International, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sharon, Pierson & Semmes, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anchor Corp. et al.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Sharon, Pierson & Semmes, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $9,438.

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.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
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. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,212.50 E. (9) $1,580.48

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Max Shine, 1126 16th Street NW., Washing, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Shipley, Akerman Pickett Stein & Kaps, 1108 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Broker Dealers' Trade Association, 472 Bridge Street, Springfield, Mass.
E. (9) $390.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. $1,000.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) 200.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, Consumer Products Division, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. David Silver, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,566.50. E. (9) $5,008.70.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform and War Singles, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3.41. E. (9) $245.79.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
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. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $8.40.

A. Donald E. Smiley, Suite 1008, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $478.59.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,374.56.

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) $146.56.

A. Mrs. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.
B. North Dakota Railway Lines.
E. (9) $8.50.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Unsubsidized Lines, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $93.25.

A. Robert William Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $135.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, 2611 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $958.80.

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) $419.37. E. (9) $284.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $487.50.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,659.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,569.35. E. (9) $6,362.65.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, One East First Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, One East First Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $475.01.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,999.80.

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) $3.78.

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. Mr. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

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) $338. E. (9) $2,649.

A. Joseph L. Spilman, Jr., 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. Louis P. Spitz, 1828 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, 1828 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lynn Stalbaum, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Dairymen, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Allan J. Stanton, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Transportation Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., et al.,
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $16.

A. Melvin L. Stark, American Insurance Association, 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. Steinhart, Goldberg, Feigenbaum & Ladar, Crocker Plaza, Montgomery at Post, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center, Calif.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $905.44.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Robert College of Istanbul, Turkey, 305 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $4.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Rule of Law Committee, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association of America, 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,550. E. (9) $111.33.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, Washington, D.C.

A. Travis Stewart, 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J.
B. Hoffman-La Roche, Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $450.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Imported Footwear Group, American Importers Association, New York, N.Y., et al.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Iron & Steel Exporters' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

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) $5,350. E. (9) $398.96.

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) $815.90. E. (9) $100.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $700.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $469.50.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $3,500.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, Box 120, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $875.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seneca Nation of Indians, Haley Community Building, Salamanca, N.Y.
D. (6) An indeterminate fraction of $3000.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $5,30- E. (9) $633.33.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $737.07.

A. Elbridge Stuart Foundation, 5045 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $15,097.45.

A. Richard L. Studley, 1400 20th Street NW., Post Office Box 19128, Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Post Office Box 19128, Washington, D.C.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Norman A. Sugarman, Baker, Hostetler & Patterson, 1956 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Akron Community Trust et al.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $484.96.

A. Norman A. Sugarman, Baker, Hostetler & Patterson, 1956 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Battelle Memorial Institute, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $136.98.

A. Norman A. Sugarman, Baker, Hostetler & Patterson, 1956 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Federal Cartridge Corp., 2700 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $9,175. E. (9) $1,598.98.

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) $320.50.

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, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irving W. Swanson, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Diseases Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $950.

A. John R. Sweeney, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 701 East Third Street, Bethlehem, Pa.

A. Mr. Russell A. Swindell, Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. N.C. Railway.
D. (6) $264. E. (9) $94.60.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $775.23.

A. Charles P. Taft, Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Russell D. Tall, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rev. Charles C. Talley, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roy W. Terwilliger, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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. Clark W. Thompson, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $196. E. (9) $204.

A. William H. Tinney, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Penn Central Transportation Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturies & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,455.

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) $2,800. E. (9) $150.44.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Com-

panies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $670. E. (9) $841.46.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $11.30.

A. J. P. Trainor, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $1,329.24.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E (9) $19.

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) $2,312. 1. (9) $39.96.

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. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $79.50.

A. Joel B. Truce, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturing.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturing.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $29. E. (9) $171.13.

A. Dick Tullis, 607 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex. and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. W. Lloyd Tupling, 235 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $359.

A. Richard F. Turney, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $287.84.

A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $410.16. E. (9) $147.86.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $673,988.23. E. (9) $65,080.80.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $227.60.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $36,192.32.

A. The Universal Exchange, Post Office Box 8701, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $537.45.

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 42d St., New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $60.75.

A. John A. Vance, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,230. E. (9) $2,559.89.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists, Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, & Aeroscape Workers, AFL–CIO, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,137.50. E. (9) $480.

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) $52. E. (9) $3.

A. Venable, Baetjer and Howard, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair and 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) $430. E. (9) $32.65.

A. Mr. 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) $45.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coucil of Technical Service Industries (NCTSI), 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $184.61. E. (9) $18.86.

A. Paul A. Wagner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $742.50. E. (9) $175.41.

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.

A. Jack A. Waller, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

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) $1,001.05.

A. Charles S. Walsh.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $127.50. E. (9) $15.

A. William A. Walton, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, Eighth and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, Eighth and Jackson Streets, 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) $4,277.50. E. (9) $275.

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. Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago, 401 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $800.

A. Washington Gas Light Co., 1100 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,500.

A. Charles A. Webb, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, Association of Intercity Bus Operators, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 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) $8,156. E. (9) $45.75.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 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 Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $66,666.67.

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. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600.

A. Clyde A. Wheeler, Jr., Federal Bar Building, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sun Oil Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Fertilizer Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. John L. Wheeler, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. White, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $180.20.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 910 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co.

A. Whitlock & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, 15th & H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.

A. William E. Wickert, Jr., Solar Building, 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) $2,500.03. E. (9) $2,796.03.

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. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities, Rockford, Ill.

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) $105.95.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $1.35.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Data Processing Service Organizations, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $103.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
E. (9) $1.60.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, 47 East South Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. College Placement Council, Inc., 65 East Elizabeth Street, Bethlehem, Pa.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $1.70.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of 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) $2.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.60.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $1.35.

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.
E. (9) $1.90.

A. Mr. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $384.85.

A. Francis G. Williams.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturing.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $170.60.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square, South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $1,146.77.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Express Co., 65 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $875.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chronicle Publishing Co., Fifth and Mission Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,460. E. (9) $15.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 300 Lakeside Drive, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,325.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Corp., for Housing Partnerships, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

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) $345.

A. Earl Wilson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $237.82. E. (9) $117.79.

A. Frank J. Wilson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Milburn E. Wilson, Route 1, Fremont, Mich.
B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich.
D. (6) $200.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Pennzoil United, Inc., 800 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $424.26.

A. R. J. Winchester, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
B. Pennzoil United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $467.08.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $750.

A. Peter L. Wolff, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,481.60. E. (9) $552.52.

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

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 Signal Companies, Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. 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) $1,719. E. (9) $641.36.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 230 Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $20.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Asociación Nacional de Cultivadores de

Cana de Azucar, Post Box 4448, Cali, Colombia.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Motion Picture & Television Producers, 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,450. E. (9) $3.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Copyright Owners Negotiating Committee, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. City of Palm Springs, Calif., Municipal Building, Palm Springs, Calif.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.00.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Unionamerica, Inc., 435 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,203.

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. First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $42.30.

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) $25.93.

A. J. Banks Young, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,260. E. (9) $28.90.

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) $4,277.50 E. (9) $528.29.

A. Dr. Norman Zamcheck, 63 Kenwood Avenue, Newton Center Mass.
E. (9) $5,011.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Zimring, Gromfine and Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert H. Zinkand, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Getty Oil Co.

A. John Zorack, 100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $377.75.

A. Charles O. Zuver, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $110.

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following reports for the fourth 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) $11,218.40. E. (9) $6,943.50.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert F. Alfrey, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $468. E. (9) $27.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,230.69. E. (9) $5,230.69.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,570.21. E. (9) $1,570.21.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $16,886.47. E. (9) $16,886.47.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,171.60.

A. American Landowners Association, Box 294, Harpers Ferry, W. Va.
D. (6) $4.50.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $116.44.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $101,790.36. E. (9) $1,651.11.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $895.07. E. (9) $895.07.

A. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1819 H Street NW, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,250.

A. Erma Angevine, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consumer Federation of America, 1012 14th NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.

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) $924. E. (9) $93.26.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building Little, Rock, Ark.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $174.93. E. (9) $102.44.

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. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,333.34. E. (9) $1,179.50.

A. Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., 6767 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $3,270.21.

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) $4,542.42.

A. Atlantic Richfield, Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $300.

A. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $403.95.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue 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. Davis M. Batson, 611 Madison Office Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael K. Beard, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. World Federalists, U.S.A., Inc., 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $238.23.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Helen W. Berthelot, 1925 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,132.46.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,958.74

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) $800.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kingsbury Browne, Jr., 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Boston Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Co., Mutual Boiler and Machinery Insurance Co., 225 Wyman Street, Waltham, Mass.
D. (6) $1,830. E. (9) $224.97.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $347.07.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farm, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe on behalf of the National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. Sargent Carleton, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $1,346.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8232 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Albert A. Carretta, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Work Glove Manufacturers Association, 1604 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $745.84.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,220.50. E. (9) $75.50.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
D. (6) $44,801.50. E. (9) $1,750.20.

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) $180.38. E. (9) $11.96.

A. E. Michael Cassady, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $13,464. E. (9) $13,464.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., 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.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,296.34.

A. Citizens for S-3000, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,065.85. E. (9) $15,914.19.

A. Joseph S. Clark, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. World Federalists, U.S.A., Inc., 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $958.53.

A. Bonn H. Clayton, Box 349, Chanhassen, Minn.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1400. E. (9) $835.05.

A. Coal Industry Committee on Mine Safety, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,650. E. (9) $8,851.96.

A. Carl A. S. Coan, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,874.99. E. (9) $177.08.

A. James F. Collins, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Iron and Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $125.

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. Computer Lessors Association, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $960.

A. Paul R. Conrad, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $171.06.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Adhesive & Sealant Council, 1410 Higgens Road, Park Ridge, Ill.

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. 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. Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis.

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 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.00 or less.

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) $1,435.76. E. (9) $1,446.33.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

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 Lumber Importers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Woolen & Linen Textile Exporters Association, Osaka, Japan.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Vorort des Schweizerischen Handels- und Industrie-Vereins, Zurich, Switzerland.

A. C. A. Darnell, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International As- Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Corporate Fiduciaries Association of Chicago.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $1,104.42.

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) $2,000.

A. Dawson, Nagel, Sherman & Howard, 1900 First National Bank Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Boettcher & Co. 828 17th Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,829.12. E. (9) $329.12.

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, Tayor & 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, New Delhi, India.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

A. DeHart & Boide, Inc., 1150 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, St. Joseph, Mo.
D. (6) $680. E. (9) $19.32.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1150 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $92.98.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1150 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 1309 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $12.95.

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. The Denver Post, Inc., 650 50th Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 82d Floor, Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $2,635.

A. Discover America Travel Organizations, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas J. Downey, 701 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $834.94.

A. R. Michael Duncan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., 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. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $750.

A. Fire Engineers Inc., 3924 Louisiana Circle, Minneapolis, Minn.

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) $775.80. E. (9) $113.54.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, 1375 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Pub. Council, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,625. E. (9) $18,149.

A. R. Frank Frazier, National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

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) $500. E. (9) $804.30.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association—Legislation & Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,871. E. (9) $84.54.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Council, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $179.42.

A. W. S. Gookin, 112 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. W. Lee Gosnell, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (5) $500. E. (9) $150.

A. Donald E. Graham, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,349.96. E. (9) $262.94.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fruit Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,050. (9) $31.75.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $514.54.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $89.44.

A. John F. Hall, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $106.61.

A. H. Robert Halper, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1001 Virginia Avenue, Hapeville, Ga.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,175.

A. Charles A. Hamilton Associates, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,838. E. (9) $1,954.

A. Jerry M. Hamovit, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Greyhound Leasing & Financial Corp., 10 South Riverside Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $622.02.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $154.50.

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. Phil D. Helmig, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. C. O. Henderson, Post Office Box 137, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $200.

A. Richard I. Hersh, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $150.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Holland & Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. The Denver Post, Inc., 650 15th Street, Denver, Colo.

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. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,900. E. (9) $8,875.

A. David J. Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000.01. E. (9) $447.03.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $6.50.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13,250.75.

A. International Union of District 50, UMWA, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,733.36.

A. Robert A. Jackson, 627 Allison Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $800.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $215.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $725.

A. Robert F. Kennon, 356 St. Charles Street, Baton Rouge, La.
B. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert F. Kennon, 356 St. Charles Street, Baton Rouge, La.
B. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Kennon, White and Odom, 356 St. Charles Street, Baton Rouge, La.
B. The James Irvine Foundation, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2000. E. (9) $471.06.

A. Kennon, White and Odom, 356 St. Charles Street, Baton Rouge, La.
B. Provident Life and Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $2100. E. (9) $2640.70.

A. John L. Kilcullen, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Coal Industry Committee on Mine Safety, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Mr. Charles L. King, Munsey Building, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Line Pilots Association, International.
D. (6) $173.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz, Masters & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

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. Mr. George W. Koch, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Kenneth S. Kovack, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,450. E. (9) $1,269.05.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,477.06.

A. League for Economic Assistance and Development, George R. Gerardi, 390 Plandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y.
D. (6) $49. E. (9) $441.

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-Chrome, Muromachi Nihonbashi, Chuo-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

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. 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.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,763.13. E. (9) $18,917.76.

A. Herbert Liebenson, National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Livestock Producers Committee, 2000 National Bank of Commerce Building, San Antonio, Tex.
B. Livestock Producers Committee, 2000 National Bank of Commerce Building, San Antonio, Tex.
D. (6) $44,200. E. $(9) $7,255.32.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,797. E. (9) $301.29.

A. Joseph E. McAndrews, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $7.55.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

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) $175.

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) $540.

A. William G. McFadzean, Apostle Islands Residents Committee, 505 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $1,268.48.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Legislation and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,108.60. E. (9) $185.13.

A. Joseph B. McGarth, 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) $924.23.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,871. E (9) $85.11.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ian R. MacGowan, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Youth Franchise Coalition, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.

A. Andre Maisonpierre, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $222.50.

A. Ben J. Man, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,107.70. E. (9) $431.94.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,100. E. (9) $550.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $3.95.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Battelle Memorial Institute, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,715. E. (9) $21.32.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, 2900 Prudential Tower, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $4,250. E. $56.01.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Gas Light Co., 1100 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,050. E. (9) $18.07.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1612 W Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association, et al.

A. Lester F. Miller, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $468. E. (9) $28.

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) $6,254.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., 1375 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, 1375 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,499.98. E. (9) $355.90.

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. 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) $45,595.11. E. (9) $45,610.84.

A. National Association of Railroad Passengers, 41 Ivy Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36,349.90. E. (9) $19,375.73.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $4,350.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $34,265. E. (9) $4,036.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,719.16.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 10,000 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $9,000. E. (9) $20,664.15.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,442.44. E. (9) $19,989.16.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco Instruments Corp., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $175.41.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, Pierson, Ball & Dowd, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $192.20.

A. Legislation & Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $26,538.81.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $61,135.75. E. (9) $3,363.80.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $833.84.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,517. E. (9) $8,357.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $685.22. E. (9) $699.66.

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) $343.75.

A. Robert B. Neville, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,687.50. E. (9) $100.

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. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $250.

A. Leo W. O'Brien, 160 S. Manning Boulevard, Albany, N.Y.
B. Virgin Islands Legislature, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $800.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,325. E. (9) $224.55.

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) $1,500. E. (9) $175.

A. Claude E. Olmstead, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $468. E. (9) $28.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,681.93. E. (9) $1,082.53

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. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Company, 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Alaska Federation of Natives, Anchorage, Alaska.
E. (9) $10,933.30.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $195.54.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $17,278.46. E. (9) $1,350.

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. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atkins, Kroll & Co., Ltd., 417 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $13.40.

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. Virginia & D. K. Ludwig Foundation, 1345 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Harold A. Miller, Miller Redwood Co., 315 Pacific Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $250.

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.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co., Post Office Box 68, Forest Grove, Oreg.
D. (6) $250.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $150.

A Realty Committee on Taxation, 299 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $41,150. E. (9) $75,546.90.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc. 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $15,543.22.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institute Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
E. (9) $5,447.04.

A. John T. Reggitts, Jr., 95 Boonton Avenue, Rural Delivery No. 2, Boonton, N.J.

A. W. W. Renfroe, Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $1,255.83.

A. Darrell G. Renstrom, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Educational Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,867.40. E. (9) $67.02.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1865, Annapolis, Md.
E. (9) $158.95.

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, $1,875. E. (9) $730.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Kellogg Company, Battle Creek, Mich.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

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) $63.44.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kozai Club, 3–16, Nihonbashi-Kayabacho, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. John P. Roche, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $210.

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) $120.20.

A. Miss Patricia A. Samuel, 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) $41,001.81. E. (9) $9,090.26.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,871. E. (9) $59.91.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $147.81.

A. John J. Sexton 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. J. A. Chapman & Leta M. Chapman Trust, Tulsa, Okla.
E. (9) $113.54.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,475.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
D. (6) $3,496. E. (9) $1,484.49.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

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) $3,446.38.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arthur R. Spillers, 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) $420. E. (9) $25.

A. Allan J. Stanton, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Transportation Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $515.90.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. California Olive Association, Market and First Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $500.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mallinckrodt Chemical Works, P.O. Box 5439, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $500.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

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, 1776 K. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Carnegie Corp. of New York, 437 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,610. E. (9) $798.25.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Governors of the Knights of Ak-Sar-Ben, 63d and Shirley Streets, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $4.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. John M. Olin, Box B, Alton, Ill.
E. (9) $23.50.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Credit Co., Post Office Box 4081. Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $522.06.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Travelers Corp., One Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.
E. (9) $14.

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. 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. Russell D. Tall, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,135.76. E. (9) $1,102.58.

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. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $4,167.44.

A. Dick Tullis, 607 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex. and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $300.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $213.07.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co., and Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. John M. Vansant, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Wasington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 916 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Wald, Harkrader & Rockefeller, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Washington Gas Light Co., 1100 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,068.07.

A. Robert P. Will, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $1002.63.

A. J. D. Williams, 1231 25th Street NW., Washington,D.C.
B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $20.

A. Kenneth Williamson, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,461.93. E. (9) $839.89.

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. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,515.62. E. (9) $219.74.

A. Nicholas H. Zumas, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Music Publishers Association, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350.

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 28, 1970*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Reverend John H. Satterwhite, D.D., professor, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, You have revealed Your will to persons in the past: Grant to the President and the Members of the Senate the revelation of Your wisdom through which in our own day they may make Your will known in our country. Reveal Yourself to them, that through their work our country may come to know justice, equality, and love for all people.

Help them to make human life more human for all and to work for a united witness in our Nation for the liberation of the poor out of fear for our lives. Our lives belong to You and help us realize that hatred, violence and the destruction of human life are not part of our liberation.

Help us to obey Your commands which we have heard but not yet obeyed and use the wealth and power of our Nation to serve the communities of poverty and oppression; and may we be renewed by Your spirit through Jesus Christ, Your Son and our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 27, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SYMINGTON LATER IN THE DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of the early hour of convening, I ask unanimous consent that, although the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) has already been granted an order to proceed for not to exceed 30 minutes, he may proceed under that order today at a time appropriate to him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to limit statements to 3 minutes in relation to the transaction of routine morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIX YEARS IN A BAMBOO CAGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, 6 years is a long time. For some of our prisoners of war held in North Vietnamese or Vietcong horror camps, it will soon be 7 years. Some of our men have spent what may be one-tenth of their allotted span of life in the most despicable conditions, in a bamboo cage hidden in some steaming jungle, their feet rotting away from parasitical infection, their bodies and minds tortured by inhuman practices fertile in the oriental mind.

Mr. President, it is worse even than this. Normally we spend approximately 20 of our years in preparation for our adult lives. Afterward, if we are fortunate, we may enjoy somewhere between 10 and 20 years of well-earned retirement. This leaves on the average approximately 40 years of adult productive living. I think it is only fair to recognize that to these prisoners, the citizens of this country who were our emissaries in a distant war, 7 years could be one-sixth of their allotted productive span of life. It has not been spent in particularly pleasant conditions.

To an enlightened people, who believe in the rights of the individual, the situation of our prisoners is intolerable. Tolerate it we must, since for the moment there seems nothing else to do; but repay it to the men concerned, and their families, we shall, so far as we can. And we hope, on that glad day when the battered remnants of these heroic men are at last repatriated to their own country and their own families, that the world will well note and long remember how they were treated, and by contrast how we have treated those of the other side who fell into our hands.

OVERSEAS ASSIGNMENT OF MILITARY VOLUNTEERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week I suggested that at this time we might give serious consideration to phasing out the draft for those who serve in Vietnam, substituting therefor those who volunteer to serve, those who are willing to put in their time in this overseas assignment. I think it might do a great deal to relieve tensions to make it clear that the element of compulsion to combat has been lifted in this instance.

I do not believe in selective objection to wars. I think all wars have some immorality associated with them, so I do not believe in the so-called immoral war concept. I do not believe we should choose the wars in which we serve; but I do believe if there are enough volunteers, and I believe there are, who would be willing to serve in Vietnam during