

Palicia, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pankey, William A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parkinson, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parris, Lonnie W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pasecky, Steve Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patrone, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patterson, Arthur W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pavolko, George J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pechnik, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pederson, Arvid P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pedretti, Harlan T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peraldo, Mario G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peters, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peterson, Andrew S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peterson, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Petryszak, Frank L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phillips, Philip H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phillips, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pickrel, Eddie G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pietras, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pipgras, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poore, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Popovich, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powell, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pressley, Humer M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Price, Delton M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Priddy, Ronald N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prouty, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quinn, John J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ralls, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramsey, Carl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rasco, Joe R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ream, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reese, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Register, Willie C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reich, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Remagen, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Revill, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reynolds, Larry K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richter, Keith M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ricketson, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reiss, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riggs, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riley, Earl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ripple, Carey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ritter, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rittmuller, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Albert J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Samuel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robertson, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Patrick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robison, Everett J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rodda, Allen Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rose, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ruths, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rybak, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sandlin, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scarboro, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schardon, Stanley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmeling, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmidt, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schoening, Norman L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schumann, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schwab, Howard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schwarz, Frederick W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schweizer, Alvin C. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scutt, Donal D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scruggs, Dennis C. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seabury, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Semrad, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seymour, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shanafelt, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sharp, Kenneth R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sharpe, Howard D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shepherd, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shook, Wayland R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shotwell, Lance D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shovts, Henry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sibly, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Silkman, Howard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Silver, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Skinner, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Small, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Dale W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Sammy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smithson, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snead, Russell L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snow, Allen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Somers, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sonnenberg, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Soos, Paul J. D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sparks, Fred W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Speir, Ross C. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Speziale, Vincent F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stalcup, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stankovich, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stebe, Jack T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephens, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stoddard, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stone, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Storm, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strickler, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stringer, McNeil S. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Szmuriga, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tallman, Howard L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Bruce D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tezak, Joseph E. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Garry B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, James R. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Philip G. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thurmon, Richard I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tiedemann, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tinney, Eddy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tolley, Lynn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Totten, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Townsend, Carl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Townsend, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tramel, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Travelstead, Joel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Traynor, Dennis W. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trentham, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tubbs, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tucker, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tudor, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Twohig, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Upshaw, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Urso, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Uzzell, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Valentine, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vallance, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vandyke, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vittorio, Andrew N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vycital, Gary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Cole E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walsh, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warde, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warr, Gaylon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wasia, Vincent P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wasniewski, Andrew S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wattles, Phillip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weber, Christian G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weiss, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Werner, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wessel, Gregory H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wieneke, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Loren N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Marion M. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Roy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Philip C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wingo, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winstel, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wisch, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wisecarver, Kurt J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Douglas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wooten, Clyde W. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wyatt, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yoder, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Myron A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ziegler, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zinkievich, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 3, 1971:

Col. William A. Willis, USAFR, XXXX
 XXXX from further consideration for appointment as an Air Force Reserve brigadier general. His name was submitted along with 20 other nominees for appointment to Reserve of the Air Force general officer grades on April 19, 1971.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 3, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He endured seeing Him who is invisible.
 Hebrews 11: 27.

O God and Father of us all, in these anxious moments and uncertain hours, we come to Thee with needs and longings only Thou canst help us meet. As we live through these difficult days, grant unto us beliefs big enough, hearts honest enough, and spirits strong enough to make us equal to the demanding duties of this disturbing day.

By Thy spirit help us to rise above all that is narrow and petty and selfish and with increased devotion may we work together for the well being of our Nation and the welfare of all mankind.

To this end guide us in our thinking and govern us in our living, that at the

close of the day we may rest in peace and arise in the morning with joy in our hearts.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS BY THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia will hold hearings at 10 o'clock, Monday, June 21, in the full committee room, on H.R. 5465, a bill to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and also on the same day on H.R. 7405, to extend the protection of the mechanic's lien law of the District of Columbia to subcontractors beyond the first tier.

Also on Tuesday, June 22, at the same place and hour, the committee will hold hearings on H.R. 7717, 7718, 7719 and 7720, companion measures for exemption from taxation by the District of Columbia of certain property in the Dis-

trict owned by the Supreme Council—Mother Council of the World—of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America.

All Members who desire to present testimony will please contact the Clerk of the committee on or before June 17.

THE TRAGIC PROBLEM OF DRUGS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the President is withdrawing troops as rapidly as I guess he thinks he can from Vietnam, with a view of ultimately getting them all out.

I am supporting the President, even though I do not like the way he is prosecuting the war. I have said a dozen times in this Chamber we ought to give the North Vietnamese 30 days to get out of South Vietnam, or knock them out with our Air Force.

But yesterday an expert witness who was testifying before our Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations told us that a young man could get hooked for life on that pure, uncut heroin they can buy as cheaply as they can Coca-Cola in South Vietnam. He said if he took it for just 1 week he would be hooked for life.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Secretary and the President will not send any more young draftees down to South Vietnam. Let them use the old, seasoned, Regular Army men who will not be as amenable to the vices that exist in Southeast Asia.

COMMENDATION OF PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have been prone to criticize the President of the United States for some of the positions that he has taken. So it seems to me that when there is a time in which I can commend him, I should do so. I want to take this opportunity to commend him on his statements at his news conference last Tuesday night in connection with the police handling of the incidents in Washington during May. Frankly, I believe the President was exactly right.

I want to say that I am personally concerned about the fuzzy thinking reflected by some members of the news media. The President has my full and complete support in his support of the local police and their handling of that situation. So, as I have said, I want to take this opportunity to commend him and hope that he continues to hold firm to that position.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 8866, UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H.R. 8866.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7109, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 438

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendments, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a typographical error be corrected in House Resolution 438. On page 2, line 5, the word "amendment" is misspelled. It should be corrected.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 438 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7109, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bill.

The purpose of H.R. 7109 is to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1972.

The total authorization is \$3,433,580,000. Estimated costs for the follow-

ing 5 years are: \$3.7 billion for fiscal year 1973, \$3.95 billion for fiscal year 1974, \$3.75 billion for fiscal year 1975, \$3.71 billion for fiscal year 1976, and \$3.68 billion for fiscal year 1977.

The sum of \$2,668,100,000 is authorized for research and development. This may be used for items which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts and for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities.

A total of \$58,630,000 is authorized for construction of facilities. Of this amount, \$6.5 million is for modernization of the 40-by-80-foot wind tunnel at the Ames Research Center; \$17,530,000 is to modernize, expand, and make alterations and additions at the John F. Kennedy Space Center; \$31.1 million is for major rehabilitation and modification of facilities at field installations and Government-owned industrial plants engaged in NASA activities; \$3.5 million is for facility planning and design.

Also, \$706,850,000 is authorized for research and program management to provide funding for research in Government laboratories, management of programs, and other activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 438 in order that H.R. 7109 may be considered.

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

The purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1972.

Authorizations contained in the bill total \$3,433,580,000, and are broken down into three main categories:

Research and development...	\$2,668,100,000
Construction of facilities....	58,630,000
Research and program management	706,850,000

Within the research and development the authorization for the last three Apollo flights total \$612,200,000. This covers space craft and booster rocket procurement as well as operations.

Another major component of the total authorization is the skylab and the space shuttle programs, authorized at \$745,275,000. This includes continued development of our orbiting laboratory and a reusable space shuttle from the earth to the satellite and return. The first unmanned launch of the Orbital Workshop is set for 1973.

Space flights, to other planets are authorized in the amount of \$311,500,000 for fiscal 1972. This authorization includes our Mariner unmanned flights to Venus and Mars which have been underway for several years, and our Viking program of unmanned flights to Mars which will be able to land on the planet rather than merely fly by as Mariner has done. The first landing is expected in 1975. Also included in the authorization is funding for development of deep space flights to Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune, beginning about 1976.

The bill also contains an authorization of \$67,620,000 for work on our nuclear powered rocket, Nerva. Much research and development work is underway and a number of research projects dealing with Nerva will be completed in fiscal 1972.

The bill authorizes \$58,630,000 for construction at several NASA facilities, including the J. F. Kennedy Space Center and Ames Research Center.

Finally the bill authorizes \$706,850,000 primarily for the administrative expenses of NASA at its various installations throughout the country. Approximately \$540,416,000 is earmarked for personnel costs.

The bill has several items which have been increased over the authorizations requested by NASA. Major increases were: First, \$47,500,000 for the Skylab project, the orbiting workshop which will have its first, unmanned launch in 1975, second, \$25,000,000 for the space shuttle, a reusable rocket to take men to and from the Skylab, and; third, \$39,900,000 for the Nerva nuclear rocket.

The 5-year cost estimates projected by the committee for NASA are:

Fiscal 1973	\$3,700,000,000
Fiscal 1974	3,950,000,000
Fiscal 1975	3,750,000,000
Fiscal 1976	3,710,000,000
Fiscal 1977	3,680,000,000

Total authorizations contained in this bill for fiscal 1972 are \$3,433,580,000, an increase over the NASA request of \$162,230,000.

There are no minority views but a series of additional views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas has explained, the resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7960, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 452 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 452

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7960) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to

the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 452 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7960, the National Science Foundation authorization bill.

The purpose of H.R. 7960 is to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1972 in the amount of \$622 million, which includes \$3 million in excess foreign currencies.

The sum of \$246.1 million is authorized for scientific research project support; \$9.3 is authorized for specialized research facilities and equipment; \$136 million is authorized for national and special research programs; \$40.2 million is authorized for national research centers; \$17.5 million is authorized for computing activities in education and research; \$9.8 million is for science information activities; \$4 million is for international cooperative scientific activities; \$1 million is for intergovernmental science programs; \$28.8 million is for institutional support for science; \$99.3 million is for science education support; \$2.7 million is for planning and policy studies; \$24.3 million is for program development and management.

In addition, \$3 million in foreign currencies is authorized for the special foreign currency program, which permits the Foundation to support meritorious research and science education projects, to provide for projects of scientific cooperation between United States and foreign scientists, and to arrange for collecting, translating, abstracting and disseminating foreign scientific and technological information. These funds would be in foreign currencies determined to be in excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

The legislation outlines conditions under which institutions of higher education shall deny or withdraw financial assistance from participants involved in acts of disruption to such institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 452 in order that H.R. 7960 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 452 provides for a 1-hour open rule for consideration of H.R. 7960, the National Science Foundation authorization bill for fiscal year 1972.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations totaling \$622,000,000 for fiscal 1972 for the National Science Foundation, including \$3,000,000 in excess foreign currencies held by the Treasury.

The authorizations contained in the

bill are the same as requested by the administration.

The largest single authorization contained in the bill is \$246,100,000 for scientific research support. Funds appropriated will be available for research grants in such areas of scientific research as atmospheric, earth, and biological sciences, oceanography, physics, chemistry, mathematics, and astronomy. Fundamental research projects receive support; individual grants average about \$47,500.

Authorizations for the national and special research programs total \$136,000,000. This authorization funds such programs as the international biological program, the global atmospheric research program, the Arctic and Antarctic research programs, and various oceanographic research efforts.

Other major components of the bill are authorizations to support science education, \$99,300,000, support for our national research centers, \$40,300,000, and for institutional support for science, \$28,800,000.

The bill also authorizes expenditure of up to \$3,000,000 by the National Science Foundation to be incurred outside the United States. These funds, foreign currencies held by the United States, are used primarily to pay the costs of translations into English of significant foreign scientific papers and books.

The committee report estimates the following 5-year cost estimate for the National Science Foundation:

1973	\$850,000,000
1974	1,000,000,000
1975	1,200,000,000
1976	1,500,000,000
1977	1,900,000,000

This estimate is based upon a continuing Federal interest in fostering research projects at approximately the same level in future years as in fiscal 1972, and a growing need in several new fields for expanded research efforts, particularly in computer-assisted teaching and systems approaches to problem identification and solving.

The bill was reported unanimously by voice vote. There are no minority views. The administration supports the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the Rules Committee for this open rule. Having said that, there is not very much to justify this bill otherwise, in my opinion. Here is a bill with \$100 million more than was expended for a variety of questionable purposes last year, and at a time in this country when we ought to be doing something about the enormous, staggering deficits.

If there was any way in the world to beat this rule, I certainly would do it in order to send this bill back to the committee for a reduction rather than an increase of \$100 million. I realize the futility of waging warfare on the rule, but it is sad when a committee brings this kind of a bill out with an increase of

over \$100 million in view of the financial situation this country is in today.

Mr. SMITH of California. I would say to the gentleman I am satisfied that there are a number in the Chamber who have felt the same way over the years, but I am satisfied that there is nothing else we can do about it. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from California for yielding to me.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question in on the authorization of \$622 million for the National Science Foundation. Those funds are for an adequate budget to keep this country progressive in the many scientific fields in which we do need research. The National Science Foundation has taken over various kinds of research that are basic to our defense. They are not programmatic nor involve weaponry. The amendment of the majority leader of the other body, Mr. MANSFIELD, shuts off much basic research in the Department of Defense. That has now been moved over into the National Science Foundation. I believe it is better that this kind of research be done on a much broader basis in the NSF.

We are making important advances in science in so many fields. To deprive young people of science coming along, who are provided for this bill, of the opportunity to get their scientific education, yes, and their higher degrees, by eliminating the funds in this bill, I believe, is a tragic mistake, not only for this generation, but for the next one.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Science and Astronautics has gone over this bill carefully line by line. For the first time, it has come up with legislation for an National Science Foundation authorization on a line item basis. This is a much different approach than has been used previously, when general funds were authorized the National Science Foundation. I would like to compliment Mr. William McElroy, who is the administrator and director of the National Science Foundation, for his excellent leadership. He has a fine background in science and medicine, having come from Johns Hopkins University. He is the type of man who has his feet on the ground. At the same time he has a forward look in science research, technology and development. I had opposed the previous nominee of the executive on the basis of his impracticality and theoretical approach. I have heartily and strongly endorsed Dr. McElroy and continue to do so because of his good work on the National Science Foundation team. We ought to be proud in this country that we are keeping pace in science, even though it is at the rate of the \$622 million level.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and wish to commend him on bringing this resolution out.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 357, nays 4, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—357

Abbutt	Crane	Heckler, Mass.
Abernethy	Daniel, Va.	Helstoski
Abourezk	Daniels, N.J.	Henderson
Abzug	Danielson	Hicks, Mass.
Adams	Davis, Ga.	Hicks, Wash.
Addabbo	Davis, S.C.	Hillis
Alexander	Davis, Wis.	Hogan
Anderson,	de la Garza	Horton
Calif.	Delaney	Hosmer
Andrews, Ala.	Dellenback	Howard
Andrews,	Dellums	Hull
N. Dak.	Denholm	Hungate
Annunzio	Dennis	Hunt
Archer	Derwinski	Hutchinson
Arends	Dickinson	Johnson, Calif.
Ashley	Diggs	Johnson, Pa.
Aspin	Dingell	Jonas
Aspinall	Donohue	Jones, Ala.
Badillo	Dorn	Jones, N.C.
Baker	Dow	Jones, Tenn.
Barrett	Dowdy	Karth
Begich	Drinan	Kastenmeier
Belcher	Duncan	Kazen
Bell	du Pont	Keating
Bennett	Eckhardt	Kee
Bergland	Edmondson	Keith
Betts	Edwards, Ala.	Kemp
Bevill	Edwards, Calif.	King
Blaggi	Eilberg	Kluczynski
Biester	Erlenborn	Koch
Bingham	Esch	Kuykendall
Blackburn	Eshleman	Kyl
Bianton	Evans, Colo.	Kyros
Blatnik	Fascell	Landgrebe
Boland	Findley	Latta
Bolling	Fish	Lennon
Bow	Fisher	Lent
Brademas	Flood	Link
Brasco	Foley	Lloyd
Brinkley	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, Md.
Brooks	Forsythe	Lujan
Broomfield	Fountain	McCloskey
Brotzman	Fraser	McClure
Brown, Mich.	Frenzel	McCollister
Brown, Ohio	Frey	McCormack
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton, Pa.	McEwen
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Tenn.	McFall
Buchanan	Fuqua	McKay
Burke, Fla.	Galifianakis	McKevitt
Burke, Mass.	Garmatz	McKinney
Burlison, Mo.	Gaydos	Macdonald,
Burton	Gettys	Mass.
Byrne, Pa.	Gibbons	Madden
Byrnes, Wis.	Gonzalez	Mahon
Byron	Goodling	Maillard
Cabell	Grasso	Mann
Caffery	Green, Oreg.	Martin
Camp	Green, Pa.	Mathias, Calif.
Carey, N.Y.	Griffin	Mathis, Ga.
Carter	Griffiths	Matsunaga
Casey, Tex.	Grover	Mayne
Cederberg	Gubser	Mazzoli
Chamberlain	Gude	Meeds
Chappell	Hagan	Melcher
Clancy	Haley	Michel
Clausen,	Halpern	Mikva
Don H.	Hamilton	Miller, Calif.
Cleveland	Hammer-	Miller, Ohio
Collier	schmidt	Mills, Ark.
Collins, Ill.	Hanley	Mills, Md.
Collins, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Minish
Colmer	Hansen, Wash.	Minshall
Conable	Harrington	Mitchell
Conte	Harsha	Mizell
Corman	Hastings	Montgomery
Cotter	Hawkins	Moorhead
Coughlin	Heckler, W. Va.	Morgan

Morse	Roberts	Stubblefield
Mosher	Robinson, Va.	Sullivan
Moss	Robison, N.Y.	Talcott
Murphy, Ill.	Rodino	Taylor
Murphy, N.Y.	Roe	Teague, Calif.
Myers	Rogers	Terry
Natcher	Roncalio	Thompson, Ga.
Nedzi	Rooney, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
Nelsen	Rosenthal	Thomson, Wis.
Nichols	Rostenkowski	Thone
Nix	Roush	Tierman
Obey	Roussetot	Udall
O'Hara	Roy	Ullman
O'Konski	Roybal	Van Deerlin
O'Neill	Ruth	Vander Jagt
Patten	St Germain	Vanik
Pelly	Sandman	Veysey
Pepper	Sarbanes	Vigorito
Perkins	Satterfield	Waggoner
Pettis	Saylor	Wampler
Peyster	Scherle	Ware
Pickle	Scheuer	Watts
Pike	Schneebeli	Whalley
Pirnie	Schwengel	White
Poage	Scott	Whitten
Podell	Sebellius	Widnall
Poff	Seiberling	Wiggins
Powell	Shriver	Williams
Preyer, N.C.	Sisk	Wilson,
Price, Ill.	Slack	Charles H.
Price, Tex.	Smith, Calif.	Wolf
Pryor, Ark.	Smith, Iowa	Wright
Pucinski	Smith, N.Y.	Wyatt
Purcell	Snyder	Wydler
Quie	Spence	Wylie
Quillen	Springer	Wyman
Railsback	Stafford	Yates
Randall	Stanton,	Yatron
Rarick	James V.	Young, Fla.
Rees	Steed	Young, Tex.
Reid, Ill.	Steele	Zablocki
Reid, N.Y.	Steiger, Ariz.	Zion
Reuss	Steiger, Wis.	Zwach
Rhodes	Stephens	
Riegler	Stokes	

NAYS—4

Ashbrook	Hall	Schmitz
Gross		

NOT VOTING—72

Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Monagan
Anderson,	Gallagher	Passman
Tenn.	Gialmo	Patman
Baring	Goldwater	Rangel
Boggs	Gray	Rooney, N.Y.
Bray	Hanna	Runnels
Burleson, Tex.	Harvey	Ruppe
Carney	Hathaway	Ryan
Celler	Hays	Shibley
Chisholm	Hébert	Shoup
Clark	Holifield	Sikes
Clawson, Del	Ichord	Skubitz
Clay	Jacobs	Staggers
Conyers	Jarman	Stanton,
Culver	Landrum	J. William
Dent	Leggett	Stratton
Devine	Long, La.	Stuckey
Downing	McClory	Symington
Dulski	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Dwyer	McDade	Waldie
Edwards, La.	McDonald,	Whalen
Evins, Tenn.	Mich.	Whitehurst
Flowers	McMillan	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Metcalf	Winn
Ford,	Mink	
William D.	Mollohan	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Sharp.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Gallagher with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. William J. Stan-
ton.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Flow-
ers.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Carney.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Staggers.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ichord.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Leggett with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Mollohan.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Rangel.
 Mrs. Mink with Mr. Metcalfe.
 Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Clay.
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. Runnels.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Downing with Mr. Whitehurst.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. 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 consideration of the bill H.R. 7109, with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield to me at this point?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

DEATH OF A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to express the sadness and loss I feel at the tragic and untimely death this week of my good friend and courageous American, Audie Murphy.

Though he was this Nation's most decorated soldier in World War II, all who came into contact with him were struck with his humility and concern for others. It was hard to picture this soft spoken, modest man as the valiant infantryman who climbed atop a burning tank destroyer loaded with explosives to hold off an advancing company of German infantry with a machinegun. But that is the way Audie was, and I think

that is the quality which made him so extraordinary.

For his acts of heroism, Audie Murphy was awarded 24 decorations, including our Nation's highest—the Congressional Medal of Honor. He will be laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery at 10 a.m. Monday, June 7, with the full military honors he so justly deserves.

It was my privilege not only to represent his hometown, Farmersville, Tex. but also to work with Audie over the years in behalf of all of our veterans. Our country has lost a great American, and for those of us who knew and worked with him, the loss is doubly heavy.

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

Mr. Chairman, we come before you today to present H.R. 7109, the authorization legislation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1972.

The NASA request was for \$3,271,350,000, which is \$61,650,000 less than the fiscal year 1971 request.

This request was broken down into three categories, as follows:

Research and development, \$2,517,700,000, construction facilities, \$56,300,000, research and program management, \$697,350,000.

The committee's action, as reflected in the clean bill before you, was to increase the total authorization to \$3,433,580,000—an increase of \$162,230,000.

The major increase, \$150,400,000, falls entirely within the area of research and development, with a \$9,500,000 increase for research and program management, and \$2,330,000 for construction of facilities.

I should remind the committee that last year's request was the lowest space budget submitted to the Congress since fiscal year 1962, and this year's request is lower by \$61,650,000.

The amount requested is approximately \$800 million less than the amount recommended as a minimum program by the President's space task group in September 1969.

Knowing full well the impact on employment caused by the steadily declining space program from a peak appropriation of \$5.25 billion in fiscal year 1965, and the extensive costs usually associated with crash starts, the committee recommends an increase of about 5 percent this year.

This increase will provide NASA with funds in critical areas to insure the success of pacing items of our future projects. Making these funds available at this time could materially reduce future costs. They will, in some areas, insure that a viable program is pursued.

Now permit me to explain briefly the program requirements contained in this bill.

The Apollo 15 mission is scheduled for July, and Apollo 16 is scheduled for next spring.

These missions should surpass any previous missions in scientific importance and public interest. The two missions will utilize the lunar roving vehicle to move over even more rugged terrain than

that encountered recently at Fra Mauro by the crew of Apollo 14.

The Apollo program will end with Apollo 17, now scheduled for December 1972.

The Skylab program, which utilizes much of the hardware and technology previously developed in the Apollo program is in an advanced stage of development. Its flight phase will begin early in 1973 with the unmanned launch of the orbital workshop.

This laboratory will be utilized to apply space for man's benefit and knowledge while demonstrating man's capability to live and work in space for extended periods.

The space shuttle transportation system, which was initiated 2 years ago as a study program, is continuing. The fiscal year 1972 request provides for the detailed design and development of the engine and the design of the airframe.

In the space science and applications area there has been an increased emphasis by NASA. The request is approximately \$185 million above the funding level for fiscal year 1971.

It includes increased funding in three exciting program areas:

First, the Viking project, which is a Mars orbiter and lander. This program places special emphasis on factors relevant to the existence of life on Mars.

Second, the grand tour program, which, by a unique alignment of the outer planets, provides an opportunity to make a fly-by of these planets with a single spacecraft.

Third, the space applications program, which encompasses a broad range of purposes, such as earth resources surveys, meteorology, communications, earth physics, navigation, and other similar programs to utilize space for man's benefit.

Also scheduled is a Venus-Mercury fly-by, as well as two pioneer spacecraft to be launched to the vicinity of Jupiter in 1973 and 1974.

On this past Sunday, NASA launched the second of two attempts to orbit Mars this November. The first attempt, Mariner 8, failed because of an electric malfunction. We expect detailed television pictures to be sent back—if all continues well on this last launch to Mars—covering the entire surface of the planet closest to us.

We also expect to fly our first earth resources satellite, the ERTS-A, in the spring of 1972. This experiment will provide information on how to utilize data from space to understand and manage our natural resources on earth.

The committee approved the above items as submitted.

Of course, our basic and applied research programs and the aeronautical research programs will continue to supply the data needed to insure our future capability.

These and other projects represent the continuation and fulfillment of major efforts begun in the 1960's. Their authorization will allow the completion of many of these jobs and will provide the base for the space program of the 1970's and beyond.

As I have already pointed out, the program is well below what the President's

space task group called a minimum acceptable program. It represents many compromises. It has many deletions and cutbacks from previous plans.

The new programs will move more slowly, and efforts to reduce annual costs are evident throughout.

There are, however, areas of importance that reflect and support new decisions for the 1970's.

It provides significant effort in science, exploration, technology, and practical space benefits for man on earth.

It begins a program of upgrading aeronautical facilities to prevent further loss of our position in this field.

Now let me explain briefly the major increases in authorization by the committee in the bill before you.

The space flight operations item was increased \$72,500,000 by the committee. This increase is to provide for:

First, the development and flight preparation for a partial rescue capability for Skylab;

Second, the evaluation of several mission possibilities for a second Skylab flight or for applications flights to prevent a 3-year hiatus in manned space flights;

Third, a more intensive effort in developing the pacing items for the space shuttle; namely, thermal protection and vehicle structures;

Fourth, studies to explore the potential of the space shuttle to fly specific short-duration missions.

The advanced missions item was increased \$8.5 million to provide more emphasis and planning to develop the best directions for future efforts in the 1970's.

The only authorization change recommended in the space science and applications area by the committee is to increase the sounding rocket and balloon research program by \$2.5 million.

These fruitful and economical probes have accomplished important scientific results, and this small addition will maintain the program at essentially the same level as fiscal year 1971.

In the advanced research and technology area the NASA request was \$51,375,000 below the fiscal year 1971 request.

The committee believes that it is unwise to reduce this area from which our future capability must emerge. As a result, this portion of the R. & D. program was increased \$64,900,000.

Twenty-five million dollars was added to the aeronautical research and technology line item.

Evidence has been accumulated both in the regular authorization hearings and in special hearings on aeronautics that unless major attention is given to correcting money deficiencies we will encounter an increasing risk of losing our strong worldwide aeronautical market.

The new funds will be used to—

First, prevent us from falling behind our world competitors in aeronautics;

Second, prevent further erosion of our store of technical and scientific knowledge, physical plant, and skilled personnel;

Third, improve safety of travel on our airways and around air terminals.

Also we added \$39,900,000 to the nuclear power and propulsion program. It is essential that the advanced nuclear rocket engine be funded at a viable level.

The NASA request totaling \$15 million for nuclear propulsion essentially constituted a holding action resolution in a two-thirds reduction of the contractor's work force.

The action by the committee allows the program to continue in an efficient and reasonable manner, although at a reduced rate from the original NASA plans.

I would like now to conclude on one highly important issue which has concerned the committee for the past several years; that is, the effect on the future occasioned by the rapid reduction of personnel in NASA.

At the level allowed under this bill, the reduction will have reached a total of 6,300 personnel since July 1967.

The request called for a reduction of 1,500 civil service positions; however, the committee recommended that this number be reduced to 1,000. Under the request, advanced research and technology would lose 533 positions. The committee action restores 500 of these positions, adding \$4,500,000 to the research and program management account.

Additionally, the committee has been concerned about the increasing average age of scientists and engineers in NASA's employ. This average age is increasing at the rate of eight-tenths of a year annually, indicating a decline in the rate of young people entering the agency.

The committee recommends an additional \$1 million for nonpermanent positions to encourage high school and college students and faculty members to enter the program through summer employment.

I have highlighted the major items in this bill and I will be glad to answer any questions the committee may have.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am very glad to yield to the ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman on his excellent statement. The bill was reported out of the committee without a negative vote. I would like to congratulate the chairman on his leadership and the members of the subcommittee as well on their intensive work in going over the programs. They were brought to the House in excellent shape. Of course, there can always be the question—Why do we go to the moon? Why are we in space? Do we not have enough problems at home?

We in the United States must remain ahead in science, research, and technology. As the chairman has pointed out, there is no second place in the world. We are either a first-class nation competing with first-class nations or we drop back in science, research, and technology. That in turn will affect industry, which affects the job situation, and which, of course, affects our U.S. economy and our defense posture.

Again I would like to compliment the chairman and say that it was an excellent statement, most enlightening and helpful.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to say that I recently returned from visiting the Air Exposition in Paris. While abroad I had the privilege of being in several of the major airports of the world. There we see 85 percent of the planes being utilized throughout the world with the American stamp on them. I can tell you that England, France, Italy, and other countries are working very hard, and the Lord help us if we ever lose our leadership in that field, not because of pride, but because of the change in the balance of payments that will come about when they cease to use 85 percent of American planes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

We members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee have been working on NASA's budget for a good many years. We have been following the programs rather closely. We have been maintaining contact with the NASA and the Government officials as well as the Budget officials. We have also been maintaining close contact with the scientific, research, and technological fields involved in exploring space. We make trips to the various NASA installations and contractors. We check and find out why things go right and why things go wrong.

I wish to compliment all of our committee colleagues in the House. The members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics have taken the tremendous responsibility of working on individual programs and becoming familiar with them. They are able to answer questions that are asked not only on the House floor but also around the Capitol and on many trips in this country.

We have to have this background in order to make a balanced judgment. We just do not accept everything that is presented to us either by NASA or by the Office of Management and Budget. We must put these programs in their order of priority, on their probability of success, and on achievement as against cost evaluation.

It becomes a tremendously complicated problem. It takes hours and hours of study.

Some of us have been interested in this field for many years.

I have been involved ever since I was on the National Board of Governors of the National Rocket Club. I have felt that it is a work of love. It is really not work at all; it is a field in which one can become so tremendously interested that it is consuming of one's time and energies. It is one of the most interesting experiences to be at the edge of development. That must have been the case when Queen Isabella sent out Columbus and the explorers of the world who came to the Western Hemisphere to find what was there.

We on our committee are on the edge of exploration. It is our committee that has put in the words, "Science, research, development, and exploration". This is the first time it has really been an expressed purpose of our Federal Government simply to go to explore, to see what there might be there.

To me that is a very daring concept. Others would rather stay at home.

Might I point out that a greater burden now falls on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The reason for the greater burden is that NASA has shared basic research in aeronautics and astronautics with the Department of Defense. Now because of the Mansfield amendment—sponsored by Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader in the other body—the basic research that is not program-directed or weaponry-system-directed in the Department of Defense goes over into the peaceful-type agencies.

For example, under the National Science Foundation we have had to increase the budget this year to \$622 million.

One might say, "JIM FULTON, this NASA budget is increased this year." Yes; it is increased 5 percent.

Why is there this increase by the Committee on Science and Astronautics of 5 percent for the coming fiscal year? It is very plain to be seen that there has been inflation at the rate of 5 or 6 percent a year on the average. Second, there have been pay raises which have been granted generally to Government employees, and new fringe benefits, new pension rights.

Of course, the employees of NASA and the contractors, because of collective bargaining, share in those increased gains.

If we look at this budget of NASA for the fiscal year 1972 it is a very tight budget. In actuality NASA's spending power is less than for the current fiscal year 1971.

We have made a real effort to hold this budget down to perform the duties that are necessary that have been laid out under the auspices of this House and the other body. The Congress has set the pace for research in this country.

The Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, working in cooperation with the Executive, have taken the lead along with the Executive rather than following the Executive's leadership alone. I have been asked to explain an occurrence that has happened with the Mariner Mars flight, May 29, I would like to explain it at this time.

The question was asked on the floor as to what really happened. My answer to that, which is rather technical, is that a small part, an integrated circuit, failed. It was apparently in a protective device, a diode, which malfunctioned. This failure of the integrated circuit was in the Centaur auto pilot and would cause the vehicle to tumble.

Unless we can get the vehicle to stop tumbling, that would be the end of the test. So, of course, it has to be stabilized.

Originally, the window to go to Mars had been scheduled through June 4 of this year. That means that Mars is in a position where we could launch from Earth at a minimal distance from Mars.

You may say how far would it be to Mars at the optimum distance. Well, it would be 246,943,000 miles, and you have to do that with one push. There is no continuous power. There is just one simple push, and then the vehicle has to coast the full distance although it can be stabilized and redirected as they go.

When will it reach Mars, somebody asked me. The present vehicle is Mariner 9. Mariner 8 failed. It will reach Mars on Saturday, November 13, 1971. At 3 o'clock this afternoon, Mariner 9 will be 643,000 miles out, but, of course, it will still have some 246 million miles to go. Just think of hitting a small planet like Mars, which is the planet with the nearest resemblance to earth that we have probably from the standpoint of temperature and location within the solar system. We will circumnavigate the planet probably in the equatorial zone, ranging somewhat in the north and somewhat in the southern areas. Originally the mission included both Mariner 8 and 9, with one operating around the one polar zone, and the second operating around the other polar zone—north and south. On Mars itself, we can see that there is a polar icecap on either end of the planet just like there is on earth. The amazing thing is that as spring advances on Mars, we can see a melting icecap with a ring, which some people think is green. Already we have seen some of the pictures from previous Mars flights that have been successful. I have been over at the Goddard Space Flight Center when the first pictures were coming in from Mars. We could see as the satellite passed over Mars the various declivities, the caps, and the cones and the crevices that were caused by objects hitting the planet Mars.

It was like a trip to the moon. It was just as we saw on our TV when we sent back the pictures of the moon.

Mr. Chairman, unless we learn how to live in this solar system of ours; unless we learn what the sun is emitting; unless we know what effect the moon and the sun have on the earth's climate; unless we are able to communicate worldwide and spread education; we will fall far behind in promoting international peace and understanding.

Think of the fact that 10 years ago if you had sat here in this Chamber and had been told that you would have had worldwide communications you would not have believed it. Likewise, imagine if you had been told that there was a new telephone service open between New York and London with no minimum limit. Imagine paying only 2 cents a second. You could travel from New York to London, call back and announce your safe arrival and pleasant journey. That would cost you but 20 cents.

Mr. Chairman, when we move into the villages of India in an effort to implement an educational system, we will be teaching the people of 5,000 villages. We will be teaching them how to live and at the same time solving the problems of population explosion, agricultural production lags, and teaching many of the other valuable lessons which we have learned in our space program.

In terms of technological benefits which are direct spinoffs from the space

program, more than 10,000 total, identifiable benefits have been provided by our work in space. As an example, in the field of materials, ultra high strength aluminum foil developed for communication satellites is used for packaging quick-freeze dried food and sensitive pharmaceuticals. In transportation, automotive brake cylinders are built and tested under techniques and tested in the hydraulic system for the Saturn launch vehicle. In the field of energy and natural resources, thermal mapping and infrared photography from space have detected fires, crop disease, insects and insect migration. In urban affairs, aerospace techniques have been applied to develop new and revolutionary methods for construction of low-cost housing. There are also heavy contributions to the fields of agriculture and forestry, geography and geology, ecology and pollution control, water resources and marine species, and atmospheric sciences. The important point to realize is that the fields or areas which have benefited by space technology and space techniques are as varied and as numerous as the number of benefits themselves.

Looking further at the field of meteorology, we presently have in operation a meteorological satellite system that is producing 24-hour coverage on a routine basis of not only the weather, but the entire earth's climatic cycles. The information we receive from these satellites is available to any nation on earth who desires it. These satellites have saved thousands of lives and billions of dollars of property, savings that can be fully documented. As one example, our space meteorological weather system discovered and tracked Hurricane Camille in 1969 as it moved along the coast of Louisiana and Mississippi. The satellite's precision tracking permitted the saving of approximately 20,000 to 50,000 American lives.

Various studies into the cost savings we can expect from meteorological satellite work have produced excellent forecasts. The IBM Corp. concluded from a comprehensive analysis of the benefits of more accurate forecasting that if weather could be predicted even 3 days in advance, man could save \$60 billion a year. Even if this savings is highly optimistic, we must realize that the space program today costs but one-twentieth of that figure. And this estimated \$60 billion is an annual return of work in merely one field. Furthermore, NASA's work today in this field is aimed at accurate weather forecasting not merely 3 days in advance, but 2 full weeks.

There have also been significant accomplishments in the field of satellite communications. To the credit of NASA's achievements in satellite communications, today we have a profitmaking international communication satellite network tying together over 40 countries of the world located on six continents. Since the advent of the communication satellite in 1963, we have seen an annual growth in telephone traffic of more than 20 times, the introduction of international live television transmissions, and a decline in the costs of international communication by a factor of more than 25 times.

In the field of navigation, navigation satellites have been in continuous operation by this country since 1960. The satellites were first put into use by the Navy, but, increasingly, are being employed by major deep-water operators. Navigation on the ocean and in the air is still a matter of a series of heading adjustments, which over the course of time can amount to considerable loss of productive money. In fact, a 1-percent savings in fuel and manpower costs due to navigational improvement would save the shipping industry \$150 million per year. Our navigational satellite system has already demonstrated that it can make a significant contribution of meeting the goal of reducing operating costs.

In another area, our earth resources satellite systems are designated to play an ever-increasing role in providing the entire world information on our global natural resources. The information these satellites can obtain in many cases could not be determined by any other means. Such geological surveys will be able to identify the location of minerals and oil, on land as well as under water, saving millions of dollars and long periods of exploration time. The prospector of tomorrow will be a data specialist in an analysis center, not the lonely man in his jeep in a wasteland.

With respect to still another field, astronomy, the unmanned astronomical observatory satellites that this country has flown have had major impact on virtually all present theories in astronomy as well as concepts of cosmology. The measurements made by these satellites in the magnetic spectrum of space provide information that would never be able to be obtained from the earth because of the earth's intervening atmosphere. Many scientists feel that in terms of man's ability to investigate the stars and planets, the satellite-borne astronomical observatories are equivalent in importance to the discovery of the telescope.

Much of our space work will also be concentrated on the area of advanced exploration. Work in this field will involve the comprehensive investigation of Mars in 1971, as well as all the outer planets before the end of the decade. Mars will be completely mapped by a photographic satellite. This will then be followed by a soft landing mission to Mars to analyze the atmospheric and surface composition and to investigate the possibility of extraterrestrial life. This information will permit further comparisons of the earth with still another body of the solar system, thus enhancing our knowledge of the earth.

Perhaps the most exciting effort will be to send two spacecraft to the very edge of our solar system. By taking advantage of an extremely rare lineup of the solar system's outer planets—a lineup which occurs only once in every 179 years—NASA will be able to investigate Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto. This program, the "Grand Tour Mission," offers this country the opportunity to explore the furthest reaches of our solar system.

NASA has also made impressive contributions to greater international cooperation. As the Congress is aware, the

National Aeronautics and Space Administration's international activities are based on the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, which provides that U.S. space activities be conducted so that they contribute materially to cooperation with other nations and groups of nations. NASA's record over the past 12 years has been outstanding. NASA has entered into some 250 agreements for international space projects; orbited foreign satellites; flown foreign experiments on its spacecraft; participated in more than 600 cooperative scientific rocket soundings in sites from all corners of the world, and involved more than 50 foreign scientists in analysis of lunar surface samples. The results of this work can be measured in significant cost-savings and profound scientific benefits.

This program of international cooperation by NASA has also made major contributions to international peace and understanding. One of the best examples is the cooperative space ventures now being discussed between NASA and the U.S.S.R. In recent meetings in Moscow between NASA and the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, an agreement has been reached to provide for cooperation in the areas of meteorological, environmental, earth resources, and lunar and planetary exploration satellite systems. And finally, one of the most dramatic programs to date between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. is for a docking between the Russian Soyuz manned spacecraft and a U.S. Apollo command and service module.

It is interesting to look at our space program's impact on other fields such as education and general problem analysis. Since its beginning in 1958, the national space program has captured the imagination of our youth, as well as inspired the Nation's educational institutions in stimulating interest in science and technology. Perhaps this is one of the most important byproducts of the space program. Specifically, new educational technologies are evolving. These include dialing into centrally located computers to retrieve information, programmed instruction, and educational television. Additionally, studies of space, the universe, and the solar system now comprise about 25 percent of the space programs in a good many of our Nation's elementary schools. The study of space exploration now extends from Galileo to Apollo 14. In college, astrophysics, advanced propulsion, and aerospace medicine are major fields of concentration. The spinoff from the space program has served as a tonic to the American educational system.

In addition, part of this spinoff benefit has been the ability of this Nation to rationally analyze and find solutions to overwhelmingly complex problems. The national space program represented a management approach to accomplish one of the most difficult problems ever posed. The Apollo program, in going to the moon, required a Government, industry, and university team which involved organizing 400,000 people, hundreds of universities, and 20,000 separate industrial companies for a common goal. These same management techniques are available to the country for use in solv-

ing our most pressing terrestrial problems.

Obviously it is impossible to predict what our descendants centuries from now will say about this country's exploration of space. Perhaps, however, their thoughts will not be unlike ours as we look back to earlier centuries and the impact which the exploratory work of our ancestors had on our life today. Anyone familiar with history knows that you cannot predict what discovery or what knowledge is going to be important. We can think of Columbus and Marco Polo and Charles Darwin. In particular, we think of the exploratory work of the Beagle as it was sent out to map the waterways of South America and to find the location of certain specific islands. For some unknown reason, a naturalist, Charles Darwin, was chosen to participate in the trip and from Darwin's "absurd" collection of rocks, plants, and animal life, our understanding of the world and everything in it was revolutionized. This same type of research and discovery in the name of the space program today plays a large role in leading men from ignorance towards greater comprehension.

The point is as we aim for the unknown and aim to solve the most difficult of problems, we often make discoveries of far greater consequence than anticipated. We now see that the challenge of our space program is leading us to so many new technologies, techniques, and advances that the spinoffs from space alone will be worth many times the cost of the basic program itself.

The purpose of our space program is not merely to launch missiles. Any Nation knows that if you can control any strategic area completely or attain overwhelming control of that strategic area, this Nation will have taken an essential step in controlling the world.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to be second for strategic purposes alone. I believe we have to give consideration right now to the fact that we must maintain our nuclear or atomic superiority. If this type of destructive power was ever sent into space to be launched back at the earth, the effect could be disastrous.

Mr. Chairman, during the seventies we must maintain a sufficient amount of fissionable material. Furthermore, we must have it stored for peacetime purposes. This material could destroy 3,000 cities alone in this world.

Think of what there could be done from outer space. A tremendously powerful weapon could be directed against any of the cities of the world. We in America have to wake up. We need a system to counter such a threat, and this is precisely why we are developing the NERVA, nuclear propulsion system. We need this NERVA rocket which will go three to five times faster than any other rocket. We need it to be able to pursue and intercept an incoming missile. We need the NERVA so that we do not have to wait for a weapon to fall on one of our cities. We now stand under the apple tree, waiting for the apples to fall, and attempting to catch them as they fall. It is too late, ladies and gentlemen, it is too late for this type of defense.

Research on the NERVA program is the kind of effort we need. We need that kind of system combined with a laser beam that will be able to counteract any kind of object or system that can be put into space. We then will assure our security and our own safety.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would say that unless we go through with the Apollo 15, 16, and 17 missions, the last three which are scheduled, it would be foolishness. It would be equivalent to having an SST, with the prototype sitting on the field ready to go. But we do want Apollos 15, 16, and 17 to be scraped at this late a time. We have the crews and the installations; we have the communications support equipment; we have the supporting experiments now on the moon; and we have the sophisticated tracking network all around the world that we are maintaining. If we should postpone it, you can see that we would fall behind in this expertise. However, by keeping the crews and the facilities, both for manned flights and for deep space exploration, a tremendous advantage would be served. We have gone right to the final wire with this program. The equipment is built. We have developed a sophisticated moon roving device somewhat like a golf cart. In fact, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and I have seen this lunar rover and have been able to drive it.

Unless we go ahead with the Apollo program we will be wasting money and effort which has already been expended. The cheapest and the best course of action is to conclude the contracts which remain and to complete the missions as scheduled.

I hope that the Members will support the Apollo program and this Nation's entire space program, and I wish to thank the Chairman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee has compiled a record of comprehensive and informative hearings on the NASA authorization for the fiscal year 1972. Under the able direction of our dedicated and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the committee and the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee have reviewed in detail the national space program. The budget recommended to you today is a minimum budget. It is a budget that delays and defers programs which are in the national interest to move along at a faster pace. Three lunar exploration flights remain. Our ability to conduct lunar exploration is then at an end. A single skylab, earth orbital workshop, is being built to fly in 1973. That workshop will be revisited three times. Following these three flights to earth orbit in 1973 our manned space capability is grounded for the foreseeable future. The option does exist to fly a second skylab or to fly two near earth orbit mission with the last hardware available for manned space flight.

The recent success of the Soviets in manned space flight makes it clear that space is no longer simply a place for investigation but a place to control, command, and utilize. This year's budget includes funds to proceed with a low cost,

earth-to-orbit space transportation system, the space shuttle. It is clear, today, that the need for man and automated equipment to be taken to and from space in a routine and low-cost manner is essential. Development of a low-cost space shuttle will assure our ability as a nation to compete and lead the continued growth in use of space for the benefit of this Nation and the world.

Mr. Chairman, a detailed record of program plans and accomplishments has been compiled for the NASA manned space flight centers and contractors. The Apollo program has successfully concluded the lunar landing and safe return of astronauts on Apollo 11 and initiated a lunar exploration program with Apollo 12, 13, and 14. Saturn I-B vehicle production has been concluded and the remaining seven vehicles transferred to the Skylab program. Saturn V vehicles and spacecraft production has been essentially completed during fiscal year 1971 and production terminated. Of the six remaining Saturn V vehicles, three will be used for lunar exploration and one has been transferred to the skylab program to be used to launch an orbital workshop in 1973. One will be maintained as a backup for the Skylab program and one complete vehicle will be placed in reserve.

The following table summarizes the actions taken by the Committee on Manned Space Flight programs:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget line item	Fiscal year 1972 budget request	Committee recommendation	Difference: budget request and committee recommendation
Apollo.....	\$612,200	\$612,200
Space flight operations.....	672,775	745,275	+\$72,500
Advanced missions.....	1,500	10,000	+8,500
Total R. & D.....	1,286,475	1,367,475	+81,000
Construction of facilities.....	120,000	122,330	+2,330
Research and program management.....	332,005	333,005	+1,000
Manned space flight total.....	1,638,480	1,722,810	+84,330

¹ Plus \$2,503,000 for rehabilitation and modification work under various locations.

The committee has approved the fiscal year 1972 budget request with several changes—for manned space flight:

APOLLO

NASA requested \$612,200,000 for continuation of the Apollo lunar exploration program in fiscal year 1972.

The NASA budget proposed for Apollo for fiscal year 1972 is \$302,200,000 less than fiscal year 1971. This budget terminated Saturn V production with three lunar exploration flights remaining.

It is the view of the committee that although the proposed level of funding does not support an adequate manned space flight program in the 1970's, it is sufficient to support the lunar exploration missions in fiscal year 1972. The committee, therefore, recommends \$612,200,000 for the Apollo program in fiscal year 1972.

SPACE FLIGHT OPERATIONS

NASA requested \$672,775,000 for space flight operations in fiscal year 1972. The committee recommends an increase of \$72,500,000 for a total authorization of \$745,275,000 for fiscal year 1972 for space flight operations.

The budget proposed for space flight operations for fiscal year 1972 is \$230,075,000 more than for fiscal year 1971. This reflects increases in funding required to support the development and flight preparations for launch of Skylab in 1973 and three planned visits to Skylab, utilizing three existing Saturn I-B vehicles. A second backup workshop is being fabricated so that if problems are encountered with the launch or flight of Skylab a second workshop will be available. This also includes funds for support of detailed definition and design study for a low cost, earth-to-orbit recoverable shuttle.

The changes recommended by the committee in the space flight operations line item are as follows:

SKYLAB

NASA requested \$535,400,000 for the Skylab portion of the space flight operations program. The committee recommends an increase of \$15 million for Skylab for a rescue capability for the most probable mission failure situations. The approach calls for converting the next launch ready Skylab command and service module into a rescue carrier by removing stowage lockers and adding two additional crew couches. Minor modifications would be required to provide extra outlets for communications and environmental control. The command and service module would be launched with two crewmembers and return with five.

An additional \$15 million in fiscal year 1972 would permit proceeding more promptly than possible under the present budget request with the fabrication of the kits to provide the rescue capability and the modifications necessary for installation of the kits into the command and service module.

The Skylab program capitalizes on the capabilities and resources developed in the Apollo program to accomplish scientific, technological, and biomedical investigations in space. Skylab has been initiated with the goal of achieving a series of steps leading toward the establishment of an operational capability in earth orbit. This operational capability will result in expanding the scientific knowledge of our earth and the surrounding universe. In addition, Skylab will build the foundation for future major steps in manned exploration beyond the earth-moon system.

The program has proceeded through phases of initial study, conceptual study and preliminary design. It is now entering the final phase of development and program operations.

Skylab missions are based on the concept of maximum utilization of existing hardware, and, in addition, the concepts of revisit, resupply, reuse and repair of equipment in earth orbit will be evaluated from an economic standpoint. For the eventuality that astronauts who

fly the long-duration Skylab missions in 1973 may get into difficulty, a plan has been devised to rescue them using a conventional three-man Apollo spacecraft modified to accommodate five persons.

A major area of emphasis in Skylab is a group of observations of the earth's resources. Skylab efforts will add to and complement the knowledge gained in both ground-based research and automated satellites. In one significant activity in this area, the astronauts will use synchronous electric cameras with various film and filter combinations to record images in visible and infrared light to be used in the analysis of earth resources. These photographs—which will be brought to earth—and other sensing devices can contribute to our understanding of air and water pollution, weather conditions, ocean food, and other material resources, mineral resources and reserves, flood control, and many other important aspects of our environment. This effort in support of NASA's total applications program ranks high among our priorities. We intend to make every effort to broaden the scope of our activities in this area within the Skylab program to test equipment, experiment with sensors, and obtain data when the load-carrying capabilities and operating characteristics of the Skylab make this the preferred method.

A principal scientific effort in the program is directed toward the use of a solar astronomy module for detailed studies of the sun, whose energy provides the driving force that controls our environment, not only on earth but throughout the solar system. Observations of the sun will be made in various parts of the spectrum. An astronomer-astronaut will probably be a member of the crew on at least one of the missions to make on-the-scene decisions on the conduct of the research program and to direct instruments toward various areas of the sun as conditions change.

Skylab will substantially augment the technology base for space activities projected for the late 1970's and beyond. The effects of prolonged weightlessness on man's well-being and performance will be investigated in depth and practical experience will be gained in long life systems operation. Habitability, medical, behavioral, and work effectiveness experiments will be performed on missions of increasing duration. It is expected that a medically trained observer will be a member of the crew on one of these missions to conduct an intensive program of experiments in these areas. The results are expected to add to understanding of healthy human subjects, thus also contributing to medical knowledge of value on earth.

Biological experiments are also planned on the effect of zero gravity on living organisms and the effect of alteration of the basic rhythms, such as the sequence of day and night at 24-hour intervals, which influence the life processes.

Combined, the results of all of these activities in the Skylab program will give

us important scientific and engineering data we cannot get any other way and permit us to establish effective and economical approaches to future space operations.

SECOND SKYLAB—APPLICATIONS FLIGHTS

Following Apollo 17 and Skylab, there is a gap in manned flight of over 3 years. The committee recommends the addition of \$30 million to the budget for the purpose of "filling the gap" in manned space flight which would permit NASA to, first, evaluate the potential of either a second Skylab, or command and service module, only, flight and second, report back on a program providing high utility using existing vehicles. Several alternatives are to be evaluated.

A second set of Skylab missions can be flown in 1974 with two manned visits of 90 days each and using only backup flight modules and experimental hardware produced for Apollo and Skylab programs. The experience and knowledge gained from the initial Skylab should permit enhancement and redirection of a second Skylab to an orbital research facility. This would allow new investigations and observations which could not be accomplished on the initial Skylab, because of insufficient crew time. In addition to the expansion of experience that could be gained by repeating selected experiments, other specific new experiments have been identified that could be added to the payload thereby greatly enhancing the value of a second Skylab.

The current Skylab plan includes the capability to launch a backup workshop approximately 10 months after a go-ahead decision. Previous budgetary constraints have necessitated planning for only partial checkout of the backup hardware; however, fiscal year 1972 funding would permit a more cost effective completion of checkout.

In addition, it would provide for initiating conversion of Apollo command and service module hardware to the Skylab configuration, mission planning, sustaining ground-based scientific investigations and enhancement of experiments.

Following Apollo 17 and Skylab, with a gap in manned flight of over 3 years, two of the command and service modules and Saturn I-B launch vehicle excess to the current manned program could be effectively used to perform earth survey mission. The scientific instrumentation module bay provisions in the service module and the operations experience gained in lunar orbit make it logical to consider earth survey missions with earth sensors integrated into the bay. A mission at 50-degree inclination and 150 nautical mile altitude would permit three separate, complete coverages of continental United States in 15 days. Integration of special cameras, a multispectral scanner and an infrared spectrometer into the scientific instrumentation module bay in a manner which would yield earth survey data would be examined. Two missions would permit coverage with seasonal variation, extensive film return, and utilization of

the crew for selective operation of the system. These missions would provide highly useful information and maintain the operating proficiency of the launch and mission teams.

Fiscal year 1972 funding would be used for program definition, development of experiments, and spacecraft modifications and checkout.

NASA has trimmed its programs to the bone, to concentrate resources for the accomplishment of the reusable shuttle development. The time is opportune; the technology is at hand to direct the space program away from its missile-oriented origins and to adopt the economical operational techniques developed by the airline industry in the competitive commercial marketplace. If permitted to proceed along this line, space will become available to a greatly expanded number of users for the simple reason that the risk of sending a payload into orbit will be no greater than shipping a cargo by air, truck, or rail; and the cost will become more reasonable as the preparations for going into orbit approach those of commercial shipping. The major impact of the shuttle and the total space transportation system is expected to be in the cost of the payloads. The extensive reliability provisions and proof-testing required in today's satellites is the major reason for their high cost. As these restrictions are relaxed, the preparation time and cost will taper off and traffic will increase. Not only will the shuttle carry its load and return to earth like a tractor trailer, but the payloads themselves can be brought back to be repaired or modernized as necessary. Nor does reusability stop there. The theme of reusability will be continued into the other elements of the space transportation system, such as the Tug, as resources become available for their development. The present budget is, therefore, greatly constrained in order to make this capability achievable in today's financial environment. The plan is not, however, without its drawbacks. Great as the promise is, the plan unfortunately puts NASA into an extended period of austerity with respect to other manned space flight activity. There is an absolute gap of men in space from the windup of the skylab missions until shuttle hardware reaches readiness for the first shuttle orbital flights. This period lasts over 4 years according to current planning. Any change in available funding could compress or extend the gap to some degree. NASA is particularly unhappy with this situation but can do nothing about it. They are convinced this is the best solution within present constraints.

They do, however, have plans for useful manned space flight activity that could be done during this gap, making use of residual Apollo hardware. The cost of these proposed missions is somewhat lessened because of the use of the Apollo equipment. This does not mean the cost would be low, because all would involve missions with modes of operation developed for Apollo. Missions such as

polar earth surveys could bring spectacular results of perhaps immediate and significant benefits to us all. However, NASA does not propose to do them within budget levels now projected for the Agency. NASA does, however, recommend for consideration that additional funds be provided for these missions if the President and the Congress feel that the return from them warrants their cost. NASA makes this recommendation only as long as there is no impact upon achievement of the shuttle capability and the commencement of "airlines" type missions into space.

SPACE SHUTTLE

NASA requested \$100 million for the space shuttle program for fiscal year 1972. The committee recommends an increase of \$25 million for a total of \$135 million for the space shuttle portion of the space flight operations item.

An additional \$25 million in fiscal year 1972 will support a more intensive undertaking of the pacing vehicle development tasks, the thermal protection, and vehicle structures. In the thermal protection area, ultimate refurbishment costs may be reduced by the development of improved thermal protection materials including the basic insulation materials and protective coatings. The cost effectiveness of the current external insulation system could be enhanced by these development efforts. In the structures area, increased support would be utilized in developing composite materials such as graphite aluminum for the primary structure which could reduce the vehicle lift-off weight. Similar intensified efforts can be applied to improving beryllium fabrication techniques for application to both the primary and secondary structures.

EXPERIMENT DEFINITION

NASA requested \$37,375,000 for orbital systems and experiments in the space flight operations line item for fiscal year 1972. The committee recommends an increase of \$2,500,000 for experiment definition when the shuttle is used as a short duration laboratory returning to earth in 1 to 7 days.

An additional \$2,500,000 for experiment definition in fiscal year 1972 would be used mainly in three areas: Earth observations; communications and navigation; and materials science and space manufacturing. Primarily, study efforts would explore the potential of the space shuttle to fly short duration laboratory missions carrying experiments. Other studies would be initiated to determine requirements for data sensors, processors, analysers, and display equipment. Increased laboratory and theoretical investigations would be made in all disciplines, directed toward maximum efficiency in mission planning and the means for making observations utilizing the unique capabilities that man provides to a laboratory in space.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$72,500,000 in the four areas outlined for space flight operations for fiscal year 1972 for a total authorization of \$745,275,000.

ADVANCED MISSIONS

For fiscal year 1972 NASA requested \$1,500,000 for advanced mission studies. The committee recommends an increase of \$8,500,000 for advanced missions for a total authorization of \$10 million for fiscal year 1972.

The committee notes that with the continuing decline in the manned space flight and total NASA programs that intensive advanced planning and analysis is needed. More emphasis is needed on analyses and planning to develop the best directions for future effort in the 1970's. The increase of \$8,500,000 in advanced missions programs would provide for:

First. More detailed study of improved information retrieval and dissemination from future manned space systems;

Second. Studies of orbital retrieval and orbital equipment reuse in the 1970's and 1980's;

Third. Planning for on-orbit large payload handling;

Fourth. Analysis of the potential for lunar resources utilization and lunar base operations;

Fifth. Study of large equipment erection and handling in space; and

Sixth. Study of the potential for increased use of synchronous orbit mission and near-earth polar orbit missions.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For fiscal year 1972, NASA requested \$20.0 million for modifications to existing facilities for the shuttle engine development program.

This project is required to modify and upgrade existing Government-owned facilities at seven different locations to provide for research, development, evaluation, and qualification of the shuttle engines, auxiliary propulsion systems, and thermal protection systems.

The project includes modifications to two existing test stands at the Mississippi test facility for sea level testing of the shuttle engine; procurement of long lead time procurement of materials eventually required to modify the existing altitude test stand at the Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn.; and modifications to existing thermal research and testing facilities at the Ames Research Center, the Langley Research Center and the Manned Spacecraft Center.

The development of a reusable high pressure rocket engine for use in both the booster and the orbiter of the space shuttle is the pacing item in the program. The development of adequate thermal protection systems is also a demanding problem requiring early resolution.

Because of the long design and construction lead times involved in the required modification work, the committee considers that this work should proceed without delay and accordingly recommends approval of the project.

The committee also reviewed the manned space flight portion of the project included under "Various Locations" for general rehabilitation and modifications to existing physical plant. This work

amounts to \$2,503,000 for manned space flight of which \$1,418,000 is specifically for projects involving the prevention, control, and abatement of pollution. Fifteen minor projects are involved at the three manned space flight centers and three Government-owned, contractor operated plants. These projects represent a continuation of the program to reduce the large backlog of deferred maintenance at NASA field centers initiated 3 years ago at the suggestion of this committee. The committee recommends these proposed projects.

The committee also considered one project which was not included in the NASA request—the general modernization and expansion of the Visitors Information Center at Cape Kennedy. We, on the committee, have been concerned for some time about the inadequacy of the existing facilities.

Many of us have long considered that a more appropriate and modern complex should be available to the general public for informational and educational purposes. Millions of people have visited this facility and it appears that with the opening of Walt Disney World in Orlando later this year, an additional 600,000 persons will visit the center annually. The subcommittee believes that improved facilities could contribute a great deal to a better public understanding and appreciation of the space program.

A master plan has been developed for the improved information complex. Based upon the plan an estimated \$10 million will ultimately be required to modernize and expand the center. Of immediate and pressing need is the first phase which includes modernization of existing plant; the construction of a new Reception and Exhibit Building and a new Hall of History building; and the expansion of site utilities. The present center can accommodate up to 6,000 visitors per day. Phase I of the improvement plan will increase the capability to accommodate up to 10,000 visitors daily.

The committee recommends that the NASA construction of facilities request be increased by \$2,330,000 to provide the necessary funds to implement Phase I of the master plan.

SHUTTLE FACILITIES

The committee adopted a strong position in last year's legislative report concerning the requirement for facilities in support of the space shuttle program. In essence the committee urged that NASA make maximum use of existing facilities to meet the shuttle needs, and that no new facilities should be considered until exhaustive studies have been made to determine the capability of the present physical plant to meet the requirements.

The committee considers that NASA has thus far abided by the committee views on this matter as evidenced by the recent decision to locate engine development and testing activities at existing installations.

The committee in the legislative report accompanying the fiscal year 1972 authorization bill, has added a further committee view complimenting NASA on

their actions and requesting the agency to report back to the committee the results of the overall facilities study now underway, prior to any final decision as to the location of shuttle facilities.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

NASA has requested \$332,005,000 for the operation and maintenance of field activities falling under the jurisdiction of the Office of Manned Space Flight. The breakdown of this request is as follows:

	Million
Kennedy Space Center.....	\$95.6
Manned Spacecraft Center.....	106.3
Marshall Space Flight Center.....	130.2

The fiscal year 1972 request is \$16.8 million less than the fiscal year 1972 budget operating level for manned space flight field activities.

Almost 70 percent of the total request for fiscal year 1972 is for personnel compensation and benefits. It will support an end fiscal year permanent strength of 11,986 personnel.

The cost limitations imposed on NASA by last year's authorization act forced a reduction of 278 personnel more than originally planned at the manned space flight centers.

The administration has directed a further reduction of 1,500 personnel, or 5.1 percent of the work force, in NASA during fiscal year 1972. Of this amount 619 positions will be eliminated at the manned space flight centers. NASA estimates that only 40 percent of this reduction can be brought about by normal attrition. The balance will have to be accomplished by reduction-in-force procedures. NASA also estimates that 32 percent of the fiscal year 1972 reduction will affect onboard scientists and engineers.

Service support contract personnel will also be reduced in fiscal year 1972 by 819 employees. Further reductions in all other functional categories of the research and program management request below the fiscal year 1971 levels are planned.

The committee also took into consideration the effect of the drain of scientists and engineers on the space program occasioned by the rapid decline in the annual funding for the Nation's space effort. Five years ago there were over 420,000 people in civil service, industry, and the universities involved in space research development and related activities. This figure will drop to around 140,000 personnel by the end of fiscal year 1971.

Testimony received also indicates that young people entering the academic fields are no longer being attracted to the space program, because of the uncertainty of the future of space. Other testimony indicated that the average age of the scientist and engineer component of the NASA work force is increasing at the rate of eight-tenths of a year annually, indicating that the rate of young people entering the space program has declined to a considerable extent. Only 88 new college graduates were hired during the first half of fiscal year 1971, as compared to 271 hired during fiscal year 1970. It is quite apparent that further emphasis

must be placed on increasing the input of new blood into the Nation's space activities.

One means of encouraging more young people to enter the space program is through the summer employment of high school and college students as well as faculty members. This program has been in existence in NASA for many years and the projected level for fiscal year 1972 is 2,300 positions, at an estimated cost of \$5,437,000, NASA-wide.

The committee considers that this program should be expanded and accordingly recommends that the research and program management request be increased by \$1 million for these purposes. This will add 600 to 800 employees to the nonpermanent work force.

Thus, the committee recommends that a total of \$333,005,000 be authorized for research and program management for manned space flight.

Careful examination of this budget will indicate that it does not fulfill the many opportunities that this Nation has in utilizing and exploring space. The President's space task group report recommended a much larger budget. Our resources in people and facilities have declined to an extent that is not satisfactory to a nation whose technological base is essential not only to our standard of living but also to our ability to compete in the world marketplace. I urge your support of the NASA authorization as recommended by the committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7109, the fiscal year 1972 NASA authorization bill. This bill will authorize \$3,433,580,000 for our Nation's space effort for the next fiscal year.

I strongly favor the action of the Science and Astronautics Committee and its members who have given so much study over the past 2 months.

Space is with us to stay. It is not only with us for peacetime uses, nor in order for us to remain first in technology, but it is also with us for our very security. Therefore, we should move ahead.

We should proceed on a measured course with a balanced program of manned and unmanned space research and exploration. We can reduce by 90 percent, the cost of earth orbit physics, astronomy and applications research by promptly going ahead with the space shuttle. Likewise the cost of planetary exploration, unmanned for the immediate future at least, also can be materially reduced. Our space applications effort must be bolstered and emphasized so that we may derive the maximum practical benefits to man from our space research. We must proceed post haste with our basic research in all fields but most important in the fields of advanced research in liquid, solid, and nuclear space storable fuels.

The NASA request for next year represents a very critically constrained budget. In fact the request as submitted by the President was the lowest budget received by the Congress for space since fiscal year 1962.

Budgetary restrictions for fiscal years 1971 and 1972 have forced a major reorientation of the space effort. Two Apollo lunar landing missions have been canceled and practically all of the other major programs have been slipped anywhere from 6 to 12 months. Faced with a declining budget, NASA has been forced to make reductions and compromises to bring their budget far below what is needed from a purely scientific and technical standpoint, that would permit this Nation to continue its forward progress in science and technology.

Fiscal year 1972 marks the beginning of the end for much of the work started in the 1960's, which for the most part will be completed in the next 2 or 3 years. The Apollo program will end with Apollo 17 in December 1972. Skylab will fly in 1973 with no successor currently planned. Our present earth resources and applications technology satellite programs will be completed by 1974. The planetary program now underway runs through the launch of the Viking unmanned landing missions to Mars which will be launched in 1975 and land in 1976; these were postponed last year from 1973 for budgetary reasons.

Thus, we are witnessing the tailing off to completion of work in progress for many years. By 1974 the number of NASA space launches per year will have declined from 26 in 1966 to eight. Likewise, after the Skylab missions in 1973, this Nation faces at least 4 years in which there will be no U.S. manned space flight.

I believe that the main question facing us in Congress is how far we should permit the Nation's space endeavor to decline. It may be that we have already gone too far. We have witnessed the dismantling of the greatest scientific and engineering force the world has ever known—the aerospace team. The current estimate for industry employment on NASA work at the end of this year and next is 108,000—less than one-third of what it was at the peak of the space program. Likewise, the NASA in-house work force will have been reduced by almost 6,000 positions by the end of fiscal year 1972.

Aside from the major impacts that these layoffs have had on the economy of this Nation, the more serious aspect is the erosion of our technological base and expertise. This country's space effort over the past decade has in fact constituted the U.S. science and technology program. To permit our technological capability to decline further would be pennywise and pound foolish. We must halt this downward trend, or lose our position of preeminence in space.

It is for these reasons that the Committee on Science and Astronautics is recommending a 1972 space bill which is \$162,230,000 more than contained in the President's budget. NASA's request was \$3,271,350,000. We are recommending that new obligatory authority in the amount of \$3,433,850,000 be granted.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to include for the RECORD a summary chart of the committee's actions:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION: ACTIONS BY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS ON H.R. 7109 NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972

[In millions of dollars]

Program	NASA request	Committee action	Committee recommendation	Purpose of additions
Research and development:				
Apollo	612.2		612.2	
Space flight operations.....	672.775	+72.5	745.275	15.0 Skylab. 30.0 Second Skylab—Applications flights. 25.0 Shuttle. 2.5 Experiment definitions.
Total.....				72.5
Advanced missions.....	1.5	+8.5	10.0	8.5 Studies for information retrieval, equipment retrieval, payload handling, large equipment erection and handling, orbit analysis and lunar resource and base utilization.
Physics and Astronomy.....	110.3	+2.5	112.8	2.0 To increase support for: .5 Sounding rocket. Balloon research.
Total.....				2.5
Lunar and planetary exploration.....	311.5		311.5	
Space applications.....	182.5		182.5	
Launch vehicle procurement.....	146.1		146.1	
Aeronautical research and technology.....	110.0	+25.0	135.0	1.4 Graduate research and study program. 7.0 Experimental STOL transport and research airplane. 3.6 Aerodynamics and vehicle systems. 5.7 Propulsion. 1.6 Operating systems. 3.5 Materials and structures. 2.2 Guidance, control and information systems.
Total.....				25.0
Space research and technology.....	75.105		75.105	
Nuclear power and propulsion.....	27.720	+39.9	67.620	35.0 NERVA. 3.0 Nuclear propulsion research and technology. 1.9 Nuclear rocket development stations operations.
Total.....				39.9
Tracking and data acquisition.....	264.0		264.0	
Technology utilization.....	4.0	+2.0	6.0	1.0 Applications engineering and NASA and non-NASA centers. .3 Technology application team activities. .225 Augment regional dissemination networks and resources. .20 Technology and system studies. .10 Computer software evaluation. .10 Program evaluation and economic studies. .075 Publications.
Total.....				2.0
Subtotal R. & D.....	2,517.7	+150.4	2,668.1	
Construction of facilities:				
Ames research center.....	6.5		6.5	
John F. Kennedy Space Center.....	15.2	+2.33	17.53	2.33 Space information and education center.
Various locations.....	31.1		31.1	
Facility planning and design.....	3.5		3.5	
Subtotal construction of facilities.....	56.3	+2.33	58.630	
Research and program management.....	697.350	+9.5	706.850	4.5 Retain 500 personnel at OART centers. 1.0 To increase temporary employment. 4.0 To improve public affairs activity.
Total.....				9.5
Grand total.....	3,271.350	162.230	3,433.580	

We are recommending this course of action not only to stem the downward trend in our space effort, but also to better align the program with the known, hard space requirements for 1972 and to move the program closer toward the objectives contained in the President's space task group report.

NASA had requested \$3,689,400,000 for the fiscal year 1972 program. The Office of Management and Budget cut the program \$418,000,000, which would cause slippages in most major space projects.

Likewise, the President's space task group recommended 2 years ago that the level of space spending for fiscal year 1972 should be \$4,050,000,000. NASA's request as submitted to the Congress is \$898,000,000 below that level, and I do not believe that the objectives contained in the report can be met. Our action will partially overcome the shortfalls.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to cover some of the major elements included in the bill before the House.

MANNED SPACE FLIGHT

Turning first to the area of manned space flight, NASA requested of the Office of Management and Budget \$1,438,600,000 for fiscal year 1972. NASA came to the Congress with a request of \$1,286,500,000 or \$152,100,000 less than their request to the Office of Management and Budget. Only two operational programs using man in space remain: Apollo and Skylab. The Apollo program with its three remaining flights will be completed within 18 months. Our only precursor space station, Skylab, will be flown in 1973, with three visits to Skylab completed by the end of 1973. Unless the low-cost space shuttle program is approved in this budget, the United States will be out of the manned space flight business in 30 months. I need not tell this body the consequences of this situation to national well-being and national security. Even with the approval of the low-cost space shuttle an unacceptable gap in manned space activity will occur in the 1974-79 time period.

With these crucial factors in mind I, along with my distinguished committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have made limited but significant changes to the bill before you.

APOLLO

With the cancellation of Apollo 18 and 19 flights, only three Apollo lunar missions remain. Considering this, the committee did not change the request by NASA for the Apollo program in fiscal year 1972. I have been concerned for some time that full scientific benefit from the three remaining flights could not be obtained; however, NASA has largely followed the scheduling which I have recommended in previous years and delayed the Apollo 17 mission by 5 months. We should, under these circumstances, receive maximum scientific return from the remaining Apollo lunar missions.

SKYLAB

Skylab will be launched in early 1973 with an unmanned launch of the Orbital Workshop. The following day the first

of three extended visits will be made to the Workshop using Saturn IB vehicles to carry three astronauts on each trip. Over 2,200 astronaut hours will be used in experiment activities in Skylab. Astronomy, space physics, earth resources studies and experiments, bioscience and medical experiments, and manufacturing and engineering technology demonstrations will be accomplished.

To assure that maximum safety is achieved we have added \$15,000,000 to the Skylab request. This additional authorization will allow conversion of one spacecraft so that a crew of two astronauts can fly to the Skylab and return with a total of five astronauts. This limited resource capability, I feel, is essential to the program and can be provided at a modest cost.

Also, I have been examining the long gap which will occur in manned space flight in the mid 1970's. My review indicated that sufficient hardware is available and sufficient important experimentation needed to evaluate two alternatives. The first alternative is to fly a second backup Skylab in 1974-76 time period. A second alternative would be to use the remaining two Saturn IB launch vehicles to conduct extended near-earth orbital missions in the 1974-76 time period.

Based on these considerations we have added \$30,000,000 to evaluate the potential of either a second Skylab or provide two Saturn IB extended missions.

In fact I have inquired in some detail into the inventory of excess hardware that could be used for future missions.

Assuming successful Apollo and Skylab missions, the Apollo Saturn launch vehicles and spacecraft which will remain after the Apollo 17 mission and the third manned visit to Skylab-A are: Four command and service modules—one complete Skylab backup spacecraft; two lunar modules—one complete and parts for another; one Skylab workshop, airlock and multiple docking adapter; two Saturn V launch vehicles; three complete Saturn IB vehicles; three additional S-IB stages; and one Saturn IB instrument unit.

There are, in addition, backup articles for the Skylab experiments, including a complete Apollo telescope mount. In general these are prototypes that could be refurbished as flight units. Fabrication of these components, as well as the backup workshop, is to be completed, but final checkout is not now planned.

Flights are not currently planned for this hardware although there are a number of valuable potential applications. A number of unmanned missions have been considered, although they do not effectively utilize the available systems nor do they serve to alleviate the hiatus in manned space flight.

It would be possible to utilize all four command and service modules in independent missions with two or three of them dedicated to earth surveys, with the remainder in support of missions involving international participation. An alternate possibility which has been given some consideration is a second Skylab with two 90-day manned mis-

sions and two independent earth observation missions flown at different seasons. A third possibility would utilize the systems which are, or will be placed in storage, to conduct a second Skylab program with three manned visits in addition to one independent earth orbital mission with, for instance, a payload of earth orbital sensors.

Each of these possibilities should be considered in the light of cancellation of Apollo 18 and 19 and delay in initiation of Skylab-A. However, any additional missions would require funding beginning in fiscal year 1972 and extending through fiscal year 1975.

For this reason missions utilizing Apollo-Saturn residual hardware have not been proposed in the current environment of heavily constrained budgets. We should continue to examine the desirability and feasibility of these and other possible missions to develop more detailed estimates of resource requirements.

It should be pointed out that the two Saturn V launch vehicles which will be available after Skylab represent the only heavy lift capability that this country will have after the Apollo and Skylab programs. The Saturn V has the ability to put 300,000 pounds in earth orbit or 100,000 pounds into synchronous orbit. Although there are no specific missions for these vehicles at the present time, there may be a need for either military or civilian heavy payload capability to react quickly to external influence. The heavy lift capability represented by these Saturn V launch vehicles is a national resource which should be carefully studied for possible use.

SPACE SHUTTLE

During this last year NASA has devoted \$80,000,000 to Phase A—preliminary design—and phase B—design definition—studies of a low-cost space transportation system called the space shuttle. It is clear from studies made by NASA and by contractors that a space shuttle developed between now and 1979 can reduce the cost of transportation to space by at least one-half when operational after 1979. More important it will allow flexible design of payloads, retrieval, maintenance or modification of satellites in orbit, again reducing program costs. Because the shuttle can be used over and over again it can be a laboratory, factory and earth or sky observatory on short notice, low cost and without modification simply by placing the needed equipment in its 15 feet by 60 feet payload bay.

NASA requested \$100,000,000 for the space shuttle for fiscal year 1972. We recognized that the pacing development tasks were the thermal protection and vehicle structures work and added \$25,000,000 for that effort. Both in terms of utilization of space and national security the development of shuttle technology and flight demonstration of the vehicle is of major national importance. As further recognition of this, \$2,500,000 was added to provide for experiment definition in the area where the shuttle would be used as a short-term laboratory for up to 7 days in orbit.

ADVANCED MISSIONS

Our national space program has declined in personnel, facilities, and programs for the past 5 years. Despite the achievement of the U.S. space effort this erosion of capability has brought this Nation close to the point of losing the value of the investment made in the 1960's. To aid in reversing this erosion of a national asset, I proposed and was supported by my colleagues on the committee in adding \$8,500,000 to the advanced missions studies program. As I have pointed out and as the Members of this body know, good advanced planning is essential to getting the most for our dollars in the space program. More effort and attention is essential in several specific areas:

First, additional intensive study of information retrieval and dissemination from future manned space systems.

Second, studies of orbital retrieval and orbital equipment reuse in the 1970's and 1980's.

Third, planning for on-orbit large payload landing.

Fourth, evaluation of the potential for lunar resources utilization and lunar base operations.

Fifth, study of large equipment erection and handling in space.

Sixth, study of the potential for increased use of synchronous orbit and near-earth polar orbit missions.

By placing more attention now on our opportunities and needs of the mid 1970's and early 1980's our return from space exploration and utilization can be increased.

The programs and budget approved by your Committee for Manned Space Flight represents a program that will maintain, at the lowest levels, the necessary skilled personnel and resources to carry out a significant and worthwhile effort. I urge acceptance of the manned space flight program as recommended by the committee and included in the bill now before you.

SPACE SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS

Now I would like to turn to NASA's unmanned flight program, which is carried out under the supervision of the Office of Space Science and Applications.

The space science and applications program is authorized at \$752,900,000 for fiscal year 1972. This represents an increase of \$187,200,000 over the level of funding for the current fiscal year.

Starting with the physics and astronomy program, NASA uses a wide variety of techniques to explore our space environment, from the relatively simple and inexpensive balloon experiments and sounding rockets, to the large orbiting observatory spacecraft.

Using this wide range of devices, NASA has been able to achieve a better understanding of the nature of the earth, the sun, the other planets of the solar system, the universe beyond our solar system, and the physical processes and interrelationships involved.

The orbiting solar observatory (OSO) project is designed to study sun spots, solar flares, and other phenomena that occur on the sun during the 11-year solar cycle. In order to understand and predict

the occurrence and intensity of solar radiation, it is necessary to observe the sun with instruments above the earth's absorbing and obscuring atmosphere.

The sun is the source of all energy on the earth. Without the sun, there could be no life on earth. Therefore, study of the sun, its radiations, and the interactions of those radiations with the earth's environment, particularly the atmosphere, provides the basic knowledge and understanding of the earth's ecosystem.

Six OSO spacecraft have been launched to date, beginning in March 1962. There are four remaining OSO's in the program which will be launched intermittently through the mid 1970's.

The orbiting astronomical observatory (OAO) project provides for the launch of three 4,400-pound stabilized spacecraft which carry telescopes of various sizes above the earth's atmosphere to view celestial objects in the ultraviolet region of the electromagnetic spectrum. The OAO-2 spacecraft which was launched in December 1968 continues to operate successfully and has made major contributions to the sciences of astronomy and astrophysics during the past 2½ years.

Last November, the OAO-B spacecraft was lost due to a launch vehicle failure which did not allow the shroud around the spacecraft to jettison during the launch phase. OAO-B carried a 36-inch reflecting telescope which was designed to investigate fainter celestial objects in the ultraviolet range.

The third and last spacecraft in this series, OAO-C, is scheduled for launch next year. It will carry a 36-inch Cassegrainian telescope constructed by Princeton University.

A new project this year, the high energy astronomy observatory (HEAO) project is designed to observe our galaxy and the universe in a completely different range of electromagnetic spectrum. It will carry X-ray and gamma-ray experiments, and will survey the sky for cosmic radiation. It is expected that such phenomena as quasars and pulsars, little understood today, will be the subject of study using this spacecraft. HEAO has been given the highest priority by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences as the next significant step in astronomy and astrophysics.

Explorer satellites are also an important aspect of the physics and astronomy program. These relatively small satellites are designed to accomplish particular scientific investigations. One of the most attractive features of the Explorer program is the fact that it has opened the door to many friendly countries abroad to cooperate with the United States in important scientific investigations in space.

Finally, sounding rockets and balloons continue to be highly useful, yet inexpensive, devices for the conduct of physics and astronomy investigations at altitudes, and for missions, in which satellites are impracticable. Sounding rockets and balloons are also useful for testing instruments and experiments prior to their incorporation in satellites. This year, the Science and Astronautics Committee increased the NASA request for sounding rockets and balloons by \$2.5

million, in order to increase the level of effort to that of previous years, and to give greater emphasis to this important work. Accordingly, the physics and astronomy program is authorized at the level of \$112,800,000 for fiscal year 1972.

Now, I would like to make a few remarks about the planetary exploration program. The authorization bill being considered today would approve \$311,500,000 for this program, the exact amount requested by the administration.

The goal of planetary exploration is the acquisition of new and more detailed information and knowledge of the origin, evolution, and dynamics of our solar system.

This program has achieved a high degree of success beginning with the Mariner 2 flyby of Venus in 1962. Venus was visited again by a Mariner spacecraft in 1967.

We have had three successful flybys of Mars, one in 1964 and two in 1969. Two Mariner spacecraft were scheduled for launch to Mars this year, each of which was designed to orbit the red planet for a minimum of 90 days. Unfortunately, due to a launch vehicle failure, the first of these two missions was lost last month. The second Mariner Mars Orbiter is on its way to Mars at the present time, and hopefully will be injected into orbit around the planet next November.

Mariner 6 and 7 flew by Mars in 1969, passing within 2,000 miles of the Martian surface and completing the most ambitious and successful planetary reconnaissance ever attempted. More than 200 pictures of the planet were returned, and additional information was achieved regarding the south polar ice cap, which was found to be composed of carbon dioxide, and about 20 percent of the cratered surface of Mars has been studied in detail, made possible by the high resolution pictures received from the spacecraft. In addition, refined data on the composition, pressure, and temperature of the Martian atmosphere were also received.

The next Mariner spacecraft will be launched to the vicinity of Venus in 1973. After taking pictures of Venus and gathering scientific information regarding its atmosphere, the spacecraft will be accelerated by Venus' gravity and orbital velocity in the direction of Mercury, and thus the same Mariner spacecraft will be used to achieve our first look at Mercury, the closest planet to the sun. Television pictures in both the ultraviolet and visual range of the spectrum will be returned from Mercury.

The most ambitious planetary mission of all will occur in 1975, when two Viking spacecraft will be launched and will soft land on the surface of Mars. Direct measurements of the atmosphere and the surface will be made by the Viking Lander. Special emphasis will be placed on obtaining biological, chemical, and environmental data relevant to the possible existence of life on Mars, past, present, or future.

As I have already indicated, exploration of the inner planets—Venus, Mercury, and Mars—is well underway. Dur-

ing the decade of the 1970's, NASA intends to extend the planetary exploration program to the outer solar system. In order to develop a convincing theory on the origin and evolution of the solar system, it is necessary to get much more detailed information on the four giant outer planets—Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune—as well as the tiny maverick planet, Pluto, the most distant body in our solar system. Moreover, the giant outer planets have 29 moons, and there are thousands of comets and asteroids, all of which are of great scientific interest.

Due to a unique alignment of the outer planets which occurs in the late 1970's, it will be possible to investigate as many as three of them with a single spacecraft, utilizing the gravity-assist technique whereby the spacecraft swings by selected planets in succession. In 1976 and 1977, there will be opportunities to fly by Jupiter, Saturn, and Pluto; and, in 1979, a single spacecraft can investigate Jupiter, Uranus, and Neptune. These missions are the so-called "grand tours."

In order to accomplish the grand tour missions, development of a new spacecraft will be undertaken in the forthcoming fiscal year. Because it will utilize a nuclear power source, this spacecraft has been named Thermoelectric Outer Planets Spacecraft (TOPS).

In the meantime, two Jupiter flybys will be accomplished in 1972 and 1973 with smaller vehicles called Pioneer-F and -G for our first look at this, the largest of the outer planets. These spacecraft will also fly through the asteroid belt, and hopefully return information on some of the thousands of asteroids which orbit the sun between Mars and Jupiter.

Finally, a cooperative venture with West Germany has been undertaken to launch two Pioneer-type spacecraft to within three-tenths of an astronomical unit of the sun. This program, called Helios, is the largest international cooperative project to date. This spacecraft will weigh about 560 pounds, carry more than 100 pounds of scientific instruments, and will provide our first opportunity to measure the intensity of solar radiation at the closest vantage point to the sun of any spacecraft launched to date.

While the space flight missions described so far have been, and will be, extremely exciting and rewarding from the standpoint of pure science, the program which has received the strongest support from the Science and Astronautics Committee over the years is the space applications program. This effort involves the launching of specialized spacecraft into near-earth orbit with the objective of achieving practical applications of space technology. NASA has requested \$182,500,000 for space applications, and the bill under consideration would authorize the full amount of the request.

Let me begin by describing the earth resources survey project. This project consists of the design and development of two spacecraft called Earth Resources Technology Satellite (ERTS) scheduled for launch in 1972 and 1973. This project also is supported by experiments con-

ducted in aircraft which are used to develop and test remote sensing techniques, sensors, and data-handling systems for ultimate use in satellites.

The survey of the surface of the earth from space is expected to have significant applications for a variety of scientific disciplines, including agriculture, forestry, oceanography, geology, hydrology, geography, and cartography. It is too early to estimate precisely the economic effects of an operational earth resources survey system, but there is general agreement that the economic gains will be enormous. Ultimately, the value of surveying the earth's resources from space may far surpass the Nation's entire investment in the space program, and we fully expect that the dividends from this effort will someday be measured in billions of dollars annually.

As a result of the impressive work done by NASA in the development of communications satellites which began in the early 1960's the world now has an effective, and profitable, operational space communications system. The COMSAT Corporation owes its very existence to the good work done by NASA during the early years of the past decade.

NASA is continuing its research and development of advanced space communications systems with a project called Applications Technology Satellites (ATS). This project provides the basic engineering and technological advances for future communications satellites. For example, ATS-F and G which are scheduled for launch in 1973 and 1975 will test erectable parabolic antennas 30 feet in diameter and which will have high-pointing accuracy. These spacecraft will be precursors to direct broadcast satellites of the future.

Of special interest is an agreement between our Government and the Government of India, under which ATS-F will be made available for an instructional television experiment to be run by the Indian Government for 1 year about the middle of this decade. Some 5,000 remote Indian villages will receive educational programs through the ATS-F satellite dealing with such matters as family planning, modern agricultural techniques, and so forth. The Indian Government will construct the necessary ground stations and plan the programing.

One of the most successful NASA programs has been the development and launch of meteorological satellites. Ten experimental TIROS spacecraft have been launched by NASA without a single failure, and an equal number of operational versions of the TIROS satellite have been successfully launched for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and its predecessor agencies. Daily pictures of cloud cover are received from these satellites by receivers placed around the world, and weather predictions have been greatly enhanced by their use.

Nimbus continues as NASA's experimental meteorological satellite program. The purpose of the Nimbus program is to provide a stabilized test-bed for advanced meteorological sensing equipment which will ultimately be used in the operational satellites launched for

NOAA. Temperature profiles, atmospheric humidity, and wind measurements will be acquired with these new sensors, and it is believed that within a few years we will be able to predict weather up to 2 weeks in advance using sensors now under development within NASA.

A third meteorological satellite development project which is designed to meet some of the future requirements of NOAA is the spacecraft known as the Synchronous Meteorological Satellite (SMS). This satellite will permit continuous observation of major weather systems routinely, thus enhancing our ability to predict and locate severe short-lived storms, and to acquire important wind-field data of large areas much more rapidly than is possible with present systems.

The SMS will be spin stabilized, and will contain imaging systems in both the infrared and the visible range of the spectrum so that both nighttime and daytime coverage will be possible.

Two SMS Spacecraft will be launched, the first this year, and the second in 1972.

Design studies and development projects are also underway in the fields of air-traffic control satellites, geodetic satellites, and advanced earth observatory satellites. All-in-all the space applications program is quite vigorous and varied, though not as aggressive as the Science and Astronautics Committee would desire. Because of the direct economic potential of utilizing space technology for practical applications, the committee has taken the position, again this year, that a larger portion of the NASA budget should be devoted to space applications. In this regard, more than 3 years ago the National Academy of Sciences strongly recommended that the budget for space applications should be at least doubled, and perhaps tripled. I am sure that I speak for other members of the Science and Astronautics Committee when I say that we concur; we believe that it would be in the national interest to increase support for projects which have practical applications of space technology.

In order to support the flight projects which I have described, NASA has requested \$146,100,000 for procurement of launch vehicles. The bill under consideration authorizes the full amount of this request.

ADVANCED RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

That part of the overall NASA program that seems to suffer first when budgets are being lowered is the advanced research and technology program. I have always been a strong supporter of our efforts in the advanced research and technology area and feel that we are depriving our country of its future in space when we fail to adequately fund this important work. The budget submitted this year was \$51,375,000 below the level for fiscal year 1971. I consider this reprehensible and indicative of short range planning on the part of NASA. In order to remedy this situation, the committee increased this program area of the budget by \$64,900,000. This amount will improve our capability; however, I do not

consider it adequate to provide the leadership in science and technology that should be characteristic of a country such as ours. I need only remind you that the Soviets are mindful of the importance of this type of research and they have consistently emphasized it in their programs. In aeronautical research and technology, it is reported that the prototype developments of Soviet aircraft have advanced design characteristics superior in many respects to U.S. designs. Our inability to proceed with the SST and similar developments have all contributed to the loss of U.S. superiority in the aeronautical field. For these reasons, the committee recommends the following action:

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

NASA's budget request for aeronautical research and technology was \$110,000,000. To the amount requested, the committee has added \$25,000,000 for a total authorization of \$135,000,000. During past years the committee has consistently called for and supported increasing attention to aeronautics research and development within NASA. Evaluation of testimony received both in the regular authorization hearings and in special hearings on aeronautics indicates that unless serious consideration is given to correcting many deficiencies we will encounter increasing risks in:

First, falling behind our world competitors in more and more areas of aeronautics and aviation.

Second, erosion of our store of technical and scientific knowledge, physical plant, and skilled people.

Third, unsafe travel by air arising from traffic congestion on the airways and around air terminals.

With these risks facing the Nation, the committee unanimously concluded that an increase of \$25 million should be made in NASA's aeronautical research and technology line item. These additional funds would be allocated for increased effort in attacking four major problem areas:

First, noise abatement.

Second, filling a number of urgent needs in our technological base ranging from basic research through flight development.

Third, airway and airport congestion.

Fourth, short-haul transportation—both short take off and landing and low population density areas.

In order to implement these ideals, the first requirement is for people. The committee has bolstered the aeronautics research and graduate study program by adding \$1,400,000. This is a continuation of a program started in fiscal year 1971 based on a previous recommendation of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Its purpose is to help solve the problem of attracting new, younger scientific and engineering men and women to the aeronautics research and development field. As presently being carried out, it is a program designed to spend \$1,400,000 over a 3-year period. I strongly believe that there is substantial justification for carrying out this highly important work at the \$1.4 million level originally authorized for fiscal year 1971

on an annual basis until significant progress has been made. The added funds would be used to expand the program to more students and more schools. The basic plan is for the graduate student to spend 2 years in an accredited school and 1 year at a NASA center.

Secondly, the committee feels that we must proceed more expeditiously on the experimental STOL transport research airplane. An increase of \$7,000,000 from \$15,000,000 to \$22,000,000 is recommended. This is a project to design, manufacture, develop, and test in flight, two experimental aircraft whose purpose is to advance the technology of short takeoff and landing (STOL) applicable to civil aviation. The research aircraft will incorporate a propulsion system that is quiet by today's standards, operating with a 500-foot sideline effective perceived noise in decibels (EPN db) as low as approximately 95. It is intended that the program will be a joint enterprise between Government and industry. On the Government side it is planned that NASA, Department of Transportation, and the Federal Aviation Agency will jointly direct the program, with DOD participation to some degree, since there will be the potential of a military application of the technology. On the industry side it is intended that the aircraft and engine companies, and the airlines, will participate. I must emphasize that the joint enterprise would be formed only to develop the technology of STOL through the testing of experimental aircraft, leaving the involved companies free to compete as they conventionally do when the technology would be applied to prototype aircraft in seeking market opportunities. Thus the joint enterprise is not a program wherein the Government would in any way underwrite a prototype development program by a segment of the industry. The justification for such a program rests on the results of a study recently completed jointly by NASA and the Department of Transportation on Civil Aviation Research and Development. Conclusions were reached that the three most serious problems in civil aviation are: severe noise pollution, congestion of the airways and terminals, and the economics of low density, short-haul air transportation. A STOL aircraft with quiet engines directly alleviates the first two of these problems. Increasing NASA's fiscal year 1972 budget request for the experimental STOL aircraft from \$15 million to \$22 million would permit NASA to accelerate the attack on the noise abatement technology that will be required in order that the experimental aircraft can be configured with low noise engines early in its flight program. This will permit earlier achievement of public confidence that environmentally acceptable STOL vehicles are realistic.

The committee has also increased the amount requested for aerodynamics and vehicle systems research. This will permit a needed expansion of basic research and increased attention to problems related to the development of new aircraft—civil and military, \$2,000,000 would be used in the areas of aerody-

namics, fluid mechanics, aeroelasticity and flight dynamics. Specific work would include such tasks as: studies and wind tunnel tests relating to optimizing supersonic aircraft configuration for minimum sonic booms; greater range of models to deal with scaling problems in the transonic speed range which is of great importance to both civil and military aircraft; expansion of spin research to develop an automatic spin prevention system applicable to all classes of aircraft.

An additional \$1,600,000 would be used to study the major systems integration problems of high performance supersonic aircraft. These major systems problems—propulsion system—airframe interaction in which flow distortions and shocks affect engine operation, control system— aerodynamic stability—would be studied by means of an expanded and accelerated YF-12 flight test program.

Of course one of the more pressing problems is in the area of propulsion. The committee is recommending an increase of \$5,700,000 to be divided between increased attention to noise abatement problems and other important areas of advanced components and systems. In the noise related activities additional funding would be used to increase efforts in basic noise research so as to increase our knowledge and provide a better understanding of the fundamental factors affecting the generation, propagation, and attenuation of aircraft noise. An increase in noise research efforts will also provide an opportunity for broadening the technological base required for the development of low noise fans for quiet engines for both CTOL and V/STOL aircraft. In the engine component related activities, we would increase the research efforts on advanced engine components and systems required for all classes of jet aircraft including small gas turbines for general aviation applications. The research would be focused on improving performance, reducing exhaust gas emissions, investigating methods for developing low-cost small gas turbine engines, and providing increased safety and reliability.

We need much more study in basic operating systems. Accordingly, we are recommending an increase of \$1,600,000 to be applied in four critical areas as follows:

First, feasibility study of offshore airports. This was an amendment offered in subcommittee by the gentleman from New York, Representative WYDLER. His interest is focused on offshore ocean and Long Island sound installations, not lakes, rivers, and streams.

Second, inertial navigation technology for STOL.

Third, aircraft trailing vortex research.

Fourth, study ways to improve flow of airfield traffic.

The committee is also recommending additional funds in the amount of \$2,200,000 for further research in guidance, control, and information systems.

These added funds would be applied to three main areas: Basic research, avionics technology, and digital electronics control systems. For basic re-

search additional work would be concentrated on design information for automated aircraft operations to reduce pilot workload. This is especially important in connection with flight paths required for noise reduction, increased traffic, and adverse weather. In avionics technology space-developed electronic concepts are being applied to avionic systems to increase economy and safety of aircraft operation. NASA will initiate the second phase of a program to replace modified Apollo equipment with advanced hardware.

An additional \$3,500,000 for materials and structures has also been recommended which would be divided between three areas: Refractory metals and coatings for noise suppression, application studies of composite materials, and non-destructive evaluation studies for aircraft structures.

I have spoken at some great length about the need for an additional \$25 million in the aeronautical research and technology area. I feel that it is extremely important to the future of this Nation's position in world aviation to continue to move forward with a vigorous program of aeronautical research.

In all of the areas of advanced research and technology the funding level as well as the NASA budget is below the recommended amount by the President's space task group report conducted in September 1969 which means that if these funds are not approved, we will not only fail to carry out an efficient program, but we will in effect fall seriously behind in our aerospace work. I need not remind this committee that the balance-of-payment contribution to this country's lagging exports is approximately \$4 billion per year by the aircraft industry alone. Surely this committee would see fit to supply these modest sums to maintain this healthy export item.

NUCLEAR PROPULSION

In the area of nuclear rocket development the committee finds it is in the position of saving a program that has been highly successful and would provide this Nation with the needed propulsion capability for the next 20 years at least, to keep us foremost in space. This program was reduced by the administration as a money-saving gesture; however, in reality it would only result in a loss of the trained manpower teams that now exist and would place our country in its historical position of being second best in thrust capability. It seems to me that we should learn that power in space is the key to our future successful dominance there.

We have reviewed the needs, the capability, advantages, and disadvantages each year of the NERVA rocket. The hearings are filled with testimony on the reasons why we should proceed with this development. However, to review these arguments briefly, nuclear propulsion makes a large amount of propulsive energy available for a variety of mission possibilities. The advantages fall into several categories: First, extend the range of mission possibilities utilizing currently available first-stage boosters—Saturn V, second, make feasible some near-earth missions that would other-

wise be impractical with chemical propulsion means—missions involving orbit plane changes over long time periods and large angles—and third, increase the probability of mission success because of simplicity of design and ruggedness.

This development provides an upper stage capability having a thrust duration hours long—up to 10 hours is the design objective—rather than minutes which is a current limitation of chemical rockets. Utilizing fully this large thrust capability, we can limit the number of upper stages required for a mission and we can transport much larger payloads. This capability thereby reduces the number of launches required to place large payloads into orbit. The NERVA engine then offers a thruster which can do a variety of missions. Its propulsive force and long burn time should satisfy the space program needs for many years ahead.

This year's testimony highlights the cost savings that could be attained with the NERVA. For example, the estimated cost per pound in lunar orbit for the Apollo program is about \$6,000. With a reusable NERVA making six reuses, this figure is lowered to \$600—assuming shuttle payload cost in earth orbit of \$100 per pound—and goes lower with subsequent reuse.

Further, this program is about 50 percent complete. The technology required to begin the stage design and construction has been proven. We should not stop at this time and lose the research work that has been performed to date, particularly since our past experience has shown that the national program has been limited by our thrust capability. I believe that we would be remiss and that the country would suffer in the long run if we did not continue this development. This continuation prevents a crash program development some time in the future and it will give us experience in using this new technology at a lower cost regardless of the direction our space program takes in the future. I strongly urge the continuation of this work.

Numerous comparisons of costs between nuclear and chemical rockets have been made. The substantial potential savings in space transportation costs relating to use of nuclear rockets in the single-use—expendable—mode. Studies of reusable systems, such as those described in the space task group report, also reveal that significant potential savings could result from NERVA applications. For example, a reusable nuclear stage to transport a 119,000 pound payload from earth orbit to lunar orbit and return without payload would weigh about 370,000 pounds, including 280,000 pounds of propellant. A hypothetical corresponding chemical stage would weigh about 800,000 pounds, including about 700,000 pounds of propellant. Because the nuclear stage requires less propellant than the chemical stage, a significant cost benefit would result from the reduced requirement to transport propellants to earth orbit. Over 10 missions, the savings would be about \$400 million, assuming a cost of \$100 per pound for earth-to-orbit transportation. If the costs of earth-to-orbit transportation are higher, the savings would be greater. In

terms of total recurring costs, it is estimated that chemical propulsion would be about 65 to 75 percent more costly than nuclear propulsion.

NASA's budget request for the nuclear power and propulsion program for fiscal year 1972 is \$27,720,000. This amount represents a substantial reduction from the \$55,200,000 for fiscal year 1971 and the \$55,269,000 program for fiscal year 1970.

Part of this program is the NERVA nuclear rocket engine. NASA should be permitted to proceed with development of the NERVA engine at a rate efficiently timed to the development of the space shuttle transportation system. To avoid loss of skilled people, inefficiency and increased total program costs resulting from a stretch out, an increase in the nuclear propulsion program of \$39,900,000 is recommended—to be used only for this program.

This action has been taken based upon the significant advance in propulsion capability represented by the NERVA system. The advantages of nuclear propulsion over the alternative chemical propulsion system are the high payload performance, propulsion efficiency, and versatility. The NERVA system will provide greater than twice the specific impulse—power—of the most advanced chemical rockets. This power will be required in missions involving high energy, long duration, and large payloads.

In operation, the NERVA will be built into a reusable, long endurance nuclear stage as an integral part of a new capability for space transportation. The system will be used for a great variety of purposes including moving men, spacecraft, and supplies between earth orbit and lunar orbit, between low earth orbit and geosynchronous orbit, unmanned missions to the nearby planets for returning samples, and fast unmanned missions to the distant planets.

In essence, the NERVA should increase payloads, reduce trip times and provide great reliability for the successful completion of missions. It is, in fact, this country's only program to develop a significant advance in space propulsion capability in the next decade or two.

In testimony before this Committee, NASA has emphasized that the \$15 million budget request for fiscal year 1972 would commit the NERVA development program to a holding action and would result in a two-third's reduction in force by the contractor organizations. The \$39,900,000 budget increase is required as a means by which to capitalize on the technology developed and permit continued work on components, fuel reactor, and engine systems in an integrated and efficiently phased manner. On this basis, it is estimated that the first development test of a NERVA design reactor can take place in 1973 with the test of the first complete developmental engine late in 1974. It is further estimated that the NERVA engine could be available for its first flight test in the 1978-79 time period and be operationally qualified in the very early 1980's.

During the past 2 years, the nuclear propulsion program has largely been

engaged in the design and development of a flight-rated NERVA engine. The achievements of the program have provided a sound technological foundation for the development of the advanced, high-performance propulsion system. Eighteen rocket reactors have been tested and two experimental engines have been operated. Over 14 hours of system operating experience has been accumulated, including more than 4 hours at or near design power. Fiscal year 1971 activity, in particular, resulted in a final baseline design for the engine.

The increased funding would be used for the following tasks:

Development of critical components, including the reactor shield, reflector, pressure vessel, and other associated components and subsystems.

Fabrication of the first ground test reactor and engine.

Initiation of experiments, instrumentation, and engine thrust structure designs.

TRACKING AND DATA ACQUISITION

This year the bill before you includes \$264 million for tracking and data acquisition, an essential program which needs little explanation.

The tracking and data acquisition program in NASA is one of the unsung heroes of our space program, and very little comes out in our reporting of this essential element of the space program. Rarely do we emphasize the vital necessity to receive all of the intricate electronic signals that provide the essential data to tell us the value and performance of our space effort. Signals indicating the body functions, the necessary guidance changes and the quality of the essential life support elements of a spacecraft are given to us almost instantaneously and presented in a form whereby immediate action can be taken by the trained controllers on the ground or in the spacecraft. The value of this essential work can never be overemphasized, and I am pleased to see that NASA intends to pursue further automation of their systems. In time we will be able to observe all of the spacecraft and mission parameters and at the same time note the corrections and changes that are being incorporated from our previous set computer program. I am pleased to commend NASA on the quality and competence of their tracking and data acquisition team.

TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION

All of us are acutely aware of the valuable outputs that have resulted from the space program and that have been transferred to our commercial community. A large portion of this activity within NASA is carried out within the technology utilization program. Over the years the Congress has strongly supported the technology utilization program. The committee has taken this position because it firmly believes in the basic principle behind the technology utilization effort: scientific, technological, and management knowledge developed with public funds and support should be made available to the public for its benefit as quickly and efficiently as possible. It is believed that this knowledge should be readily accessible to all potential users,

whether a major corporation, a small businessman, a school, or a private citizen. Among the specific objectives of the technology utilization program are:

First, to increase the return on the national investment in aerospace R. & D. by encouraging additional uses of the knowledge gained.

Second, to shorten the time gap between the discovery of new knowledge and its effective use in the marketplace.

Third, to aid the movement of new knowledge across industry, scientific discipline and geographic boundaries.

Fourth, to contribute to finding better ways of transferring technology from its points of origin to its points of potential use.

During the past few years the technology utilization program has concentrated a good part of its effort in the medical area. This has included improved instruments, diagnostic techniques, surgical techniques and medical systems management. More recently there has been a turning toward work in public sector problems: water pollution, air pollution, crime, transportation, housing construction and rehabilitation, and mine safety. It is in large degree to support additional work in these areas that the committee strongly recommends an additional \$2,000,000, for a total of \$6,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The fiscal year 1972 construction program is minimal. NASA requested \$56,300,000 and the committee added one project to the request and is recommending that a total of \$58,630,000 be authorized for facilities.

The NASA request of \$56.3 million compares to \$24.9 million appropriated in fiscal year 1971 and \$50.1 million in fiscal year 1970.

Major budget activities to be supported by the 1972 construction program include: Manned space flight, \$20 million; scientific investigations in space, \$15.2 million; aeronautical research and technology, \$6.5 million; and other activities, \$16.93 million.

Aside from rehabilitation and modification work at all field centers amounting to \$10 million, and advance planning and design authorization for future construction—\$3.5 million—the total construction programs consists of only seven projects. These represent \$45.13 million or about three-fourths of the total.

The major projects involve the modernization of a large wind tunnel at the Ames Research Center in California—\$6.5 million; improvements to two launch areas at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida—\$15.2 million; the first increment of facilities in support of the space shuttle to provide an engine test capability and thermal protection research facilities at six different locations—\$20 million; powerplant replacements at two tracking stations—\$6 million; and the relocation of the Application Technology Satellite Ground Support Station to a site to be selected in Western Europe—\$5 million.

There has been much debate and controversy over the siting of facilities to support the shuttle program. I have insisted that NASA use existing Federal

facilities to the maximum extent possible to meet these needs. For 2 successive years the committee has taken a strong position in this regard, insisting that no new facilities be contemplated until exhaustive studies have been made to determine the capability of existing physical plant to meet the shuttle program requirements.

NASA is moving in this direction. The \$20 million included in this year's construction program for shuttle engine and thermal protection research and test facilities will be used to modify existing facilities at the Mississippi test facility, the Arnold Engineering Development Center in Tennessee, the Ames and Langley Research Centers, and the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston. These are urgent needs to conduct research on the "pacing" items for the shuttle program. I plan to continue to insist that existing facilities be used to meet future shuttle program needs. We must use what we have before any consideration is given to expanding our capital plant further.

The program also includes \$10 million as the third increment of a comprehensive plan to upgrade the NASA physical plant, to enhance its broad usefulness, and to reduce the large backlog of deferred maintenance now facing the agency. The rehabilitation and modification package also includes \$3 million for items involved in the prevention and control of air and water pollution at the NASA field centers.

Also included in the fiscal year 1972 construction program is \$3.5 million to support field installation master planning, special engineering studies, preliminary engineering reports for future construction projects, and the design and specification work for authorized construction projects.

As I mentioned previously, the committee added one project to the NASA request. This project will implement phase I of a plan to modernize and expand the visitor's information center at the Kennedy Space Center. This project had originally been proposed by NASA but was eliminated in the budget review process by the Office of Management and Budget.

I have long considered that the existing public information and education outlet at the Kennedy Space Center is inadequate not only to meet the existing visitor load, but to meet an anticipated increase of 600,000 additional visitors per year. I believe that an improved and expanded facility could contribute a great deal to a better public understanding and appreciation of the space program. This work should be initiated without delay.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The NASA authorization request for research and program management for fiscal year 1972 totaled \$697,350,000. Our committee is recommending an increase of \$9.5 million, raising the level of the amount to be authorized to \$706,850,000.

This is the part of the annual bill that provides the civil service staff necessary for in-house research, and to plan, manage, and support the research and development program. It also provides an operational capability to the laboratories and facilities such as logistic support—

travel, transportation, maintenance and operation of facilities—and technical and administrative support.

The research and program management account, although providing for the cost of operating and maintaining the NASA institutional base, is not an "overhead" account per se. But rather it pays for the NASA people and institutional services which get NASA's work done.

Over 70 percent of the research and program appropriation is used to pay salaries and related benefits for civil service employees. The balance is needed for the other support necessary to operate and maintain the institutional base.

NASA personnel, consisting of a large body of scientists, engineers, and technicians, plus a much smaller group of administrative personnel, together with the laboratories and specialized facilities, provide the Nation with a formidable capability to plan, manage, and support the research and development program.

These are the people, who together with those in the universities, industrial companies, and other government agencies, compose the complex team which has achieved some of man's most outstanding technological advances during these past 12 years.

Professional scientists and engineers comprise almost 45 percent of the NASA work force. Technicians make up another 27 percent. The balance is made up of professional administrative and clerical personnel.

However, the in-house capability of NASA is gradually being weakened by repeated cutbacks in personnel. The peak employment in NASA was reached in July 1967 when 34,126 personnel were on the rolls. The manning levels for the Agency will drop to 28,850 by the end of fiscal year 1972.

The original NASA authorization request had envisioned a reduction of 1,500 additional personnel during fiscal year 1972. The special analyses, budget of the United States indicates that by Executive order reductions in personnel are to be effected in four departments and agencies of the Federal Government. These were a 1.6-percent reduction in Department of Defense; a 3.0-percent reduction in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department; a 21-percent reduction in the Agency for International Development; and a 5-percent reduction in NASA. The personnel strengths of practically all other departments and agencies of the Federal Government reflect increases for fiscal year 1972 over the 1971 levels.

I have been very concerned over the critical erosion of our skilled scientists and engineers who are engaged in aeronautical and basic research.

What is particularly disturbing to me is the mandatory cut of 500 scientists and engineers that will occur in the Office of Advanced Research and Technology. This is very imprudent. Research and development, especially in advanced basic and applied sciences, are the heart and soul of NASA's future. These are the sole source of the technologies that will be essential in the not too distant future to make possible the success of NASA's

other programs that are now budgeted and ongoing. Cutting the personnel of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology is analogous to giving medicine to a patient that will cure a current disease but will eventually kill him.

Let me give you a specific example. At Westinghouse Astronuclear Laboratory, where very important research is going on, 910 people are working on NERVA. The present budget level requested by the administration will force the reduction of that staff to 180. In effect, Westinghouse, for all practical purposes, will have to forget about making any real progress. Furthermore, the overall NERVA program will have to be cut from 2,500 people to 800.

These people in Westinghouse and in NASA are uniquely gifted and talented scientists and engineers who will scatter to the four winds. At some future date when it becomes necessary, NASA will never be able to reassemble them, or others equally capable, without greatly increased costs and loss of time to the program. The intent of the committee is to keep the NERVA team as it is presently constituted—which is already slimmed down—and maintain an even tempo of research and development to preserve the investment this country has already made in nuclear propulsion.

It was for these reasons that I proposed an amendment to add \$4.5 million to the NASA request for research and program management to prevent a further deterioration of that capability. This amendment will permit the retention of 500 personnel. My amendment carried and is now in the bill under consideration.

Likewise, of equal concern to me is the effect of the drain of scientists and engineers on our Nation's technical capability occasioned by the rapid decline in annual funding for the space program. The committee heard testimony to the effect that young people entering academic pursuits are no longer being attracted to the space program because of the uncertainty of the future of space. Also, statistics show that the average age of the scientist and engineer in NASA is increasing at the rate of eight tenths of a year annually, indicating that the rate of young people entering the space program has declined considerably.

The inability of NASA, because of Governmentwide and often blindman power policies known to us all, to inject new and young blood into its research staff is a grave problem. The gradual rise in the average age of the scientific and development personnel has very threatening implications to the future. The young people are the innovators, the challengers of the status quo, of the set procedures, of traditional research approaches. These are the people coming out of the engineering and science schools of our universities that NASA needs and needs now. To me it is the height of illogic to expect NASA's advanced research to continue to be where it is supposed to be—in the vanguard of science—5 or 10 years from now under the present circumstances. Without the young scientist and engineer, that just will not happen.

I proposed an amendment which was adopted by the committee and is now in the bill before you which adds \$1 million to the research and program management request to bolster the summer training program for young people. This will provide an additional 800 summer trainee positions for high school and college students. Hopefully this will encourage more young people to select space engineering and science as their careers.

Another area that has concerned me for some time is the NASA public affairs effort. I do not believe that NASA has done a particularly good job in conveying to the general public the true story of space, particularly the benefits derived from this program. There has been too much emphasis placed on the spectacular aspects of the space effort and not enough on the practical benefits derived from our space endeavors.

I believe that while public enthusiasm over space appears to have waned, there is still great interest in this Nation's space endeavors, particularly as they affect the individual and his well-being. I am sure that the American public will support the space program, but only if the true story of space and its related benefits are more effectively brought home.

Our public affairs effort needs to be bolstered and reoriented so that the man on the street knows more about what our space effort means. The committee has adopted my amendment to add \$4 million to the NASA request for public affairs to strengthen the Agency's effort in explaining the practical benefits of the space program to the public.

In my opinion the \$706,850,000 included in this bill for research and program management is the minimum necessary to maintain our institutional base and our space research capability. Any reductions below this level will have a serious and far-reaching effect on our future stature as the leading nation of the space age.

In conclusion, I would like to summarize the action taken by me in committee. I added seven major amendments providing for an increase in authorization of \$123 million.

With respect to the Office of Manned Space Flight Programs, my amendments proposed increases for the Skylab and space shuttle programs. I proposed an amendment to increase the Skylab program funding from \$535.4 million to \$580.4 million—an increase of \$45 million. The amendment was to provide a second Skylab mission in addition to an astronaut rescue capability. The committee approved the full amount proposed.

The space shuttle amendment, which I also proposed, was to provide an increase in funding in order to support advanced research in critical system technology. The amendment recommended an increase in the NASA request of \$100 million to a new figure of \$130 million—an addition of \$30 million. The committee finally approved a reduced increase of \$25 million, making the final space shuttle program funding for fiscal year 1972, \$125 million. A further amendment to the NASA budget which I recom-

mended added \$8.5 million, bringing the NASA request of \$1.5 million to a total of \$10 million. The full proposed increase was approved by the committee. The money will provide for continued advanced planning and analysis related to future space missions.

In the advanced research and technology areas, major discussion centered upon the amendment proposing an increase for the nuclear power and propulsion program. The budget amendment submitted by myself requested an increase of \$39.9 million. The original NASA request was \$27.72 million, with the recommendation making the revised figure \$67.62 million. The proposed increase included adding \$35 million for the NERVA program, bringing the NASA request of \$9.9 million to \$44.9 million; adding \$3 million for nuclear propulsion research and technology, bringing the NASA request of \$5 million to \$8 million; and adding \$1.9 million to the nuclear rocket development station operation, bringing the NASA request of \$0.1 million to \$2 million. The full amount recommended in the amendment was approved by the committee.

Two other amendments which I proposed were also approved by the committee. One provided for a \$2 million increase in the area of technology utilization. This raised the original amount of \$4 million to \$6 million. Work in this area provides for the transfer of space technology and techniques to the public sector. The second amendment provided for the retention of critical personnel at the Ames, Langley, and Lewis Centers. The amendment proposed adding \$4.5 million to the NASA request of \$205,338 million, bringing the new total to \$209,838 million.

Another of my amendments which was approved by the committee was to provide for an expanded summer training program for high school age students. All 11 major NASA centers throughout this country will participate in this program. One million dollars were added to the NASA request of \$332,005,000, making the new total \$333,005,000.

A final amendment concerned public affairs activities. The committee approved my \$4 million amendment which will be used to permit NASA greater participation in public affairs and to enhance the public's understanding of the agency. The original public affairs budget was raised from \$7,144,000 to \$11,144,000 by the amendment.

This, then, is the program included in the bill, H.R. 7109, now before us. It will support the conviction that the groundwork for future, more diversified and productive activities must be laid, although in more modest aspects.

The fiscal year 1972 NASA authorization bill outlines a national space program that will be continued at a slow, but steady pace at a moderate funding level.

There are no crash programs included, but rather wide ranging space goals for the 1970's. These goals are exploration, the gathering of scientific knowledge and the practical applications of the lessons of space to life on earth.

The \$3,433,850,000 to be authorized for

the space program in fiscal year 1972 is less than 1½ percent of the total national budget. It is not as much as should be provided, but it will move the Nation forward in space, but at a dangerously marginal pace.

I recommend the passage of H.R. 7109 as voted out by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7109, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1972.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, I shall have some remarks about NASA's unmanned space flight program. I would like to begin, however, by making some general comments about the national space program as a whole.

Each year for the last 6 years, we have witnessed a decline in the space budget, from a high of more than \$5 billion in fiscal year 1965 to the present level of funding, slightly more than \$3 billion for the current fiscal year. Combined employment by Government and industry in support of the space program has declined even more dramatically from a peak of approximately 420,000 persons in 1967 to about 140,000 persons today. The resulting unemployment of thousands of highly trained scientists and engineers is a matter of great importance to the Nation as a whole, not to mention the personal hardships visited upon the individuals involved. The aerospace industry is in a severe state of distress at the present time, partly because of the reduced level of funding of the space program.

It is noteworthy that this contraction of the American effort in space has been accompanied by a significantly increased effort by the Soviet Union. It is now estimated that the Soviet Union is currently devoting the equivalent of more than \$5 billion, perhaps as much as \$6 billion, annually in its space program. Thus, it appears that the Russians are investing almost twice the resources in their space effort, in absolute terms, as is the United States. When one considers the magnitude of their investment relative to the gross national product of the Soviet Union, which is approximately one-half of that of the United States, the relative importance the two nations place on space exploration is truly astonishing.

The degree of emphasis by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics can be illustrated in other ways. For example, during calendar year 1970 the NASA launch rate was only about one-third of that of the Soviet Union. This constitutes almost a precise reversal of the relative launch rates of the two nations 5 or 6 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that it is not my position either that we should undertake to turn the aerospace industry into a modern, high skill WPA, or that we should be guided in determining the appropriate level of effort for the United States by what the Soviet Union

undertakes to do in space. Rather, our national space program should be assessed on its merits, on its contributions to the advancement of science and technology, and, most especially, on the basis of its potential benefits to the quality of life on earth.

I am convinced that the investment of public resources in the space program to date has been more than justified by the results. Accordingly, I regret that the proposed NASA budget for fiscal year 1972 must be described as austere, and will preclude undertaking many meritorious experiments in space. Furthermore, I look forward to the day when the leaders of this wealthy Nation will again determine that it is in the best interests of our people, and all mankind, to increase its investment in this worthy program.

Turning now to the work of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications which I have the honor to chair, the NASA budget request for fiscal year 1972 represents an increase of approximately \$187 million over the current fiscal year. This increase is largely attributable to the funding requirements of the Viking project, the most ambitious planetary exploration project ever undertaken by NASA.

Approved by Congress during the past 2 years, Viking is designed to softland two complex instrumented devices on the surface of Mars in 1976, the year of the U.S. bicentennial. The objectives of the project are to conduct biological, chemical, and physical observations and measurements on the Martian surface in order to increase our understanding of the origin and evolution of the solar system, with special emphasis on the possible existence of extraterrestrial life, past, present, or future.

The planetary exploration program also includes a number of other projects. This year, two Mariner spacecraft were launched to Mars with the objective of orbiting the red planet for 90 days, and thereby achieving a very thorough reconnaissance of the planet, mapping about 70 percent of its surface and observing seasonal changes and other dynamic processes. Unfortunately, due to a launch vehicle failure, the first of these two missions was lost. The second Mariner is now on its way to Mars. Its expected arrival date is next November. It is hoped that most of the data expected from both missions will be achieved by this single spacecraft.

In 1973, NASA will launch a Mariner spacecraft to the vicinity of Venus where a number of scientific observations will be made, particularly of its atmosphere. Then, utilizing the gravity-assist technique, the same spacecraft will be accelerated on a trajectory to the vicinity of Mercury to provide our first closeup observations of the planet nearest to the Sun. Very little is now known about the physical characteristics of Mercury, and the 1973 mission is therefore of great scientific interest.

A second major program of the Office of Space Science and Applications is the physics and astronomy program. Using a wide variety of devices and techniques, this program seeks to explore our space

environment in order to understand its nature and the physical processes that shape it. The knowledge that is acquired will ultimately help in the solution of the many practical problems of men living on the surface of the Earth.

Because the Sun is such an essential part of the ecological system here on Earth, a major portion of the physics and astronomy program is devoted to gathering information and increasing our understanding of the dynamic processes of the Sun, and all aspects of the Sun-Earth relationship. It is well understood that the Sun is the source of all energy on Earth, and that without the Sun's radiations, life could not exist on Earth. The role of the Sun as a source of heat and light for photosynthesis is well understood; it is the basis for all food production. The Sun's radiations also are known to have a controlling influence on the dynamics of our atmosphere, the hydrological cycle, the magnetosphere which surrounds the Earth, and many other physical and chemical processes. Surely, extending man's understanding of the unique relationship between the Sun and our home planet is at once both scientifically important and invested with practical consequences. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that this research will someday form the basis for man gaining a measure of control over the Earth's environment, and may even lead to the design of a radically new power source for use by men here on Earth.

The major project for study of the Sun during the 11-year period of the solar activity cycle is the Orbiting Solar Observatory—OSO—project. Six OSO spacecraft have been launched since 1962 which have discovered many phenomena that have laid the ground work for greatly enhanced understanding of solar processes. Four additional OSO's will be launched through the mid-1970's.

Astronomy is one of the oldest recognized scientific disciplines. The study of the universe, its nature, and evolution, is recognized as one of the most demanding and rewarding of scientific endeavors. Now that men are able to place instruments above the Earth's absorbing and obscuring atmosphere, the science of astronomy is making enormous strides.

Astronomical observations are made from highflying airplanes, with instruments carried aloft by balloons, by sounding rocket experiments, and with satellites which orbit the Earth. All these tools of the space age have contributed greatly to the advancement of the science of astronomy.

The Orbiting Astronomical Observatory—OAO—project has achieved only one success out of the three launch attempts made to date. Yet, scientists assure us that the one successful spacecraft has provided data which will occupy astronomers for years to come, having added a new dimension to the science of astronomy by opening up a large window in the electromagnetic spectrum that was unavailable during centuries of ground-based astronomy. It is expected that research and theoretical studies based upon the OAO data will provide

much deeper insights into the nature and evolution of the universe. The fourth and last of the OAO series will carry a 36-inch telescope aloft next year.

Whereas the OAO experiments are in the ultraviolet range of the electromagnetic spectrum, a new spacecraft, proposed for the first time this year, called the High Energy Astronomical Observatory—HEAO—will make observations in different regions of the spectrum, specifically in the X-ray and gamma ray portions. In addition, HEAO will measure cosmic ray fluxes. The National Academy of Sciences' summer study on scientific priorities in the space program rated HEAO the highest priority project in space astronomy. Such new discoveries as quasars, pulsars, and neutron stars, little understood today, will be the subject of intense investigation by HEAO and other devices launched into space.

The relatively smaller, less complex, and less expensive spacecraft called Explorers continue to be used effectively both for initial discovery of scientific phenomena, and for development of experiments. Many of the instruments ultimately flown on the large observatory class spacecraft have been tried first on Explorers.

Explorers also have made it possible for NASA to engage in cooperative scientific missions with other countries. A pattern has been established whereby each cooperating foreign partner normally provides the spacecraft and much of the scientific payload, while NASA provides some of the experiments, the launch vehicle, and tracking and data acquisition facilities.

Finally, the so-called suborbital programs involve instruments flown aboard specially outfitted aircraft, launched with sounding rockets and carried aloft by balloons.

Sounding rockets are indispensable devices since they constitute the primary means for measuring vertical profiles of the atmosphere and for obtaining other geophysical data at altitudes below 80 miles where use of satellites is impracticable. They have been especially effective when used to complement physics and astronomy observations by satellites in the performance of coordinated investigations.

Since the level of effort in sounding rockets has declined somewhat, and because the Science and Astronautics Committee is convinced of the value of both sounding rockets and balloon experiments, a total of \$2½ million has been added to the administration's request of \$19 million for these important activities.

I would now like to turn my attention to the program which I consider to be potentially the most beneficial and most economically productive of all NASA's endeavors—the Space Applications Program. This view is shared by the vast majority of my colleagues on the Science and Astronautics Committee.

Everyone knows that satellite systems have already revolutionized intercontinental communications in the short time since the first experimental communications satellites were launched about a decade ago. Progress has been so rapid

that today a commercial system provides reliable, cost-effective communications to people around the globe: truly, an achievement impossible to conceive a few years ago. An international consortium including 79 nations has evolved, and agreements have been reached for the operation of an expanding global communications system in the years to come. To get so many nations to agree on anything is a remarkable, perhaps unprecedented, feat. This cooperative spirit alone demonstrates the capacity for good inherent in space activities.

The science and technology of the space age have also placed within man's grasp the tools for understanding the physics of the earth's atmosphere, and for achieving improved, longer range predictions of the earth's weather. Ultimately, meteorological satellite systems may provide the basis for weather modification and control.

Again, the space program has provided an opportunity for the United States to cooperate with other nations in an international effort to study the dynamics of the atmosphere, and the international world weather program is the result. Among other activities, the global atmospheric research program—GARP—is being planned to conduct a comprehensive program of research focused on acquiring a better scientific understanding of the earth's atmosphere to be incorporated in mathematical models.

Perhaps the single most important of the applications satellite projects is the Earth Resources Technology Satellite—ERTS. This committee has urged NASA to undertake development of an earth resources survey spacecraft for several years. It now appears that NASA finally has a minimal effort underway. Two ERTS spacecraft are scheduled for launch in 1972 and 1973. These research and development satellites are designed to determine the extent to which remote sensors in orbiting spacecraft can help mankind to manage the finite natural resources available to him.

With appropriate sensors in space we shall be able to inventory known resources, locate undiscovered resources, and ultimately develop a global management system. It will be possible to monitor the health of the earth's vast stands of timber, to prospect for deposits of petroleum and minerals, to conduct periodic crop inventories, and to assist in the development of the ocean's resources. The economic benefits to be derived from such a system have been estimated at billions of dollars annually. If ever a program could be justified on the basis of economic gains, it is the earth resources survey program.

Cooperative programs have already been worked out by our Government with Brazil, Mexico, and Canada. There is every reason to believe that an operational earth resources program in the future will be of great value to the peoples of nations around the globe, and will therefore lead to cooperative efforts on a much broader scale than heretofore.

Advanced space applications systems are currently being studied and these will lead to more effective navigation and

air traffic control systems in the future, direct television broadcasting, enhanced weather prediction, and even telephonic communications at a fraction of today's costs.

As noted in the report which accompanies the bill under consideration, each year since the mid-1960's the Science and Astronautics Committee has strongly recommended greater emphasis be placed on space applications. Our committee believes that this program, more than any other, engenders public support for the space program as a whole, and that it deserves much greater emphasis and financial support than it has received to date.

Four years ago the National Academy of Sciences concluded that it was in the national interest to invest a minimum of \$200 million, and perhaps as much as \$300 million, in the space applications program annually. The members of our committee concurred in that recommendation. Unfortunately, NASA has demonstrated that it has rejected this conclusion by the most prestigious scientific body in the United States. While the annual expenditure for applications will exceed \$180 million in fiscal year 1972 this amount represents only a tiny fraction of the NASA budget of more than \$3 billion. We have put NASA on notice that a more vigorous space applications program must be undertaken in order to receive the continued support of the Congress and the American people. In the sense that the practical applications of space technology have been given low priority relative to scientific experiments and the expensive engineering projects associated with other programs, I believe the NASA program as a whole lacks balance. I would like to take this opportunity to recommend to the new Administrator of NASA, Dr. James Fletcher, that serious consideration be given to reorganizing the Space Agency to include a new office of applications to be headed by an associate administrator for applications. In this way, we may achieve a new direction for our space program with appropriate emphasis on practical applications. It is my intention to press for such a reorganization until it becomes a reality. I am convinced that public support for the space effort as a whole will be greatly enhanced by the improved status of the applications program, and that consequently, the future prospects of the U.S. space program will be vastly improved.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I join in supporting the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1972, although with some personal reservations as to its emphasis.

Especially, I want to call your favorable attention to one of the line items, the program called space applications, for which the administration requested and our committee approved the sum of \$182.5 million.

Every year since the mid-1960's our Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications has strongly recommended

greater emphasis on this program. We are beginning to make progress.

But even now we have not reached the level of funding for space applications advocated by the National Academy of Sciences 5 years ago. Back in 1967, the academy recommended a NASA investment in those programs of from \$200 million to \$300 million annually. The academy reiterated that view in its recent report on Priorities for Space Research, 1971-80, in which the working group on earth-oriented satellites called for a budget level of \$235 million a year. That level of funding is more than \$50 million in excess of the amount in the bill before us.

The objectives of our space applications effort are to: First, expand our knowledge of geophysical, oceanographic, atmospheric and space phenomena; second, conduct a broad program of research and technical development oriented toward the application of space techniques for the benefit of mankind; third, develop and test procedures, instruments, subsystems, spacecraft and interpretive techniques for the various applications; fourth, fulfill NASA's responsibilities under the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; fifth, develop and implement for the national oceanic and atmospheric administration the operational meteorological satellite system; sixth, cooperate with the user Government agencies, such as the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Navy through the Earth Resources Survey Program Review Committee to achieve practical benefits in earth resources; seventh, cooperate with other Government agencies in space related activities in the communications, navigation, and geodesy/earth physics disciplines; and eighth, cooperate to the extent possible with foreign countries in the general advancement of space applications.

Mr. Chairman, a most intriguing and potentially utilitarian component of space applications is this earth resources survey program. It involves, first, surveys by aircraft, which have been underway since 1964; and second, more remote sensing of natural resources from space by means of satellites called ERTS—Earth Resources Technology Satellites—which are about to be flight tested.

The ERTS program has tremendous appeal to people and agencies concerned with agriculture, forestry, geography, cartography, oceanography, hydrology, geology, and mineralogy.

In this connection I will cite the cooperative effort of just one of the many user agencies—that of the U.S. Geological Survey. The USGA budget for its part of the earth resources survey program in fiscal year 1972 is a little over \$5 million, an increase of 274 percent from its 1971 budget for this program. Of course, the eager user agencies like the Geological Survey would not have anything to use unless we provide adequate funding for the basic satellite program—that is, ERTS.

It should be recognized, I think, that ERTS-A and B, now scheduled for launch in 1972 and 1973, will not do the entire job. They are primarily test and

development spacecraft, each with a useful life of a year or so. Also, I am aware that these first two ERTS will not carry sensors for use in oceanographic surveys. NASA has much work to do in future detailed design and in improved fabrication of these spacecraft in the years ahead. The fiscal 1972 budget provides a good start.

It may be noted that the NASA authorization bill which is before the other body has in it an item for space applications in the amount of \$185 million, which is higher by \$2.5 million than the figure in the House bill. The Senate Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences increased the administration budget item by this amount, to be applied specifically to the ERTS aircraft and satellite survey program.

Mr. Chairman, I am not today proposing an amendment for an increase in the NASA budget. I am offering these facts as solid evidence of the soundness and paramount importance of one particular NASA program—Space Applications.

Returning to the proposed NASA authorization in general—which I already have said I support—I nevertheless think it is worth observing that the research and development budget seems to me too heavily weighted toward manned space flight—\$1,367,475,000. The sum for manned space flight exceeds the combined budgets for space science and applications—\$752,900,000—and for advanced research and technology—\$547,725,000.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the day when our automated unmanned flights, including planetary and space applications programs, will win a greater share of the overall NASA budget.

And I should be pleased, too, to see a larger budget next year for aeronautical research.

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the leadership of the committee—both the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), who has done an outstanding job in providing leadership, expertise and knowledge in the committee that very few chairmen have, and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) for providing the leadership on the minority side, and in helping to prepare a very successful package in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7109 to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This bill will allow us to continue space funding at the lowest possible level while guarding against short-sighted cuts which would certainly prove more costly in the long run.

We hear a lot about priorities these days.

And I am among those who have supported the very reordering we have witnessed.

But setting priorities—weighing the relative merit of competing national

goals—does not mean, and should not mean, the complete elimination of worthwhile efforts in exchange for those thought more valuable—an all or nothing approach.

Rather it means keeping our Nation's needs in perspective.

Where technological spending is concerned, it is clear that priorities have been changed.

One glance at Los Angeles unemployment figures tell us that.

What does this bill represent in the way of expenditures?

The slight dollar increase over last year's level of appropriations does not even account for inflation.

When compared to the 1965 peak year, this bill's funding level shows a 40-percent cut.

The same comparison in terms of jobs shows a 65-percent cut.

And yet there are those who would have us cut still further.

And there are some who would not be displeased if we stopped technology spending altogether.

It is this antitechnology overkill that causes me greatest concern.

The lengthy catalog of down-to-earth benefits which have accrued from our space spending is often overlooked.

And yet this list is only a small hint of the benefits to all mankind which will result from the continuation of an orderly space program.

It is ironic that the decade of the sixties was one of public approval of the late President Kennedy's dream.

While in the seventies, when we are just beginning to realize the magnitude of space research benefits, the glow is off—appreciation has declined.

It is rather like a Cinderella story in reverse.

The projects to be authorized by this legislation have already been discussed in some detail by my colleagues, but I would like to make a few additional points.

The Space Shuttle—which will probably receive more detailed discussion later today—is absolutely vital if we are to realize the value of space expenditures.

The tremendous progress we can foresee in direct earth benefits—in communications, environment, health, agriculture, natural resources—are all contingent on a transportation workhorse which can allow us to reap those benefits at a cost we can afford.

The Space Shuttle is nothing more than a tool, a means to the end of bettering the life of all mankind through the utilization of space technology.

Also not to be overlooked is the pure fact of life that our Nation is not alone in space.

Space cooperation among equals is a far better situation than one which would result if a Nation like Russia or China—whose attention to the human benefits of space is perhaps not so great as our own—were to gain unchallenged superiority in space.

The defense-related potential of space is not overlooked by other nations, and would be ignored by us only at our greatest peril.

Peaceful cooperation in space is pos-

sible only with a strong space program of our own.

The bill before you resulted from the most careful analysis by your Committee of each line contained therein.

It is low enough to demonstrate recognition of other, perhaps more immediately visible, priorities, and just high enough to maintain the bare essentials of a vitally important national effort.

Mr. Chairman, I urge most strongly the approval of the Committee bill without amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The subcommittee on advanced research and technology had jurisdiction over the advanced research and technology and tracking data, acquisition and technology utilization.

One of the areas of our subcommittee has put particular emphasis on is the development of the aeronautical strength of this Nation, which has sadly been neglected over the past decade. Only in recent years has increased emphasis been placed on the development of aeronautics.

In addition to this, the subcommittee has voted a small increase from \$4 million to \$6 million in the technology utilization program. NASA which we feel has great potential in the transference of the knowledge derived and developed from the space program as applied to industry and the development of projects beneficial here on earth.

I have been very disturbed as members of the committee have with the decline over the years in the amount of authorization and support for advanced research and technology.

It stands to reason that the well springs of the Nation's future strength depend on the extent of our investment in research today, in 1971. The present authorization actually is \$78 million less than the amount authorized for the last fiscal year, which is a tremendous cut in the amount of the authorization for advanced research and technology. I would hope that this Committee could give support to the amount of the requested authorization in the areas of advanced research and technology, research and program management, tracking and data acquisition, and technology utilization.

The Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology has carefully reviewed that part of the NASA budget authorization request for which it has jurisdiction. The full Committee subsequently examined our recommendations and approved them without change. That part of the NASA request which I will discuss was for \$692,663,000—which was \$78,582,000 less than the amount authorized for fiscal year 1971.

To the requested amount, the Subcommittee recommended an increase of \$71,400,000, which was then approved by the Full Committee. This increase brings the recommended authorization amount to \$764,063,000 which is still less than the

1971 authorization level. The total amount is recommended to be allocated as follows:

Advanced research and technology	\$277,725,000
Construction of facilities.....	6,500,000
Research and program management	209,838,000
Tracking and data acquisition.....	264,000,000
Technology utilization.....	6,000,000
Total	764,063,000

First, I would like to make a few general comments and then discuss the items which I have just mentioned. An important question can be asked, "Why has the Committee recommended an increase of \$71,400,000 over the NASA request?"

First, as I mentioned a moment ago, even with the increase, the recommended authorization is below that of last year. But more importantly, there has been a steady drop in the Advanced Research and Technology area since 1968—and this drop greatly concerns our Committee.

This area is the original source for many of the applications which are developed subsequently for the benefit of man in the aeronautics, space, and other sectors of our society. The nature of the ideas coming from the investment in Advanced Research and Technology is that they are often not reflected in applications until 5 to 20 years later. So the point is very simple: A declining budget level in this area means that future applications will suffer and many major problems will go unsolved in years to come. It is with a deep concern for the future that the committee has recommended an increase.

One of the important increases in Advanced Research and Technology is \$25 million for aeronautical research and development. This increase is based on the recognition by the committee that the serious nature of many problems in aeronautics and aviation urgently call for solutions. These are problems which affect nearly every Member of the House and a great majority of the people in the United States.

These problems have been documented in extensive hearings held by our Committee during the past several years and in our reports. Most recently—in April of this year—a Joint Department of Transportation-NASA Civil Aviation R. & D. Policy Study was issued. This study is based on nearly two years of intensive work and it develops in detail how extremely serious aircraft noise and congestion problems have become.

There is no doubt that many Members of the House have had numerous complaints from their constituents about aviation problems—with aircraft noise probably being at the top of the list in the urban areas. But there are other problems: one of these is airways and airport congestion which increasingly carries the risk of high tragedy as aircraft size and passenger loads grow larger.

Another problem in the thinly populated areas of our Nation is that declining rail service is cutting off numerous geographical regions from the mainstream of our economy. To supplement the automobile and bus, there is a distinct need

for aircraft which can economically and safely provide service in such parts of the country. We need to insure that our national transportation system is really national—and that it will serve people who live in the small towns of America as well as it serves those who live in the large cities.

In high population density areas, one way to attack both the noise and congestion problems is through a new short haul system, separate as much as possible from the present long haul system. This system could help relieve congestion at existing airports especially those where there is high traffic density. A major contender for this type of short haul system is an economically viable, safe, and low-noise level short takeoff and landing aircraft—commonly referred to as a STOL. A part of the recommended increase by the committee is directed at just such a system—with major emphasis upon the noise reduction and safety objectives.

Related to aeronautics is still another critical major problem. There has been a steady erosion of advanced research and technology personnel. The reduced personnel levels, in combination with civil service regulations, have had the effect of increasing the average age of professional employees and making it extremely difficult to recruit younger individuals educated in disciplines related to aeronautics.

This situation is closely tied to my earlier point that advanced research programs are governed by leadtimes of 10 to 15 years. These programs demand innovative minds and a steady inflow of individuals newly educated in the most recent disciplines. For this reason, the committee increased the research and program management area by \$4½ million in order to permit the retention of 500 personnel positions of 533 which would otherwise be lost under the budget request submitted by NASA. If the act is carried out, it will be virtually impossible to hire these badly needed younger people.

In another area, the committee increased the technology utilization request by \$2 million for a total of \$6 million. Over the years the committee has strongly supported the technology utilization program. This is because it firmly believes in the basic principle behind the technology utilization effort: scientific, technological, and management knowledge developed with public funds and support should be made available to the public for its benefit as quickly and efficiently as possible.

The committee believes that this knowledge should be readily accessible to all potential users, whether a major corporation, a small businessman, a school, or a private citizen. Among the specific objectives of the technology utilization program are:

First, increase the return on the national investment in aerospace R. & D. by encouraging additional uses of the knowledge gained.

Second, shorten the time gap between the discovery of new knowledge and its effective use in the marketplace.

Third, aid the movement of new

knowledge across industry, scientific discipline and geographic boundaries.

Fourth, contribute to finding better ways of transferring technology from its points of origin to its points of potential use.

During the past few years the technology utilization program has concentrated a good part of its effort in the medical area. This has resulted in improved instruments, diagnostic techniques, surgical techniques, and medical systems management. More recently there has been a turning toward work in public sector problems: water pollution, air pollution, crime, transportation, housing construction and rehabilitation, and mine safety.

Our review of the construction request of \$6,500,000 for modernizing a wind tunnel at the Ames Research Center in California shows that the request is soundly based—from both an operational and safety point of view. It is a facility unique in this Nation where full-size and large-scale models of aircraft may be tested—with the objective of reducing as much as possible more expensive actual flight testing and finding out problems before aircraft get into the air.

The tracking and data acquisition request of \$264 million was carefully examined and found to be austere based. These funds are used to operate, repair, and modernize the tracking network for all of NASA's space mission—manned and unmanned.

In concluding, I urge your support for this authorization request. We are not merely authorizing money, we are authorizing the means to solve critical problems now and in the future.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this authorizing legislation. At the outset I want to pay tribute to the chairman of our committee. One of the most rewarding experiences of my many years in this Congress has been my association with the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). He is a very inspiring individual, and I know all of us on the committee have considered it a great privilege to work with him.

Then, too, I would like to say a word about the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is the ranking Republican member of the committee (Mr. FULTON). He is extremely well informed, and altogether I think this legislation has had very close and well-considered scrutiny.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology it has been my great privilege to be associated with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), and we have worked closely together. I think I can say for both of us that through the years we have been somewhat frustrated because of the fact that we did not feel enough emphasis was being given to various aspects of research.

Members of the House know that I am cautious when it comes to spending Federal money. My record in considering budget increase requests shows that I believe that there must be an extremely

important case for me to go along with it.

It is with this record in mind that I wish to give you my views on H.R. 7109 today.

For me there are three guiding principles in considering requests for space and aeronautics projects: First, the project must offer the promise of benefit to our Nation. Second, it must be in the direction of obtaining these benefits more efficiently and inexpensively as time goes on. Third, the project must offer a promise of solving major problems of acute concern to our citizens.

In the manned space flight area one of the increases approved by our committee is for the space shuttle transportation system. There is no doubt in my mind that this is the keystone program in our future effort in space. It will provide a cost-effective way to carry large payloads into orbit. It meets a requirement which I mentioned earlier in that it will be low cost, reusable and highly reliable.

It meets another of my stringent criteria by providing benefits to our Nation. The capability to do this comes from its large, inexpensive cargo-carrying capability. Space applications satellites will no longer be severely restricted in size, weight, and the number of on-board experiments. The result will be more capability for less money, whether it be a communications satellite, a weather satellite, an earth resources satellite or a navigation satellite. For these reasons, I am supporting an additional \$25 million to be added to the \$100 million budget request to provide for a more extensive effort on those key pacing items which must be developed before a space shuttle system can become a reality.

Closely related to the comments I have been making are the reasons why I strongly support the space applications part of the NASA budget. From the work done with the money the Congress has authorized and appropriated over the years have come the means to revolutionize communications and weather forecasting on a worldwide basis. We are at an early stage of accomplishing the same thing for navigation and traffic control of both aircraft and ships. Potentially as important as these applications but yet to be realized are the benefits that we shall derive from the Earth Resources Technology Satellite project. Each passing month reveals new possible applications and what we shall be able to accomplish with a large-scale operational system in years to come. These applications range from agriculture to mining, from forestry to the environment, and from hydrology to cartography.

In two other areas where the committee has recommended increases, I wish to add my unqualified support. The first of these is a \$25-million increase in aeronautical research and technology. The second is a \$2 million increase in the technology utilization program.

Other Members will be talking today about a number of problems in aeronautics and aviation and I do not intend to go over these in repetitious detail. But I do want to say this as strongly as I can

put it, the problems in aviation today are not a matter of "crying wolf." The problems are real, overwhelming, and potentially disastrous. I urge the Congress to provide the resources and guidance to the administration to attack these problems.

Having examined these problems in great detail over the past several years, the committee unanimously concluded that the increase of \$25 million should be made in NASA's aeronautical research and technology line item—from \$110 million to \$135 million. The major part of this increase would be allocated in three ways: First to more work in reducing aircraft noise, second to finding ways to relieve airway and airport congestion and third developing the technology which will make possible safe, reliable and economically feasible short haul transportation both in urban and small town rural areas of the Nation.

This increase meets my stringent criteria of providing benefits for the Nation and solving critical problems.

Finally, each year the committee has expressed its strong support for the technology utilization program area. This is because we firmly believe that it provides an important way by which the results of space and aeronautical technology is made available for use in other sectors of our economy.

Our recommended increase of \$2 million will permit a more extensive concentration on transferring NASA technology to problems in the public sector: water pollution, air pollution, crime, transportation, housing construction and rehabilitation, and mine safety. There is not one section of the country which cannot but benefit by the infusion of the advanced technology resulting from NASA's work.

For these reasons I urge you to support H.R. 7109 today.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield briefly?

Mr. PELLY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Washington, the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, particularly for the leadership which he has exercised in the development of aeronautics. He and I have worked very closely together on putting emphasis on aeronautics, and I think he deserves a great deal of the credit that has accrued to the committee for the development of aeronautics.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I believe any commendation in this direction should properly rest where it belongs, in the cooperation I have had from my subcommittee chairman. It has been a great pleasure to me to work with the gentleman from West Virginia. He and I together, I know, have enjoyed the privilege we have had of trying to point up more forcefully the needs of aeronautics.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7109, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1972.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, I would like to congratulate our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, and associate myself with his remarks.

The NASA unmanned space flight effort has been overshadowed by the manned program, both in terms of costs and public appeal. Still, some of the most remarkable scientific results have been achieved using automated devices, and in fact, the bulk of the scientific data produced by the NASA program to date has come from unmanned satellites and probes.

The one activity in space which is certain to be confined to unmanned exploration for the foreseeable future is planetary exploration. Anticipating constrained NASA budgets in the forthcoming decade, no one seriously suggests that we should undertake to send men to the planets in this century.

The exploration of the planets is considered by our scientists to be one of the most fruitful of scientific endeavors, and has been given the highest priority by such prestigious organizations as the National Academy of Sciences. It is quite clear, too, that the Soviet Union places very high priority on planetary exploration—higher, in fact, than we do.

To date, the United States has made nine attempts to launch spacecraft to Venus and Mars. The Soviet program has been more ambitious. The best available information suggests that the Russians have deliberately bypassed only one launch window to Mars and Venus since 1960. This is to say that compared to our nine attempted planetary missions, the Soviet Union is believed to have made about 24 launches to Mars and Venus thus far.

The results of the American planetary effort to date have been much more productive, however, since we have had five successful Mariner missions out of eight, and a ninth Mariner is on a trajectory to Mars at the present time, and we have every expectation that it will succeed in its mission to orbit the Red Planet. By contrast the Soviets have had only two successful missions to Venus.

The objectives of planetary exploration are to increase our understanding of the origin and evolution of the solar system, the origin and evolution of life, and the dynamic processes that shape man's terrestrial environment. Important information has already been received from our missions to both Mars and Venus. In 1973, a Mariner spacecraft will be launched to the vicinity of Venus, and after making scientific measurements, will be accelerated by Venus' gravity and orbital velocity on a trajectory to Mercury. Using the so-called "gravity-assist" technique, this spacecraft will provide our first opportunity to observe Mercury, the closest planet to the sun.

The highest priority objective in the study of the solar system is the search for evidence of extraterrestrial life. Our current knowledge of the planets suggests that the only place where life may possibly exist, may have existed in the past, or might evolve in the future is on the planet Mars.

In pursuit of this type of information, the most ambitious planetary project ever undertaken by the United States is the Viking project. The purpose of Viking is to advance our knowledge of the physical, chemical, and biological properties of Mars and its atmosphere. These objectives will be accomplished by soft landing two spacecraft on the surface of Mars in 1976.

Exploration of the so-called terrestrial planets—Mars, Venus, and Mercury—has been underway for some years. A satisfactory theory of the origin and evolution of the solar system, however, must take into account the giant outer planets as well. Jupiter, Saturn, and Neptune, as well as tiny Pluto, the most distant planet in our solar system, will be the subject of extensive studies in the future.

Because of a unique alignment of the outer planets which will occur in the middle and late 1970's, it will be possible to make fly-by observations of as many as three of these mysterious bodies with a single spacecraft.

Launch windows in 1976 and 1977 will provide opportunities for a single spacecraft to fly-by Jupiter, then to Saturn, and then on to Pluto. In 1979, fly-by missions will be possible to Jupiter, Uranus, and Neptune. These multiple planet swing-bys or "Grand Tours" will substantially reduce the cost of exploration of this vast and unknown portion of the solar system.

A new spacecraft is being designed to accomplish these "Grand Tour" missions. Since a radioisotope thermoelectric generator—RTG—is being developed for this spacecraft, it has been named Thermoelectric Outer Planets Spacecraft—TOPS. TOPS will provide a stabilized scan platform which will permit sensitive measurements to be made of these major outer planets, as well as many of their satellites. From all of these bodies, the TOPS spacecraft is expected to return vital data on surface appearance, size, mass, density, temperature, and atmospheric composition.

In short, Mr. Chairman, planetary exploration has been one of the most scientifically productive efforts in the total NASA program. It has enhanced man's understanding of our solar system, having already substantially altered our assessment of both Mars and Venus. Significant new discoveries are virtually guaranteed from future missions to investigate the remaining planets.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support the national space program. It constitutes the major scientific and technological effort of this country devoted solely to peaceful purposes, for the benefit of men everywhere.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN).

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, NASA space missions, both manned and unmanned, reveal through data collected and transmitted back to earth that our planet's environment is directly and vitally affected by dynamic forces in space. Understanding of these forces is vital not only for dealing with problems of environmental pollution but in planning the management of earth's resources,

particularly with respect to our agricultural resources from farming. Scientific spacecraft now in orbit are gathering essential data on the dynamics of the atmosphere; but much more needs to be known. To provide such data, NASA plans to send into orbit an Earth Resources Technology Satellite—ERTS—system in 1972. In addition to atmospheric observations, the ERTS satellite will be capable of collecting and transmitting data important for geologists, oceanographers, foresters, city planners, and especially farmers.

Special infrared sensors and other equipment on the ERTS satellite will make it possible to identify untapped sources of fresh water; measurements and photos of snow and ice formations will provide knowledge for the prediction of water runoff locally and regionally around the globe. Such prediction will be a tremendous boost for the farmer, particularly in our Western States where large amounts of water are needed for irrigation; for it will enable optimum regulation of water levels in our reservoirs. In California, for example, the cost of water is about \$15 per acre foot. In all the Western States of this Nation, water stored for irrigational purposes totals about 107 million acre feet or about \$1.5 billions annually. The more efficient utilization of runoff which observations from ERTS should make possible will mean substantial savings nationally as well as internationally in money and water and is certain to result in increased and improved agricultural productivity.

Infrared sensors on the ERTS satellite will make it possible to identify the onset of disease or insect infestation in crops and take measures to control and eliminate such blights. A demonstration of the effectiveness of infrared sensors such as will be placed on ERTS, was undertaken by NASA last year in cooperation with Purdue University. The sensors were carried aboard aircraft and from an altitude of 3,000 feet, kept surveillance over corn crops to identify the blight that has so drastically afflicted this Nation's corn crops. The data from the airborne infrared sensors has enabled scientists to rate crops as healthy, mildly infested, or severely infested. The accuracy of such ratings was confirmed by ground inspection. A similar survey is planned for this summer and will cover 210 selected sites in Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, and Nebraska. But one infrared equipped satellite, such as the ERTS system, could far more quickly, efficiently, and economically survey most parts of the world from space, detect diseased crops and forests, and provide a variety of information of benefit to the farmer.

The ERTS satellite also will be able to detect such phenomenon as locust clouds carried by the wind and provide the data necessary to predict the path of locust clouds in countries of Africa and Asia. Crop losses from locusts in these countries is extremely high. With the present methods used for spotting and control, the annual cost is about \$15 million. But the present benefits are relatively little, in proportion to the effort and expenditure because of the difficulty in identifying the swarms well enough in

advance and communicating the findings in time. The ERTS satellite can provide accurate and rapid warning, thus making possible swift methods for control.

Our weather satellites have enabled us to provide better weather data worldwide; and such capability is most important to the farmer. Indeed weather, indisputably the sovereign physical force, is one to which the farmer is totally subservient. Weather phenomena, whether rain, sleet, snow, balmy winds, drought, or hurricane, are caused by the movement and interaction of masses of air in the atmosphere, described as a never-ending series of battles between warring masses of air: high-pressure and low-pressure masses, cold fronts and warm fronts. Observations from our weather satellites are bringing us closer to the time when we can predict these forays and forecast weather. What this will mean to the farmer is that he will know the optimum time and place for planting to produce the best yield; he will also know when to harvest.

Knowledge of proper planting time is absolutely crucial in certain parts of the world, such as India, where planting depends upon the onset of the monsoon. Planting too early—before the rainy season starts—means a poor and stunted crop. The seeds will dry up. Planting too late also means an inferior crop, because plants will not have the full amount of rain during the growing season.

ERTS, weather, our other scientific satellites offer a view of earth that will provide the data to enable not only the farmers of the world, but all of us to use this planet's resources more wisely for the benefit of all peoples and all nations.

Project Apollo, our program of manned exploration of the moon, also holds promise for the farmer. For example, the Apollo 9 spacecraft was fitted with four cameras with special sensors. The hundreds of pictures of earth taken with these cameras from space provided images and data that revealed the condition of a variety of plants and made it possible to differentiate between species, estimate crop yields, and identify land use in certain regions. But when our astronauts reached the moon and brought back some of its substance, a most exciting discovery of great potential benefit to all the farmers of the world was made.

NASA scientists in Houston found that plants grow three to four times faster in lunar soil than they do in the best soil to be found on Earth. This finding has been verified in experiments with hundreds of plants of all varieties. When the chemical makeup of the lunar soil is determined fully, including identification of the trace elements, it may be possible to duplicate the lunar soil artificially and chemically for use by farmers. Agriculture experts predict that such material would revolutionize farming throughout the world. Large-scale production of such artificial moon dust could bring new hope to the overpopulated barren parts of our world where today the inhabitants barely eke out a living from hostile, infertile soil.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use

to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I would like today to speak especially to the manned space flight programs which are included in the NASA authorization before you. It has been my privilege over the last few years to work with the able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, in examining in exhaustive detail our national space program. I would like to touch on only three major items. First, the Apollo program, second, the Skylab program—our first precursor space station—and third, a low-cost transportation system known as the space shuttle.

In 18 months our Apollo lunar exploration program will come to a close with the final flight, Apollo 17, to the moon. The last three Apollo flights will provide the largest scientific return of the entire Apollo program. Two additional flights that were originally planned have been eliminated. The hardware is ready. The schedules are set and we are now undertaking the greatest program of scientific exploration in the history of man.

The budget for Apollo in fiscal year 1972 is \$302,200,000 less than fiscal year 1971. The committee has recommended that this reduced budget be funded in full so that the Apollo program may be successfully completed with a maximum return on the investment. I believe that the completion of the Apollo program on the scheduled plan will provide this Nation not only with the scientific information from the moon but also with the essential technology that is required to help maintain our Nation as a leader in technology in the early 1970's. Even with the follow-on Skylab program for 1973, however, the current manned space flight programs in NASA do not provide the technological impetus necessary through the 1970's to maintain that competitive technological edge so essential to our Nation.

The Skylab program which I mentioned will be conducted in 1973 and will include a Saturn V to launch an unmanned workshop into near-earth orbit which will then be visited during the year three times by three astronauts on each visit. NASA requested \$535,400,000 for the Skylab program which is part of the space flight operations line item in this bill. To provide additional safety in this program the committee has added \$15 million to the Skylab program for a rescue capability for the most probable mission failure situations. This would provide for converting one command and service module into a rescue carrier so that two astronauts could fly to the Skylab and return with the three additional astronauts or a total of five astronauts from earth orbit. The Skylab is a precursor space station. It will provide the basic information necessary so that in the late 1970's and early 1980's this Nation may be able to use space on a routine basis as a place not only for scientific experimentation but also for utilitarian applications.

Prior to the development of a low-cost

transportation system there will be a gap of 5 to 7 years in the manned space flight program. Your committee has included an additional \$30 million in this budget to examine the possibility of flying a second Skylab with existing hardware or flying two Saturn IB vehicles modified for earth orbital applications and scientific experimentation. These vehicles, either the Skylab or the Saturn IB vehicles, could be flown in the 1974-78 time period. The moneys added by your committee will allow a thorough examination of the advantages and effectiveness of these missions utilizing the hardware which is now in storage. This addition to the program will do much to assure that all of the feasible opportunities for manned space flight are adequately examined.

Turning now to the space shuttle, NASA requested \$100,000,000 for the space shuttle program for fiscal year 1972. The phase B design definition studies on a low-cost transportation system will be completed during this summer. Additional phase A studies examining other alternative space shuttle configurations will also be completed at the same time. The committee has added \$25 million to the space shuttle program for purposes of providing additional development work in the areas of thermal protection and airframe fabrication techniques. It is the view of the committee that these moneys spent early in the program will improve the operational efficiency of the space shuttle and provide early information on the technologically most difficult portions of the shuttle program. The committee also added \$2.5 million for experiment definition in the shuttle program. The intent of these funds would be to provide additional funds for experiment definition in earth observation, communications, navigation and materials science and space manufacturing. The intent of these funds would be largely devoted to increasing the ability of the space shuttle to fly short duration laboratory missions carrying experiment systems for use in orbits tailored to specific requirements. These flights would be self-contained and would use the shuttle as a laboratory for up to 7 days. By operating in this mode the shuttle would provide additional information after the completion of the Skylab program from which to design a space station for the early 1980's.

The development of a low-cost transportation system to space is feasible. Second, the studies indicate that once the shuttle becomes operational it should reduce by one-half the costs of operations in space. It is important to note that the largest savings will likely come from the payloads placed on the shuttle. The availability of a low-cost transportation system with its large payload bay will allow a major reduction in the sophistication of our spaceborne payloads. In addition to this, the shuttle will provide our first real capability to repair in orbit or refurbish on the ground satellites currently in use and contemplated during the 1970's. Instead of being in the position of launching the vehicle and then having to follow it with many more ve-

hicles over a period of years it should be possible to repair and maintain a number of our satellites either in orbit or by returning them to the ground and again placing them in orbit.

Your committee has made other relatively minor changes to the manned space flight portion of the fiscal year 1972 budget. I will not go into detail on those changes but I would like to point out that your committee and the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight have made an exhaustive review of the bill before you today. We have visited key contractors and held hearings on every major aspect of the program. The testimony and information obtained on the manned space flight programs compromise over 1,100 pages of information on this budget. Based on this exhaustive review, I recommend your support of the fiscal year 1972 NASA authorization bill.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I urge my colleagues to give the NASA authorizations bill their wholehearted support.

After much thought and deliberation, the committee, under the able leadership of its distinguished chairman (Mr. MILLER) and its distinguished ranking minority member (Mr. FULTON), has recommended that \$3,433,580,000 be allocated to NASA programs for the 1972 fiscal year. In terms of broad categories, this \$3.4 billion will be distributed as follows:

Research and development	\$2,668,100,000
Construction of facilities	58,630,000
Research and program management	706,850,000

If authorized and appropriated, these sums will enable the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to proceed with the national space program.

In the interests of brevity, I will not attempt to highlight the most significant components of the three NASA general program categories; this has already been accomplished by the report of the committee and amplified by the remarks of the committee chairman and other distinguished committee members. By the same token, I would refer the attention of my colleagues to the additional statements appended to the body of the committee report. There will be found my views on particular facets of the space program including the space shuttle, the NERVA transportation system, the sky lab missions, and the practical benefits from aerospace activities.

I would, however, Mr. Chairman, like to place the space program in a general perspective so that those of my colleagues who are less than well acquainted with the program's fundamentals can obtain a better understanding of the need for the NASA authorization this body is voting upon today.

In 1961 the space program of the last decade was inaugurated when President Kennedy, in his second state of the Union address, declared that—

This Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of

landing man on the moon and returning him safely to earth.

When this goal was enunciated there were those who thought its attainment within the decade a technological impossibility. As we well know, however, in July of 1969, the critics were silenced by the moon walks of Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and the successes of Apollo 11.

With the goal of the 1960's achieved, President Nixon, in March of last year, outlined three new purposes for the national space program. The President declared that the program should be dedicated to: Pushing back the frontiers of the unknown through space exploration; broadening the base of scientific knowledge; and, maximizing the practical benefits of aerospace activities.

I believe these three goals are worthy of the sustained efforts of this Nation. And if the successes of the space program in the 1960s are any guide, then the extent to which these goals are achieved will be determined by the strength of our commitments and the dedication of our efforts. Thus it is of prime importance that Congress continue to authorize and appropriate the funds needed by NASA to carry on the space program.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say that it has been a privilege to serve on this committee. The chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON), as well as the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), have provided dedicated and progressive leadership.

Mr. Chairman, there are several points I want to touch upon. The gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) have previously discussed the space shuttle. However, I think additional comments are warranted as in my opinion the space shuttle is the key to our space program, without it—we do not have any future in space.

We have heard many times on the floor of the House criticism of the space program. The question has been asked time and time again what is it going to do for us here on earth. We're only bringing rocks back from the moon. Without going into the arguments on either side, I think we can say that the space shuttle answers all of the criticisms which have been leveled against the space program. To begin with the shuttle will provide tremendous savings on our investments. Instead of launching a vehicle and then throwing it away as we do today we will have a vehicle which can be used up to 300 times. It not only will reduce the transportation costs of the space launch vehicles but the cost of manufacturing the satellites by about 50 percent.

It is estimated that by using the shuttle all but two of our launch vehicles can be replaced. From 1978 to 1990 we will save approximately 10 percent a

year on our investment by using the shuttle instead of our present inventory of rockets. The shuttle will be near earth orbit where it will be able to conduct earth-oriented experiments such as communications, weather, and ecology.

There will be no question of who the shuttle benefits and where the benefit will be. It will be right here on Earth. I understand the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) at the proper time is going to offer an amendment to delete approximately \$300 million from the NASA appropriation, with the purpose to postpone Apollo 16 and Apollo 17. Frankly, the cost of the basic hardware for Apollo 16 and 17, has already been spent. It is my understanding that if we postpone Apollo 16 or Apollo 17, we would save 175 million dollars. But isn't this foolish after spending over 21 billion on Apollo to stop.

One other point that I hope the House will consider is that such a postponement in the long run will end up costing us more money. And what about the people in the program. You can't store people. We're already at the breaking point. We must maintain the facilities and we must maintain the crews needed to man the flights.

Mr. Chairman, we are forced with a situation where we have built and paid for vehicles and have the crews trained and ready to fly.

Not to let them fly just does not make sense. I hope the amendment proposed to be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) will be defeated.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his very excellent statement.

I might also say that we certainly appreciate the work of the gentleman on our committee, as we do the work of the other members who serve on the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state that in these days, when the interest of the public is waning in the space program, and when many people feel that we have done all that we can or should do in the space program, it takes dedication and hard work on the part of this great committee—which I once had the pleasure of serving upon—to generate interest and to keep our great space program going.

I would further say, Mr. Chairman, that just because some of the theatrics are out of the program—for instance, it is true that Alan Shepard probably holds the world's record for the longest golf ball driven by man, and this caught the imagination of the public, but that is not worth the billions of dollars we put into it; and it is true seeing the lunar landings live on television also caught the imagination of the public—that somehow or other in this regard they think

that, well, we have done enough. But this great committee knows that this is just the beginning.

I want every Member of this House to realize that this program is going to contribute and has contributed more to some of the very problems that the Members are interested in than they can visualize.

Again, I also know that the gentleman from New York is going to try to delete \$300 million from this program, and put this money in some other program. In that connection, I will just say to the gentleman that, if he were successful in deleting the \$300 million, it would not mean that that \$300 million would be placed where he wants it.

I would also point out to the gentleman that I have never seen this Congress, present or past, fail to do something, if it wants to, because of lack of money. If enough of us want to do something in the field that the gentleman is interested in then we will do it, and he does not need to try and clip this program in order to try to accomplish it. Everything stands on its own merit.

The gentleman from Iowa—he is not here, and I will repeat it when the gentleman comes back—he always calls this a “moondoggling” program, and I want to beat him to the punch a little on that. And I would point out to the gentleman from Iowa that this program is going to help the State of Iowa, if they are still growing corn out there, and I understand they are on the farms in the State of Iowa—but this is going to help the State of Iowa through the detection of blight, weather forecasting, and in all phases of some of our own earth resources.

When we talk about the earth resources we are talking about farming, we are talking about natural resources, we are talking about oceanography, you name it, and it is all covered in the space program. The space program just was dragged into it because of all the things that were developed in the space program.

So I want to tell the Members of this House that when you start chipping away on this that you are chipping on some of the developments of technology that are going to help you with the programs you want to accomplish.

I want to commend the committee on bringing out a great bill under pressure, with very mild public support. The public just has not been informed and just has not grasped the real situation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we give this committee a good strong vote and support the very great work that they have done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might use.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas on his most excellent statement. As a matter of fact, this is one of the best statements I have heard in my career in the Congress on the balance between funding programs. Taking money out of one program does not automatically put it over into another. Any Congress worth

its salt certainly would provide for the Nation's needs in the way of money when it votes for programs. I congratulate this House for doing that every time. I do want to congratulate doubly the gentleman from Texas because he hit the very kernel of the problem that we on this Committee on Science and Astronautics, on which he served as a member have been studying for months. It is not simply the launching and the use of the manned facilities around the world. It is not construction. To cancel at this late point in time when we are going to make the greatest scientific advances ever in these last three flights, when we are just coming to the fruition and the flower of the program, then to cut off this work is certainly not the way to do it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN).

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill for the purpose of directing attention to a wealth of benefits accruing from America's space program which are unplanned, generally unexpected, and which indeed are extracurricular dividends over and above the official objectives of space exploration of the moon, the planets, and the solar system.

Chances are, gentlemen, that the packaged steak your wife bought at the market this week is wrapped in the same type of transparent polyester film—one two-thousandths of an inch thick—used for America's giant balloon satellites.

And that high-strength aluminum foil that protects our freezer-dried foods and other perishables probably is the same as that used on communications satellites.

The new walking chair that enables a crippled child to cross rough terrain is redesigned from the six-legged vehicle proposed for unmanned exploration of the moon.

And a new automatic traffic sentinel that spots you—or me—on the freeway, notes that you are speeding and takes a picture of you, and your license plate—this, like it or not, also came from aerospace technology.

These and scores of other new developments are fallout returns from this Nation's aerospace accomplishments. The practical benefits from our investment in space technology are legion. Many are mentioned in a report issued last December by our committee, entitled “For the Benefit of All Mankind”—House Report No. 91-1673.

I would like to mention a few more examples, as evidence that our space program—in addition to its great basic achievements in the enlargement of human knowledge of the universe in which our planet earth travels—also has tangible spinoff dividends to the general public down here on earth.

For instance, selected fire departments across the country soon will be testing new fire protective outfits developed from work done by NASA. Similar garments were developed by the crew equipment branch at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston for use by NASA rescue

crews. In response to a request from the International Association of Firefighters, a prototype of the new protective outfit was built and displayed at a symposium of the firefighters group in January.

Doctors can watch a movie of the beating of a patient's diseased heart—identifying dead spots or scar tissue in the heart wall, and other malfunctions—with a computer method devised by a NASA team at Stanford University. The system, which is still under development, would improve on current complex diagnostic methods by providing a simple means of viewing the heart in action. Figuratively, it allows doctors to “walk around” the isolated beating heart, viewing it from any desired angle. They also can stop the display at any desired point of heart expansion or contraction and can play the picture back and forth for many cycles.

The search for new oil and gas deposits is being effectively aided by technology directly resulting from the space program. According to the chief executive of the United Geophysical Corp., the following advances in petroleum exploration are resulting from space technology:

High-quality color photographs of inaccessible areas of the earth, taken by spacecraft, have provided valuable help in locating potential petroleum areas.

Side-looking radar, developed for military reconnaissance and refined in the space program, has provided high-resolution imagery of surface terrain.

Airborne multispectral scanners, developed in the space program, provide thermal infrared imagery of terrain which permits identification of different types of rock, including oil producing outcroppings.

And, magnetometer experiments deployed on the moon by Apollo astronauts, are contributing to knowledge about the continental drift theory which is of direct interest to petroleum geologists.

I could go on. But I would rather refer you back to the committee study I mentioned, published as House Report 91-1673, which all Members have received. It cites 90 examples other than those I have mentioned today. This is space technology payoff, here and now, on earth. It is another compelling reason for approval of the bill before us, H.R. 7109.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) who has some questions.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for yielding for several questions which I would like to address to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Before I do so I should like to express my astonishment at the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas a few moments ago to the effect that Congress generally finds the money to do the things we want to do. It is not my intention here today to attack the NASA program or to say that we ought to take all these funds and put them elsewhere. But it seems to me that in funding all of these programs we should take into con-

sideration the fact that we are not doing a good many things that we would like to do.

I do not think there is a single Member of the Congress who enjoys the fact that we have millions and millions of hungry people in this country, that we do not have school breakfast programs, that we do not have school lunch programs for kids who desperately need those programs, that there are millions of kids in our schools who are half asleep in the morning, because the last square meal they had was the school lunch the day before.

I do not think that most Members of this body are happy about the fact that a program that has met with universal approbation, the Headstart program, is not applied to the 4 million kids in this country who ought to have it, but, instead, only to 270,000 kids—nowhere near the 10 percent of the kids who ought to have it.

One could go on and on with the education programs, the manpower training programs, the slum clearance programs, and the health and hospital construction programs that we are not funding because we do not have the money. I think it is a very great mistake in considering the funding of any program to say that that funding can be considered in a vacuum without reference to the multiple needs of a pluralistic society.

Mr. MILLER of California. I yielded to the gentleman to ask questions and not to make a speech.

Mr. SCHEUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask you some questions about the earth resources satellite, which all of us are very interested in, and which many of us believe holds out great hope for improvement in many aspects of our society here on earth. May I ask you first, specifically in the area of drug control, which is of such concern to every single Member of this body, this question: We have a half dozen nations on this earth which are growing poppies. Poppy culture ends up as heroin in my district, your district, urban, suburban, and rural districts across the country. Many of these countries would like to do a better job in controlling the poppy culture. The poppy is of a very bright color, clearly visible. I wonder if the earth resources satellite program would contemplate a continuing program of high-altitude satellite photographic surveillance or other surveillance of areas of the world where poppies are being grown in order to inform our Government, in order to inform those governments, and in order to inform interested United Nations organizations such as the United Nations Narcotic Control Board and the United Nations Special Fund for Drug Abuse Control, exactly where poppies are being grown on a day-to-day and a week-to-week basis, so the U.N. or the local police can take effective action.

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

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

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I can answer specifically and directly to the point the question the

gentleman raises, but let me just say this, that at the present time we will fly the earth resources satellite in 1972 and 1973. We are developing sensors, for example, that can distinguish sick crops from healthy crops, sick trees from healthy trees, and I would judge we could probably develop that capability, if our Government insisted that we do it, or if, for example, we are requested to do so by a foreign nation. We look very favorably toward cooperation with other countries, particularly in these application fields.

While I do not know the specific answer to your question, I would think that with the kind of capability we already have and the technology that we are today developing, we could probably do precisely what the gentleman is asking whether or not we are able to do at this time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman has made an excellent point. The earth resources technology satellite would be developed for the benefit of all mankind.

It is going to depend upon the resolution of the cameras involved. For example, with space devices we have already tracked a truck between Baltimore and Washington in traffic.

We will get a resolution where we have been able to follow from space the progress of corn blight.

We have been able to detect forest fire's start.

We have been able to calculate the water content of snow cover, for expected drainage later.

We are approaching what the gentleman is coming to. He is looking ahead to a forward-looking program and to what can happen in the future if we will simply have the energy, the willingness, and the patience to progress.

We are moving in that direction tremendously fast.

Mr. SCHEUER. I appreciate that information very much.

I should like to follow this up with my colleague from Minnesota.

Both my colleague from Pennsylvania and my colleague from Minnesota have mentioned the surveillance being done on crop diseases and crop blight, presumably as to forest management, and presumably surveillance of air and water pollution.

Is there any way in which this extremely valuable information which is being collected can be made available on an hourly or daily basis to the cities, so that this can be plugged into their environmental quality control programs for air pollution, water pollution, forest management, or snow removal, for example?

It seems to me that we ought to be thinking of this now. If my colleague from Pennsylvania is right—and I am sure he is—that this information is in the process of being prepared, we ought to be thinking now of delivery systems to make it available on some kind of a computer storage basis to the cities, so that it can be applied and used by them.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. I should like to respond by saying that once NASA has developed the technology then, of course, it will be up to one of the other agencies—at least, this is the present plan—the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Defense, to distribute it.

Mr. SCHEUER. And certainly the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal.

Mr. KARTH. It will be up to them to amass this information and distribute it to the various areas to which the gentleman feels it ought to be distributed.

I personally do not favor that system. I personally feel the agency which develops the system and understands the technology involved, ought to amass all the information and feed it to those who find it useful, no matter where they be, whether it be a municipality, a State, or even a fire department, for example.

I am not sure exactly what the plan is going to be. I am not sure the plan has developed to a national policy. I do feel it would be better if the developing agency had full control and was able to disseminate the information.

That information will be available, and that technology can be developed. There is no reason why it cannot be disseminated.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before leaving that point?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is going down the same avenue as those of us on our committee who have a progressive outlook. We are looking ahead to reach these same goals.

On the matter of technology utilization, there was \$4 million requested by the administration. It was my amendment that increased it by \$2 million up to \$6 million. This committee by its unanimous action has upped by one-third the administration's requested figure of \$4 million.

We have in colleges, universities, and foundations methods of getting out the information. For example, I serve on the board of the school of Engineering of the University of Pittsburgh. We have there what we call a space building. We have the same faculties at various universities in connection with their science departments, engineering departments, and research and development departments.

The average person or a businessman can go there and ask for technical reports. We have a regular system of technical briefs being put out by NASA, just as does the Army has and the other military services have.

We are moving into that field strongly. I am very glad that you bring this point up, because I would have it move faster. For example, the technology application has been moving in the direction of developing cooperative programs with other agencies such as the Air Pollution Control Administration, the Water

Pollution Control Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the Social Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Small Business Administration, and many others. We are looking into liaison on that. We have been progressing in the direction that the gentleman wants to go. Again, I compliment the gentleman for his excellent work in this field.

Mr. SCHEUER. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I have one last question to address to Mr. KARTH. There is probably no single problem which is more vexing from the point of view of cities than the overwhelming problem of solid waste and human waste disposal. It is estimated that the average person accounts for about 5 or 6 pounds of solid waste a day, which is expected to reach a total of about 10 pounds of solid waste by the middle or the end of the decade. Is there any technology that we have learned with regard to recycling, and so forth, in the manned satellite program, that can be applied to the human waste disposal problem of cities? If there is something to be learned, how is this new knowledge being applied to urban problems? How can cities look for relief from the terrific knowledge that you have developed?

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KARTH. The answer to the question is the technology in those very narrow perimeters has already been developed as the result of the Apollo program. I would be inaccurate if I allowed you to believe that it would be an inexpensive process to apply it in terms of the magnitude you are talking about. You are talking about new sewage disposal systems, for example, in major cities. However, the technology for doing it is here. All it takes is money to apply it.

Mr. SCHEUER. What other means of disposing of human wastes is there? Maybe new technology is available that would be of help.

Mr. KARTH. I do not know of any new technology of the character that you describe, but the technology that you asked the question about has already been developed, although obviously it is still on a very small scale. NASA does not have the responsibility for extrapolating this and carrying it on to the point where the municipalities of this country can apply it to their own pollution problems. That will come under another agency such as HUD, for example. Whether HUD has chosen to take that technology and utilize it for the purpose suggested by the gentleman from New York, I do not know. I doubt it, however, and I wish that they would, because the technology is there. It cost substantial sums of money to develop it, and it might well answer one of the major problems of this country. I just wish they would get on with the job.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague and very frankly I would say that I have been very much encouraged by the answers that I received here, and, as a

matter of fact, they have changed my point of view. My original deep concern with the problem of the cities and their reallocation of funds, and the problem of disposing of wastes in the cities is one which has given me a great deal of difficulty in voting for this funding in the past, but I am encouraged that you are coming up with new answers to old problems.

Mr. MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield to me for one moment while he is holding the floor?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to express my appreciation for your asking these questions. We just wish that more of our colleagues, particularly those from the big cities, would get into this and not just say let us go off and spend this money in the ghettos or someplace else. NASA has not solved all of the problems, but it certainly is attempting to.

Mr. SCHEUER. I appreciate that statement very much, and I would like to say, as I told Mr. KARTH of Minnesota, that I had a commitment to vote against this funding, because of being on the record in prior years in terms of a reallocation of these funds, but I am convinced now that there is enough hope and a significant contribution may be made toward the cities, so that I intend now to vote for the funding. I thank you very much.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to compliment the chairman of the full committee and the ranking Republican member for the dedicated services and time that they have given to their job on this particular committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my support to H.R. 7109, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1972. This bill will permit the authorization of \$3,433,580,000, for our national space program for the coming fiscal year. The Science and Astronautics Committee, in drawing up this bill, has based its final recommendation upon some 2,500 pages of testimony delivered by more than 26 expert witnesses, in addition to information gathered by field trips taken by members and staff. And as a participating member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I strongly favor the action taken by the committee and its members who have dedicated so much time to the consideration of this bill.

As I have listened to the many arguments pro and con for the U.S. participation in space, I feel that there has been very little attention paid to one of the most significant aspects of our work in space—the economic benefits. We should realize that more than \$44 billion has been spent on space since the program's initiation in 1958. More meaningfully, this money has been spent in one of the most labor-intensive sectors of the entire economy; a sector in which the ratio of manpower costs to material costs is on the order of 9 to 1.

But the true economic impact of this

Nation's space program is the nature in which the salaries received by the aerospace community were recirculated into the rest of the economy. Studies have shown that the annual economic multiplier for the salary dollar is a factor of approximately seven. Accordingly, since no less than 90 percent of the NASA costs have been allocated for salaries, the value to the economy of our space program has been over \$3 billion.

We can see another aspect of economic growth from our space effort in the regional impact of space facilities. Employment levels, standards of living, educational opportunities, and industrial development have been multiplied many times with the establishment of such facilities as the Mississippi test facility, the Slidell Computer facility and the centers at Cape Kennedy, Houston, and Huntsville. The demands of the space program for highly skilled and highly qualified personnel have clearly exceeded available talent pools and, therefore, have had to be met by training and a general upgrading of skill levels. The individuals who have received this training have undeniably benefited from the demands imposed upon them by working within the aerospace environment. The increment of skill which has been added to the inventory of the individual worker represents a distinct contribution of permanent value.

There is also another aspect of the economic benefits of the space program which this country has enjoyed. This relates to the fact that the economy of any nation is tied directly to its degree of technological and scientific development. Very simply, the number and the magnitude of the problems with which present-day society is faced deny conventional solution. But with the application of science and technology, we can anticipate sound and logical solutions to even our most pressing problems. Look for example at England since World War II. By virtually any standard—commercial, industrial, financial—England is suffering a major decline. And by the same token, England is an example of a nation which set a high priority on welfareism at the expense of promoting industry, research, and development.

In contrast, during the identical period, Japan and Germany have become two of the world's strongest and most prosperous nations. Their products and their accomplishments rival the finest of this country. Here on the other hand are two examples of nations that have cared for their people through an emphasis on science, technology, and an advanced industrial complex. This emphasis has, in turn, provided the sustaining economic growth by which schools have been built, hospitals and clinics funded, and higher standards of living offered to the general population.

In the United States our economy has flourished in the past two decades for the very reason of our concentration upon scientific research and development, the bulk of which is represented by this country's space effort. It is quite apparent that we must now take all measures necessary to assure that our economy continues to grow as it has in recent years. It

is only through this advance in productivity, based upon the knowledge derived from science and technology, that we can create the wealth to address the most pressing problems of our times. There is no question that we should do more to meet the needs of man on earth. There is also no question that the heart of the problem lies in a strong and sustained economic pattern of growth—a pattern to which our space effort makes a vital contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to terminate my remarks with a statement that was made in 1932 by a great Oklahoman and a great American, Will Rogers, on the 5th day of June 1932, made this statement:

Any experiment that has been made in the air is not a waste of time or money. Our defense, offense, and all have got to come from the air.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I find this an overly generous authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

By adding \$162.2 million to the NASA budget request, the authorizing committee is attempting to underwrite a very ambitious space program. I believe this is not the time to do so.

In particular, I regard it as unwise to authorize \$125 million for the space shuttle and \$39.9 million—more than twice the amount requested—for the NERVA nuclear rocket engine. Nor do I see any need for a \$500,000 outlay for a feasibility study of offshore airports.

The committee proposes to authorize \$3.4 billion for NASA in the coming fiscal year, and gives the following estimates for NASA budgets in the subsequent 5 fiscal years: \$3.7 billion, \$3.95 billion, \$3.75 billion, \$3.71 billion, and \$3.68 billion.

Yet a Rand Corp. report for the Air Force last year said:

Shuttle development would require a peak civilian space budget in excess of \$7.0 billion in 1975, about double the present level.

The report also notes that while shuttle proponents envision a long-term saving of \$2.8 billion through its use, total NASA program costs "for a variety of plans range from about \$75 billion to about \$140 billion—1975 to 1990—and any program uncertainties could cancel these savings or make them appear small by the time they are predicted to be realized."

Further, it appears that heavy use of the space shuttle by the Air Force is the only foreseeable way to realize the savings projected through shuttle use. Science magazine for March 12 carried an article entitled "Space Shuttle: A Giant Step for NASA and the Military?" and in it declared:

Although the shuttle is promoted almost exclusively as a civilian system of space transportation, the Air Force expects to use it as frequently as NASA. DOD would deliver its own satellites into orbit and conduct its own classified manned missions in space for as long as 30 days.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report is silent on military applications of the space shuttle, and for that reason I find the proposed expenditure for develop-

ment of the shuttle more than a little disturbing.

At a time when we are running deficit budgets, when dollars for needed programs are scarce, I do not see how we can justify expansion of the shuttle, rocket engine, and other space programs. To me it is a case of flying to the things we know not of, rather than carefully allocating our scarce resources to deal first with the problems we do know of.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, part of our national investment in space has been spent for education. Education, of course, is not the primary mission or goal of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; but under the 1958 legislation by which NASA was established, the space agency is directed to increase the national scientific and technical capability for the advancement of space exploration. Certainly one way of increasing that capability—and perhaps the best way—is by education and aiding educational institutions. And in response to the congressional directive, NASA has contributed to or developed a variety of educational programs and services. Some of the valuable work at the college and university levels has had to be curtailed because of budgetary restrictions; however, important work is continuing in the development and preparation of space-science materials for elementary and secondary schools to assist in updating classroom instruction and student participation, spacemobiles—traveling science classrooms—educational publications, a speakers bureau, motion picture production, exhibits for display at home and abroad, and radio and television programs—NASA also has undertaken a study for adult education in space. All of these are important means for supplementing general education in science and increasing public understanding of and appreciation for the goals and concepts of our national space effort.

NASA's involvement in education is consistent with our historic heritage; for the concept of education, the best education, for all the people, was fundamental to the leaders of the American revolution who founded this democracy. Thomas Jefferson, that remarkable genius who drafted the Declaration of Independence, wrote to one of his fellow legislators in 1786 concerning legislation then under consideration:

I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is for the diffusion of knowledge among people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness... Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know... that the tax which will be paid for this purpose is not more than a thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests and nobles who will rise among us if we leave the people in ignorance.

Now, in this second decade of the space age, surely the hazard of ignorance is for greater than it was in 1786. A look at the world scene underscores the fact that the true road to emancipation for nations as well as for individuals is education. This means education that is rele-

vant to our era, to the problems that face us, to the advancements in science and technology that have propelled us into space, and the explosive accumulation of knowledge that has resulted. Such education—education for the now generation as well as for future generations—provides a new kind of literacy: scientific literacy. For, as the distinguished educator, Dr. James B. Conant has pointed out:

Whether we like it or not, we are all immersed in an age in which the products of scientific inquiries confront us at every turn. We may hate them, shudder at the thought of them, embrace them when they bring relief from pain or snatch from death a person we love, but the one thing no one can do is banish them.

Under our democratic system, we are called upon to make important decisions on questions in which science is involved. Some of these now are political issues such as environmental pollution, the use of food additives, the expansion of nuclear power and future programs and funding for the exploration of space. Only a public that is scientifically literate can respond to these questions intelligently. In the less than 13 years since its establishment, NASA has made an important contribution to the advancement of such scientific literacy among the citizens of our Nation.

Dr. Lee DuBridge, former science adviser to President Nixon, foresaw this contribution to education by NASA in 1959, when NASA had been in existence less than a year. He said then:

One hundred years from now the new kind of knowledge attained in space research will surely have paid untold, unforeseen, and unexpected dividends. Already the dawning of the space age had impelled Americans to seek to improve their schools. That alone may be worth the cost of all our space rockets.

Rich though our Nation is in all resources, it no longer can afford to waste its human resources by offering less than the best in education to all our citizens. The conquest of space achieved thus far could not have been accomplished without the educated manpower to design and plan the program. Our future on earth and our advances in space makes it imperative that our advances in education continue through NASA's programs as well as through other funding through the Congress and supported by the administration.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommendation for the funding for our Nation's space flight program deserves the enthusiastic support of this body.

The resources going in the space effort in the past few years have been at the very minimum required for a proper pursuit of the worthwhile goals.

The Science and Astronautics Committee has taken commendable steps to provide modest increases in several of the NASA programs. The improvements in funding will accelerate the realization of this scientific work and will hasten the benefits which will accrue to those of us who remain earthbound.

There is hardly a phase of human activity which has not realized improvement as a result of the research and de-

velopment effort which has accompanied the Nation's space program.

Communications, weather control, medical and biological sciences, navigation improvements, and everyday activities, such as cooking and camping have been only a few of the beneficiaries of space research.

The most visible aspect of the space program—man's exploration of outer space—is only a small part of the immense and immediate value the people of our Nation realize from the investment in this endeavor.

I want to commend the chairman and the committee for the considerable effort they have made in studying the NASA program and bringing to this House a proposal which will improve and enhance our Nation's efforts to realize its best return from this investment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, under whose leadership the work of the subcommittee was carried out again this year in a most thorough conscientious, and thoughtful manner. I might add that the deliberations of our subcommittee have always been characterized by a completely non-partisan attitude by all the members.

Since you have heard other Members describe the various elements of the national space program in some detail, I should like to emphasize the increasingly important role which our space effort has come to play in the nation's international relationships. From my standpoint, no aspect of the space program has more importance. The prospect of cooperating in space, and thereby establishing patterns which could lead to reduced tensions among the nations of the Earth, is certainly appealing.

Space is intrinsically international. Orbiting satellites know no national boundaries, and the scientific understanding which has been generated by activities in space has contributed to the common intellectual heritage of mankind. These new tools of the space age—rockets, satellites, probes, modern instrumentation of all types—have made it possible for us to build upon the scientific foundations of the past.

Recognizing the international character of space exploration, Congress wisely provided in the Space Act of 1958 that American activities in space should be conducted so as to contribute materially to cooperation with other nations and groups of nations. I believe we can all be proud of America's record during the past decade. We have conducted our space program openly, before the eyes of the world. We have shared our triumphs with men everywhere, and made no attempt to conceal our failures. More importantly, we have invited other nations, as well as individual foreign scientists, to participate in our program.

NASA has entered into some 250 agreements for international space projects to date. We have furnished the launch vehicles for 16 foreign satellite missions, and agreements exist to launch an additional 15 in the future. These satellites, in all instances, have been conceived,

built, and funded abroad. There is never an exchange of funds; there is no give-away or foreign aid aspect to these cooperative ventures in space.

One of the most impressive cooperative projects is one entered into with West Germany. This project, called Helios, provides for the design and development by West Germany of two probes to be launched to within 45 million kilometers of the sun. The Helios probes will fly closer to the sun than any spacecraft to date, and should contribute importantly to our understanding of solar physics. Typical of most such agreements, West Germany will design and manufacture the two spacecraft, and provide the bulk of the scientific payload. NASA will provide two Titan-Centaur launch vehicles. West Germany's investment in the Helios project is expected to be in the neighborhood of \$100 million.

While Helios is an illustration of a cooperative venture well suited to an advanced nation, such as West Germany, NASA's international program also includes many developing nations, as well. One of the most exciting projects of this type involves an experiment in the broadcasting of instructional television, via satellite, to some 5,000 remote Indian villages. The experiment will be made possible under an agreement with the Indian Government whereby NASA's ATS-F satellite, to be launched in 1973, will be made available to India for 1 year of educational broadcasting devoted to such programs as family planning, modern agricultural techniques, and national integration.

The United States-India experiment in instructional television by satellite will be closely watched by other developing countries, and the experiment should provide a valuable precedent for the proper use of direct broadcasting capabilities from space.

Foreign scientists have also been given many opportunities to fly their instruments aboard American spacecraft. These are selected strictly on the basis of merit and, like foreign satellites, they are underwritten financially abroad.

More than 600 cooperative scientific sounding rockets have been launched from sites around the world, thereby giving the smallest nations an opportunity to participate in our space effort.

Broad participation by foreign scientists has also been made possible in the analysis of the lunar samples brought back by Apollo astronauts. More than 250 foreign scientists have helped in the analysis of those samples.

Applications satellites have also provided a new avenue for international cooperation. The world now has an effective, and profitable, operational space communications system in which 79 nations participate under the so-called INTELSAT agreement. Transoceanic communication capabilities have been greatly advanced since this international consortium began operations.

Moreover, direct daily reception of data from U.S. meteorological satellites occurs in 50 nations around the world by virtue of the automatic picture transmission equipment aboard our spacecraft. Relatively simple and inexpensive ground equipment makes it possible for

any nation that chooses to make a small investment in inexpensive ground equipment to read-out timely weather data from our meteorological satellites.

In the field of earth resources survey by satellites, NASA has undertaken cooperative projects with Brazil, Canada, and Mexico which are designed to acquaint their scientists and government officials with the potential of remote sensing from orbit. Many believe that surveying the earth's resources from space is the most promising means by which space technology can help to accelerate development of the emerging nations by improving their ability to exploit and manage their resources.

The widespread interest in the Earth Resources Survey Program is indicated by the fact that representatives of 53 countries and international organizations attended a workshop on Earth Resources Survey Systems held last month in Ann Arbor, Mich.

What about the future?

In the 1970's there will be opportunities for international cooperation on a significantly larger scale. The nations of the free world have been invited to join with us in America's post-Apollo program. Negotiations have been held for more than a year with our friends abroad. There are many difficulties to be overcome, but we remain hopeful that a meaningful cooperative arrangement can be worked out.

With respect to the Soviet Union, the only other major spacefaring Nation in the world, the relationships between our two nations have been characterized by competition rather than collaboration. This has been so because accomplishments in space tend to reflect the state of a nation's technology, and technology has political and security consequences in the modern world.

There have been recent developments between the United States and the Soviet Union, however, that are encouraging. Both sides have begun to realize, so it seems, that we all live on a tiny planet in a vast universe which both nations wish to explore; and that important new knowledge of that planet which we share, and the universe, can be gained for the benefit of all men.

In the fall of 1970 the Soviets agreed to our proposal to study the possible design of future manned spacecraft of the two countries so as to permit rendezvous and docking. The safety of American astronauts and Soviet cosmonauts may someday depend upon a satisfactory agreement on this matter.

Subsequently, in January of this year, an American delegation met with Soviet leaders in Moscow to consider a wider range of future cooperation. A preliminary agreement was reached bearing on possible future joint consideration of the objectives and results of space research, improvement of existing weather data exchanges, techniques for studying the natural environment using space and conventional means, the expanded exchange of data on space biology and medicine, and the exchange of lunar samples.

It is impossible to tell, Mr. Chairman, what the future might hold. But the po-

tential of more meaningful international cooperation in space is so great, the possible results are so attractive, that it is clearly worthy of our best efforts.

I want to conclude by commending NASA for its excellent record of the past, and extend my best wishes for future success.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the \$3.43 billion NASA authorization, I would like to remind our colleagues of another monetary matter which came before this House just last month: the second supplemental appropriation bill.

The NASA authorization is \$162 million above the amount requested by the administration; the total is \$23 million greater than the amount provided by the Congress in 1971. Included in this \$3.43 billion request is \$4 million for NASA "public relations."

Let us compare this unrestrained generosity with the treatment given to four vital programs under the second supplemental bill.

LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT

The \$5 million needed to implement this act—Public Law 91-695—was not included in the House version of the supplemental. Although the Senate added these funds, the House conferees obtained their deletion. This money would have helped the 400,000 children in the United States who are afflicted with this preventable disease, which causes irreversible brain damage and sometimes death.

TITLE IV OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Funds to continue the nutritional pilot programs for the elderly were not included in the House bill. The Senate added \$1.7 million, but again the House conferees prevailed in having it deleted. This money would have maintained the 18 existing projects for 1 more year, until a permanent program could be established. The two demonstration programs in New York City, one at the Hudson Guild and the other at the Henry Street Settlement House, serve 4,700 meals per month, and provide recreational activities, social services, referral assistance, and nutrition information to elderly citizens. Now this vital program for the elderly is in danger of extinction.

SECTION 235 AND SECTION 236 FUNDS

Our efforts to add \$25 million for each of these sections were defeated on the House floor. The funds included for these programs by the Senate were deleted by the House conferees. National Association of Home Builders President John Stastny explained the need for these funds to the House Appropriations Subcommittee, stating:

We understand there will be an anticipated, unfunded backlog in the beginning of fiscal 1972 of close to \$300 million for the 236 program and close to \$100 million for the 235 program.

New York City alone needs \$12 million to complete the 17,500 housing units under construction, for which it was promised \$30 million in 236 funds in fiscal year 1971; to date the city has only received \$18 million from the Federal Government.

COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM PREVENTION, TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION

The Conte amendment, to add \$10 million to the supplemental bill, was defeated by the House. The \$20 million added by the Senate was deleted by the conferees. These funds would have helped treat the 300,000 alcoholics in New York City, less than 2 percent of whom are reached by existing programs.

Although \$30 million was authorized for this program—which was enacted last year—for fiscal year 1971, no money has yet been appropriated, so the program remains mere words on paper. In anticipation of adequate funding, the New York Bureau of Alcoholism Service developed a plan for comprehensive treatment of alcoholics which would operate through six hospital-based treatment centers. If the supplemental money had been approved, the first center could have opened this summer. Now, opening will be delayed at least until 1972.

The total amount added the supplemental by the Senate for these four programs is less than \$77 million. Somehow, 2 weeks ago the House could not tolerate adding \$77 million, but today an "authorization overrun" of more than twice that amount causes little objection.

The \$3.43 billion authorization for NASA represents a 5 percent increase over last year's authorization, an increase, we are told, made necessary by inflation. Yet, in April, when many of my colleagues and I tried to add \$728 million to the Office of Education bill to compensate for this same 5 percent inflation, we were defeated.

If this bill, with its increased amount for space exploration, it will show to the public how twisted the priorities of the House are.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent for permission to revise and extend the remarks that I made today.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request on behalf of all of the Members. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development", for the following programs:

(1) Apollo, \$612,200,000;

(2) Space flight operations, \$745,275,000;
(3) Advanced missions, \$10,000,000;
(4) Physics and astronomy, \$112,800,000;
(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, \$311,500,000;

(6) Space applications, \$182,500,000;
(7) Launch vehicle procurement, \$146,100,000;

(8) Aeronautical research and technology, \$135,000,000;

(9) Space research and technology, \$75,105,000;

(10) Nuclear power and propulsion, \$67,620,000;

(11) Tracking and data acquisition, \$264,000,000;

(12) Technology utilization, \$6,000,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffet Field, California, \$6,500,000;

(2) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, \$17,530,000;

(3) Various locations, \$31,100,000;

(4) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$3,500,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," \$706,850,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$100,000.

(h) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the

Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Administrator or his designee within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 30 and June 30 thereafter the names of any nonprofit institutions of higher learning which the Secretary of Defense determines on the date of each such report are barring such recruiting personnel from premises or property of any such institution.

Sec. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward of 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (4) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized

for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

Sec. 6. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act. If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(c) (1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an inde-

pendent, disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions.

Sec. 7. Section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2476), is amended as follows: (1) subsection (a) is hereby repealed, and (2) subsections (b), (c), and (d) are renumbered as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively.

Sec. 8. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1972".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MIKVA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MIKVA: At page 2, lines 5 and 6, delete "\$135,000,000;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$134,500,000; provided that none of the funds provided for in this section shall be used to finance research with respect to the construction of airports in lakes or their tributaries."

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to section 1(8) of the bill now before us. That section calls for an authorization of \$135 million for aeronautical research and technology. On page 144 of the committee report, the committee states that \$500,000 of those funds are to be used for a feasibility study of offshore airports, "to establish the technical feasibility and economic practicality" of such airports. The amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) and myself would delete that \$500,000 authorization, and would provide that no funds authorized under this section shall be used to finance research with respect to the construction of offshore airports.

Mr. Chairman, this is no brave new idea which warrants a half a million dollar technical feasibility study. I recognize that for many Members, this may be the first time they have considered the prospect of building airports in rivers and lakes. However, those of us from the Lake Michigan and Lake Erie areas have been dealing with this for some time. Both Chicago and Cleveland have expressed interest in constructing additional major airports in Lake Michigan and Lake Erie, respectively, and a good deal of ink has been spilled on the subject. In the case of Chicago, there have been a number of feasibility studies, including three by professional consultants. All they have told us is that our engineers are technologically capable of constructing an airport in the middle of Lake Michigan. They do not begin to deal with the equally important questions of whether we ought to do so. I suppose we are technologically capable of turning downtown Washington into a cow pasture, we could pave in the whole lake without technological difficulties.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that this authorization asks the wrong question.

It ignores grave questions as to the environmental and ecological impact of building an airport in a body of water. It ignores the air safety problems which have been raised by the Air Line Pilots Association and the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association; concerns which have led both those groups to oppose construction of an airport in Lake Michigan. It ignores the likely effects on development of nearby shorelines. There are a lot of people in Chicago who are less than enthusiastic about seeing Lake Michigan's natural shoreline beaches and parkland replace with the glittering tinsel of rent-a-car lots, fast-food eateries, motels, and airfreight warehouses.

These kinds of questions, involving human needs and goals, require at least as much attention as questions of engineering feasibility. I am not opposed to progress. But I am opposed to a definition of progress which says that because we can produce billion dollar technological wonders, we necessarily ought to.

Let me give you some idea of what we have learned during the past few years' study of the desirability of constructing an airport in Lake Michigan. The studies commissioned by the city of Chicago contemplate a major airport 8 miles off shore, covering 11,000 acres of lake. The idea is to build 16 miles of circular dike, and then to pump the water out from the center. More than 50 million cubic yards of sand and rockfill would be carted in and dumped in the hole, and the airport built on top of the fill. The walls of the dike would rise about 70-foot high at the end of the runways. Access from the shore would be by causeway or by tunnel, or both. At least some tunneling would be necessary to avoid interfering with navigability for ships and boats. It is estimated that a tunnel would cost roughly \$20 million per mile. In addition, it would be necessary to extend the various utilities from the shore out to the airport—gaslines, electricity, water, and fuel for the planes.

By the time all this is finished, it is estimated that the dikeport, or whatever you want to call it, would cost \$2¼ billion. This compares with an estimated \$1¼ billion for a comparable landsite. A billion dollar premium is a rather substantial one, justifiable only if additional considerations were overwhelming. Far from it, there are drawbacks and dangers at every turn.

For starters, consider air safety. The Air Line Pilots Association warns of the dangers posed by icing. The constant spray and moisture from the surrounding water will cause icing problems in the cold months, not only for airplanes, but for runways and for safety and navigational equipment.

Visibility will be reduced, as compared with a landsite, due to more frequent fog and haze. The bowl-like depression of the dikeport makes lingering fog even more likely.

Radar altimetry required for low visibility approaches may not function properly over calm water such as is often associated with fog.

Wind velocity will be ordinarily higher than would be true at a landsite. An additional problem is posed by the pro-

tection dike, whose height would diminish the winds within the airport. Consequently, when the plane crosses over the wall, it suddenly encounters a strong wind shear.

Finally, and perhaps the greatest safety risk of all, is the vulnerability of the entire structure to damage to the protective dike. What happens if an airplane or a ship strikes the dike, causing a leak?

The list of environmental hazards is even longer. What will be done with the considerable amounts of waste material produced by an operation of this size? The studies done in Chicago have offered to resolve this problem by assuring us that no wastes will be discharged into the lake. Rather, everything will be piped through waste treatment plants. This is admirable, but it means adding considerably to the construction and maintenance cost.

Provision must also be made for runoff and seepage. Such water will undoubtedly carry pollution from the oil, kerosene, and carbon particles which will accumulate on the runways.

There is the risk of massive oil spills, in the event of a break or a leak in the fuel lines supplying the airport. In an inland body of water such as a lake or river, this could be disastrous.

Another problem with regard to inland bodies of water or even a bay or a sound, is the interference with circulation in the area around the airport. The capacity of a body of water to assimilate wastes is dependent not only on the total volume of water, but also on the mixing effect provided by currents. Interference with the natural circulation could result in stagnation of a portion of the lake or bay, destroying water quality in that area.

We must also not overlook the unpredictable disruption of marine plantlife and wildlife—of the entire sensitive ecology of the waterway—which would result from such a massive construction and the continuing operation of miles of roadway, runway, auto traffic, and air traffic.

Finally, there are the intangible costs in terms of loss of esthetic beauty. This applies not only to the lake, but to the shoreline as well. The related commercial development of the adjacent shore area would overtake the construction of the dikeport in terms of the magnitude of the disruption. Hotels, motels, car rental lots, train and bus terminals, supportive services of all kinds, warehouses to handle increasing airfreight, and on and on.

The impact on recreational uses of the lake or river, as well as of the shore areas, would be tragic.

And all in the name of what? So that more airports can handle more air traffic so more people and property can be moved more places at more rapid rates. Is it too much to ask that before we get on that merry-go-round we pause and ask why? That was the lesson of the SST. Once set in motion, these projects have a way of taking on a life of their own. If questions are not asked at the outset, it may be too late.

Progress is not worth the price if it makes life less livable. The costs of commercial exploitation of our rivers and

lakes is not merely economic. There is more than bricks and mortar at stake. Yet the authorization in this bill completely ignores these other considerations.

I understand the interest of some of my colleagues in finding new alternatives for commercial development, to relieve the excessive development already imposed on our urban areas. There is simply no land left in many areas to build new airports. The temptation is understandable. I share those concerns, but I submit that technical feasibility studies which deal only with engineering needs and cost-benefit analyses are not what is needed nor what is appropriate.

If the notion of offshore airports is deserving of exploration, let us do so in a framework which is more receptive to participation by all the interests which would be affected—environmental, air safety, regional planning, as well as economic and technical. I suggest that public congressional hearings would provide such a framework, and would represent a far more useful and valuable first step than the authorization now before us. That money could perhaps be better used for development of high-speed, rapid rail transportation systems, for I have a feeling that when the hearings on dikeports are done, the alternative of regional land-based airports which serve various cities and communities by a network of rapid transit will seem much more attractive.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, as the House has heard from the reading of this amendment, the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) is to strike out the sum of \$500,000 from the authorization, which money was earmarked for a study by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the feasibility of the building of wet ports, or jet airports in the water areas of the United States of America.

The gentleman from Illinois has circulated a letter to the House which explains his opposition to this proposal, and that is on the basis that the gentleman does not want a wet jet port built in the Chicago area.

I have some good news and some bad news for the gentleman from Illinois at this time. The good news is that I can support his amendment, but the bad news is the reason that I can support his amendment is that I have been informed that the Federal Government intends to undertake this study in any event, and is ready to sign a contract to make such a study by the Department of Transportation.

Just to inform the House on the facts as they relate to my proposal, and as I know them, this Federal study is going to be undertaken by the FAA, and the Department of Transportation, on the feasibility of wet ports in the New York area. In other words, it will be a combination study of the feasibility of building such a wet port in or around the Long Island Sound area of New York, or

in the Atlantic Ocean off the southern coast of Long Island.

Quite frankly, I can also tell the gentleman from Illinois that it was my original hope that the proposed NASA study would prefer that very area, because it is the area of most concern to myself, but I think it is indicative of the wet port problems and possibilities throughout the Nation.

I have also studied the work plans and the proposals of the DOT study and these proposals as set forth by the DOT are almost identical with the proposals that our committee has put forth and which are now before the Congress. So we would be in the position here today of authorizing a duplicate study if we were to allow this particular item to go through in the budget.

So having agreed to withdraw this proposal, I just want to make it clear to the gentleman that there was nothing in the proposal, so far as this Member is concerned, that was going to interfere with the local jurisdiction or options in any way, shape, or form. The purpose of my proposal was merely to determine once and for all whether it was feasible to build wet ports or whether it was not feasible to build wet ports. The study was supposed to determine that and bring it to a conclusion for the people of this Nation.

So I am glad to tell the gentleman that I can support his amendment at this time and under these circumstances.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

We, in the Chicago area, have had several feasibility studies. We were concerned that this was not only a duplication of efforts already made, but also an attempt to superimpose some Federal judgment on local judgments which I think are going the other way. That is why my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) and I proposed the amendment.

I hope in the light of what the gentleman has said that opposition to the amendment will be withdrawn and that the amendment can be adopted because, as it has been pointed out by the gentleman from New York, this would be completely duplicative of what the Department of Transportation has already authorized.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I can advise the gentleman, after having consulted with him about his amendment under the circumstances, we have no objection to the amendment passing.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, at this point I accept the good news as outweighing the bad and thank the gentlemen for their kind consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) seeking recognition?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on the amendment that we have just been discussing, it was stated that there would be no objection on either side of the aisle. Has there been any action taken on that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No, there has not been any action taken on the amendment.

The Chair would advise the gentleman that the Chair is trying to determine whether or not the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) desires to speak on the amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask a parliamentary inquiry—the fact that they have not voiced any objection still leaves it open for discussion inasmuch as they have not accepted the amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment must be voted upon by the members of the committee, the Chair would advise the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but am I correct in my understanding that neither have they agreed to accept the amendment at this point, but merely have suggested they do not object to it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would have to advise the gentleman from Illinois that the determination would be up to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union as to whether to accept or to reject this amendment or any other amendment.

Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) seek recognition on the amendment?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, when it is stated by both sides of the aisle that there is no objection, it would seem to me that the obvious effect of that is that the amendment is agreed to and it is acceptable to both sides. Of course, as the Chairman pointed out, it has to be passed on by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLLIER. But, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not yet actually agreed to and it is still under consideration.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states that any Member desiring recognition to discuss the amendment will be recognized.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am unable to discover from reading this report just how much is proposed to be authorized for spending under the terms of this bill. Can someone give me the total?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I shall be glad to answer the question. On page 1 of the report it is stated that the authorization is \$3,433,580,000.

Mr. GROSS. What do the figures on page 2 mean?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. There is no page 2.

Mr. GROSS. Call it whatever you want. There is a page 3.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Those are specific programs on page 3. The gentleman will notice that the figure of \$2,668,100,000 appears on the first line in the table on page 1. That is research and development. If the gentleman will turn to page 3, he will find the total for research and development at the bottom of that page, \$2,668,100,000.

Mr. GROSS. So it is approximately \$3.5 billion, is that correct?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It is \$3,443,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. All right. How does that compare with last year's authorization?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is 5 percent more than last year's authorization.

Mr. GROSS. And why?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The reason is that there has been a 5-percent annual increase in inflation. As the gentleman, who is a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, knows, there have been required increases for Federal Government employees in various categories such as salaries as well as fringe benefits and pension fund increases. So we had to provide the increases in the authorization for NASA.

Mr. GROSS. Does this \$3½ billion have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The Bureau of the Budget, now Office of Management and Budget, originally sent up a bill that was 5 percent less than this figure. So the Office of Management and Budget did not approve the \$3,443,580,000 as such. But within the framework of inflation, it is just the same figure in purchasing power.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the House Appropriations Committee which will have to provide the money.

Mr. JONAS. On the question of mandatory increases for employees, I think the RECORD should show that the Budget proposed a reduction of 1,500 employees, and this bill authorizes an increase of 500 employees above the number requested in the budget. That accounts for a substantial part of the increase.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We on

my amendment restored 500 office of advanced research and technology employees of the 1,500 NASA personnel proposed to be cut by the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. JONAS. The information that we have in the Appropriations Committee is that additional positions, over and above the budget, provided in this bill will be 93 at Ames, 26 flight positions, 184 positions at Langley, and 197 positions at Lewis. The Budget contemplated a reduction of 1,500 employees.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for the pertinent information he has provided.

Mr. JONAS. While I am on my feet, may I say, in case the record is not clear, that this bill is \$162 million above the budget.

Mr. GROSS. It is \$162 million above the budget?

Mr. JONAS. Yes; \$162,230,000 above the budget, to be exact.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if there is any awareness on the part of the committee that in the first 10 months of this fiscal year the Federal Government piled up a deficit of \$21,600,000,000? Is there any awareness on the part of this committee that somewhere, somebody is going to have to cut some of expenditures instead of increasing them by 5 percent?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The difference between us occurs at the figure we start with. On page 150 of the committee report you will find the following language:

The additional money will allow OART to retain 500 positions of the 533 it will otherwise lose.

So the figures the gentleman from North Carolina referred to personnel increases for Ames Research Center, Flight Research Center, Langley Research Center, Lewis Research Center—as being pluses really represent the restoration of positions that otherwise would be lost.

Mr. GROSS. That is what he said; they were pluses. I am beginning to think there are some people who have been moonstruck around here.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Nobody is moonstruck. I gave the explanation. We have restored 500 of the 1,500 positions the Office of Budget and Management had recommended be cut.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Since obviously there is no objection to it from either side, I take this time to suggest that I am unalterably opposed to any further study being made of an in-lake airport in Chicago. We have studied and restudied it to death.

There has been a study made by the American Institute of Planners. There is an in-depth study which is available,

and I gather known to the committee, by a private engineering firm in Chicago as to the feasibility of an in-lake airport in Chicago.

It has been said that there is no need to hurry this project because we will not be needing a third airport in Chicago for the next 10 or 15 years.

I want the Members to know, as the Representative of the district in which O'Hare International Airport is located—the busiest airport in the world—that it will not wait 10 or 15 years. The folly of hanging on to the hope of an in-lake airport for the city of Chicago to me is preposterous.

The Governor of Illinois has established a commission which is presently studying possible sites for an airport. We have had before us a plan that would provide a third airport in what is now a farm area some 35 or 36 miles from downtown Chicago, where sensibly the airport would precede the establishment of residential areas. Hence there could be the kind of planning that was not done at the time O'Hare International Airport became a commercial airport, having been transformed from what was previously a military air facility.

I am sorry to hear that the FAA has approved this type of study. I believe the time has come when we should get along with what must be done; that is, to find a suitable site, a site that would be available at a dollar figure much less than the projections of future cost for an in-lake airport. We should be moving forward with what has to be done because there is presently court action pending, and there will be additional litigation.

Permit me to remind the House that the 928th Tactical Airlift Unit occupies an area adjacent to the busiest airport in the world, and the Chicago Airport authority is presently seeking the transfer of the 928th Unit to a different part of the reservation so that they can annex the adjacent property for further airport expansion.

I can assure the Members today if that happens the communities in the area will pool their resources, and there will be further litigation.

I believe the time has come when we should put an end to these costly repetitious studies. We have made an in-depth analysis of every aspect of the proposed in-lake airport. We need a third airport. We need it desperately.

As I pointed out before, this sort of thing could be taken care of in advance, and we would not be faced with the problems that the constituents of my district now are tolerating, because there was little preplanning in the case of O'Hare International Airport.

Mr. MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. I have great sympathy for the gentleman and the problems of O'Hare International Airport. I have experienced some of the things that have happened there, but may I call his attention to the fact that this is not directed singly at O'Hare or at the city of Chicago. This is for the whole United States. Some of us would

perhaps like to think of a time when we will not fall into the type of trouble that you got into on this matter.

Mr. COLLIER. Let me say to the chairman that I understood this was a broad program for the entire country, but possessing the same quality of provinciality as is characteristic of most of my colleagues. I am directing my remarks to the manner in which this program affects my district and my constituency.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Unless I completely misunderstand the parliamentary procedure, the amendment that the gentleman is speaking for has already been agreed to by both sides of the aisle, and I am wondering why we cannot go ahead.

Mr. COLLIER. I made it very clear at the outset of my remarks I understood the parliamentary situation, but I also explained that it will probably be the only opportunity I will have to voice my opposition on this floor to the use of any funds for a purpose which has been adequately explored and can only delay the inevitable at the inconvenience and aggravation of my constituents.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment to H.R. 7109, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1972, which provides that certain funds shall not be used to finance research with respect to the construction of offshore airports.

Most of the Members are aware of the fact that Chicago's Mayor Daley feels that Chicago needs a third major airport and he remains certain that the location of it should be in Lake Michigan.

I am convinced that the mayor is wrong on this issue. There is mounting evidence that a lakefront airport study cannot guarantee that there will be no further lake pollution.

Entirely apart from pollution, commercial pilots have been insisting that a lake airport would be more hazardous than one located on land. The lake breeds local weather conditions that are far more dangerous than those found over land.

These perils to safe flying would be present regardless of whether the planes were landed by human pilots or sophisticated electronic equipment.

I am convinced that a lake airport would cause pollution—it would disturb the prevailing water currents—ultimately it would mean a highly commercialized lakefront area. All of these things, I think, outweigh the handiness of a lake airport.

I believe Mayor Daley would be well advised to give up the enormously costly lake airport concept, and instead agree to a land site.

In my opinion, any new airport should be located away from the city and there should be new mass transportation services between the airport and Chicago. It does not make sense to me to continue overcrowding Chicago's airspace and destroy its lakefront.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support

this amendment and urge Members to adopt their proposal.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today I was on the floor when the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) offered his amendment, and he engaged in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) on the subject matter just discussed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI). Let me say that a number of other States border Lake Michigan in addition to the State of Illinois. I think that the record should be clear at this point before any recommendation based on any report involving an airport in Lake Michigan is approved, that other States besides the State of Illinois will have something to say about it. We will, of course, await any report, recommendation, et cetera, but in the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, there are other States that have an interest in maintaining the integrity of Lake Michigan.

Of course, we must be consulted, and we must have our voice heard at the time that any recommendation is made for an airport in Lake Michigan that will primarily serve the city of Chicago.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, that neither NASA nor this committee is involved in any site selection of airports. This is not a line item in the budget, it is merely suggested in the committee report, and we accept the amendment to strike it out. It simply provides for a general feasibility study to include an examination of the concept throughout the Nation, but under the circumstances, the committee will accept, and as I understand it, the other side also accepts the amendment to strike out these funds for the feasibility study.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment that had to do with the personnel management problems. I have been particularly interested in that field.

The question has come up as to the number of permanent employees NASA has had on board during the last 3 years and what the strength will be in 1972.

The number of personnel positions in fiscal year 1970 was 32,576. That number included 31,350 permanent positions and 1,226 nonpermanent positions.

In this fiscal year, 1971, that total has been reduced from 32,576 to 30,908. Out of those positions there were 29,850 permanent and 1,058 temporary positions.

For the coming fiscal year, 1972, the Office of Management and Budget transmitted to our committee legislation to reduce personnel to 29,309 in NASA from 30,908 strength for the current fiscal year of 1971.

Then, because of my feeling that we were falling behind, and as the chairman of the committee cited a few moments ago, we noted that the average age is increasing in NASA and, therefore, we need a program to attract more younger people.

So, in the Office of Advanced Research and Technology where there was a total reduction of 533 positions proposed. My amendment put 500 of those positions back.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) pointed out on page 150 of the committee report concerning the programs at Ames Research Center, the Flight Research Center, the Langley Research Center, and the Lewis Research Center. The facts that he pointed out are correct. But overall it represents a cut.

The question comes up on the nonpermanent employees.

Mr. Chairman, the visitor information centers at NASA installations are really insufficient. If any of you have been down to a launch at Cape Kennedy, you would feel you were in a cattle barn or cattle pen. So, I put in \$4 million to help on those centers.

Likewise, in order to help the young people I have put in additional funds for more nonpermanent positions for summer employment. So, the number of permanent and nonpermanent employees is just as I have said, if you will look at pages 150 and 151 of the committee report you will find it spread out in detail.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just finished saying completely confirms what I said in answer to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I said it just before each of you started. I started at one point and you started at another, and your figures are correct as well as those which I have cited.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would like to call attention of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman in the well to page 135 of the report of the committee and the table which appears at the top of that page which indicates that even with the committee recommendation there is a decline of 1,000 in personnel for NASA, rather than an increase as the gentleman from North Carolina has indicated.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, I would simply add that the action of the committee, all it does is make a decrease of 1,000 in NASA personnel rather than 1,500 as contemplated.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is correct. The increase is 500.

Mr. JONAS. I think we are correct in

our understanding, and what I intended to say—and I will have to read the entire record to see if I said what I meant to say—is that the budget contemplated a reduction of 1,500 jobs, and that the committee's action has increased the number of jobs by 500. What the gentleman is saying now is that you restored 500 of the 1,500 jobs proposed to be reduced.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. And I listed the places at which the increases occurred.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In addition to that fact, we have an indefinite amount at the NASA reception centers which we have asked them to make plans to improve the conditions so that when visitors arrive at the facilities they can be taken care of. Also we can possibly get more public acceptance for the programs, and for the good these programs are doing for the general public. We feel this should be done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, so you are going to cut your cake in huger slices, you are still spending more money than you did last year.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. There is no doubt of that, because of the inflation factor of 5 percent, this bill is up in the amount of the rise in inflation. However, it does not take into consideration the inflation that may occur in the next year. Actually last year there is a deficit of 1 percent, because the rise in inflation for that year was almost 6 percent. So when we take into account the 5-percent inflation factor for last year, we will still not be taking into account the possible 5-percent increase for the coming year if inflation continues at its present rate. It is not so much the dollar amount as it is the purchasing power of the dollar. And this, of course, has the new pay raise in it. I hope the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service understand that all of the salaries are going up.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PEYSER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEYSER: Page 1, line (7) strike out "\$612,200,000," and insert in lieu thereof, "\$312,200,000."

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have watched with fascination and admiration the astounding success and accomplishments of our space program. I believe the United States should continue to play a leadership role in the exploration of space. The Apollo missions have yielded much in the way of new scientific discoveries and advancements in technology. I believe the space lab program that is planned in the future will also yield much in this direction.

In July of this year we are planning another manned space shot to the moon that will vastly increase our knowledge in these areas. As I have reviewed the

budget requests for the NASA program, and the gains that will presumably be made through the Apollo 15 moonshot, I have serious doubts in my mind as to the wisdom in the light of present-day circumstances in our country to continue with two additional manned moonshots; namely, Apollo 16 and Apollo 17.

I feel it will take us years to be able to assimilate the knowledge that has been gained through the previous moonshots, and particularly the knowledge that will be gained from Apollo 15.

We have done much talking and thinking in this Congress dealing with priorities. It is for this reason that I am recommending an amendment to reduce the NASA authorization by \$300 million. This \$300 million would come from the Apollo 16 and 17 moonshots.

We are now faced nationally with a pressing need to develop new and better methods of mass transportation. The problems of urban mass transit are overwhelming. It includes everything from obsolete and unsafe equipment now in use to inadequate funding authority under the Urban Mass Transit Act. I would like to urge that the savings realized by the termination of these two shots could be directed in the area of mass transportation.

I do support the moving ahead in the space program of other missions, such as I mentioned previously, the space lab.

There are those who may argue that the cancellation of the Apollo 16 and Apollo 17 would be wasteful because we have already incurred the expense of developing the hardware for those flights.

First of all, there is no reason why this equipment cannot be placed in standby storage and, second, we in the United States are constantly seeking ways to improve international relations and to bring about peace and closer harmony among all nations.

I would like to suggest that we make our surplus Apollo hardware available for an international space mission to the moon with the other countries that want to join us in contributing to the actual cost involved in these flights, and we will have already contributed the cost of the hardware.

Once again, let me state I offer this amendment as no criticism of the space program but merely as a way of evaluating whether we are to proceed in the last two missions of the Apollo program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to reduce or to limit the Apollo 16 and Apollo 17 flights.

The fiscal year 1972 budget request includes \$612.2 million for Apollo and \$535.4 million for Skylab. This budget is based on our current plan to launch Apollo 15 in July 1971, Apollo 16 in March 1972, Apollo 17 in December 1972 and the initial Skylab mission in April 1973. The April 1973 date for Skylab was established to provide for a reasonable flow of operations at KSC in the phase-over from Apollo to Skylab operations. Consistent with these launch schedule decisions, we have adjusted our Skylab hardware delivery schedule planning. If a de-

cision were made at this point to delete Apollo missions, it would not be possible to accelerate the Skylab schedule more than 2 or 3 months at the most, providing for the initial Skylab mission in January 1973.

The fiscal year 1972 budget estimate of \$612.2 million for Apollo provides for requirements unique to the Apollo program and for operational and supporting activities common to Skylab and Apollo. The Skylab estimate of \$535.4 million covers requirements specifically identified as Sky-lab program requirements on the assumption that the common requirements will be covered by Apollo.

If the Apollo 16 and 17 missions were canceled, it would be necessary to maintain the operational capability for Saturn V launch vehicle and the command and service module which is currently sustained in the Apollo program. It is our estimate that under these circumstances, a net reduction of not more than \$100 million in fiscal year 1972 funding could be made. This reduction would be accomplished by: first, terminating those activities specifically relating to lunar missions such as the lunar science efforts, lunar module support at Grumman and KSC, and lunar mission planning and training activities; and second, phasing down activities planned to support Apollo missions but also required to support Skylab such as Saturn V and CSM checkout and flight support, mission control, and launch operations.

A reduction of \$300 million in Apollo would require not only the cancellation of Apollo 16 and 17 but also the termination or a major readjustment in the Skylab project.

Mr. Chairman, I include an excerpt from National Academy of Sciences "Priorities for Space Research 1971-1980:

1. Completion of all remaining Apollo missions through Apollo 19 (since this study Apollo 15 and Apollo 19 have been canceled) should take highest priority in the space program. The Apollo program has made a good start. The richness of scientific data obtained has provided important constraints for redefining old questions and for asking significant new ones, but a better sampling program and a broader geophysical net are needed to resolve those questions. As only eight landings will have been made, if all remaining missions are completed successfully, the loss of any missions will seriously degrade the baseline for future lunar and other planetary exploration—especially the later missions with longer stay-times and extravehicular work and with more complete instrument packages. Several factors make it seem improbable to us that Apollo can be interrupted and successfully restarted later. To abbreviate further, or to postpone, a program so fruitful, so well conceived, and with so much promise for resolving fundamental questions would, in our opinion, be irresponsible.

As the gentleman mentioned, it would be fine for providing international cooperation. But this is not particularly appealing to foreign countries because they are interested in the post Apollo programs and the space shuttle program. They plan to put their money into those programs.

Furthermore, the gentleman has no idea that we can make a commitment here today. As has already been pointed out, if this money is eliminated, it will

not be used for programs that he feels it should be used for such as mass transit, drugs or some of the other programs regardless of the merits of those programs.

We have already purchased the hardware and the equipment is ready to fly these missions and the flight training has already begun. If the decision was made at this time to delete these further Apollo missions, it would not be possible to accelerate the Skylab program more than possibly 2 or 3 months to fill the vacuum that would be left in the manned space flight program.

It is necessary that NASA retain the operational capacity to launch the Saturn vehicle, particularly the command and service module which will be used in the Skylab program. Here we would have a gap and a layoff at the Kennedy Space Center as well as at the Grumman plant in New York of several thousands of people who need to be retained in order that we keep the launch capability in tact. These people must remain as proficient as possible for safety.

The only result or savings that would occur would probably be less than \$100 million. Plus, when the Skylab comes along, we would have start up costs again in order to have these launch crews and the other tracking and data necessary for the support of the Skylab program.

I do not think it would be wise to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It would only cost more money in the long run to close out these two flights.

I should also point out that two flights have already been closed out. These are very essential flights.

I have information that I would like to quote from the National Academy of Sciences.

They say:

To abbreviate further, or to postpone, a program so fruitful, so well conceived, and with so much promise for resolving fundamental questions would, in our opinion, be irresponsible.

This is from the National Academy of Sciences—the academic and scientific community all over the country is very much interested in this program.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to congratulate the gentleman on his excellent and well thought out statement. Furthermore, I would like to make this statement. Congressman "Tiger" TEAGUE of Texas, the senior member of the majority on the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, and I have discussed the risk to astronauts as a result of postponements. We have had that as a factor in our judgments. We have found that the safety risk to astronauts as a result of postponements of 1 week or several weeks goes up astronomically, really geometrically, if we do not continue according to plan.

Second, if we take into consideration the factors of the obsolescence of material in the various components, fittings and bolts, there is a tremendous loss of capability. For example, there are 5,500,000 parts which have to function perfectly on each one of these Apollo flights.

There is a great loss in reliability in this respect as a result of postponements. I say that for both Congressman TEAGUE and myself in appealing for our astronauts and their safety.

Likewise we should consider the benefits being desired from the Apollo program.

Sixteen major experiments were set up on the surface of the moon. These experiments were designed to advance man's understanding of the environment in which the planet Earth exists. The objectives of the experiments were to seek the Earth's origin.

As an example of the experiments set up, the laser reflector experiment enables scientists to improve knowledge of the earth-moon distance to a precision of 15 to 30 centimeters. This experiment is vital to the understanding of earthquakes on the surface of the earth. Another experiment is the helium measurement experiment designed to compare the amount of helium in the solar wind with the helium contained in the moon surface material. This information will improve the understanding of the evolution of the sun throughout history.

Advanced photographic technology pioneered under the Apollo program is now used to pinpoint sources of air and water pollution precisely and quickly.

The TV cameras developed for Apollo are used to monitor complicated industrial processes. Sensors used to record the bodily functions of our astronauts are now used in the intensive care units of our hospitals.

The materials developed for the space suits used by the astronauts are now being used for recreational and emergency clothing and sleepwear.

Certain of the foods developed for the astronauts are now marketed commercially as a recommended dietary supplement.

These examples represent only a handful of the total number of directly identifiable spinoffs from the Apollo program.

Man as the astronaut has shown that no machine has yet been produced with the intelligence, experience, judgment, and physical mobility of man. Man has clearly demonstrated himself to be the most highly sophisticated data-sensing, data-gathering, and data-processing device in existence. Furthermore, man with his proven ability to discriminate and assess has provided a significantly higher rate of essential and meaningful data than any unmanned space-borne missions.

One of the most fundamental examples of man's contributions in this Nation's exploration of the moon was the saving of the Apollo 14 mission by the astronaut team. The entire fate of this \$400 million mission hinged on the ability of man to overcome faulty mechanisms and touchdown in safety. As an unmanned remote control mission, Apollo 14 would have failed.

In terms of the crew's other accomplishments, the geographical area covered, the scientific instruments set up, the experiments performed, no robot will be able to duplicate before the turn of the century.

Man has demonstrated himself as a highly effective space experimenter. His value is that he is motivated, he is goal-

oriented. When he is impeded he creates, evaluates, and pursues an alternative. Finally, man is creative and innovative, a capability which even the most complex of equipment is unable to challenge.

One of the most significant benefits of the Apollo program has been the reputation this country has gained from the accomplishment of our moon program. The United States now has the reputation as the foremost leader in the field of advanced research and technology. This reputation is now directed into an increased cooperation with the nations throughout the world in the pursuit of advanced scientific and technological programs. Our Apollo program has also contributed significantly to a greater peace throughout the world and an increased understanding among peoples. Two of the events which are best recollected in our Apollo program are the Christmas 1968 flight of Apollo 8 around the moon and the July 1969 Apollo 11 landing on the surface of the moon. Both these times there was a tremendous uplift of the human spirit throughout the world. For one brief moment the people of the earth did not think in terms of nationality or race. Rather men thought in terms of men like themselves being able to accomplish this marvelous feat. People were brought together as they had not been brought together for decades.

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is well meant. His concern with mass transit needs is an important matter that deserves the attention of the Congress. But I think it must be clear to all of us the fact that we might cut out money from the authorization does not mean that mass transit would get more than what it would otherwise get from the Congress.

The point is that we on the committee have greatly reduced the number of Apollo flights.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. WYDLER. The point is now, if we do not have these two Apollo flights, the manned space flight program of the United States of America will come to an end. So we had better consider that when we vote on the amendment. I urge that it be defeated.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. Certainly nothing in the amendment would affect the safety of the astronauts, for whom I have as high a regard as anyone in the Congress. However, looking at the reports from NASA as to what is to be gained scientifically in shots 16 and 17, this is where I ques-

tion the value of what would really happen. Apollo 15, according to the report that I have, and Apollo 16 are basically going to be performing the same function. At this time I question the wisdom of continuing that kind of program.

Mr. FUQUA. I would like to point out to the gentleman from New York that the National Academy of Science and the scientific community all over the country have urged very strongly that we do not eliminate any further flights.

Furthermore, as to the safety of our astronauts, I think we are at a minimum launch schedule now where our launch crews can remain alerted and on their toes, so to speak.

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

(Upon request of Mr. Gross, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The argument that is being made in behalf of these two additional Apollo flights sounds to me like a rerun of the SST, and the same old scarecrows have been telling us that the world is going to come to an end if we do not make two more flights in addition to the one in July to the moon. I do not buy it at all.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa if he was not referring to the British-French SST in his remarks?

Mr. FUQUA. I would like to point out to the gentleman from New York that in order to realize the maximum on the investment we made in this program, these additional flights will assure us of maximum utilization of our resources.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and I would like to bring to his attention some of the things that are going to be done.

The last three Apollo missions are the most sophisticated and comprehensive of the entire series. A whole new array of exploration procedures and instrumental concepts open new opportunities for research on the moon to scientists from all over the world. A total of 62 surface and orbital experiments will be conducted on the Apollo 15 to 17 missions. Of these, 18 will be new experiments. In addition, three new photographic tasks will be conducted from lunar orbit, and these tasks will be performed on each mission. Changes in the LM and lunar surface hardware will allow the astronauts to remain on the lunar surface for up to 66 hours; the landed scientific payload will be doubled to approximately 1,000 pounds; and the range and efficiency of surface operations will be increased through improved suit mobility, im-

proved life support system, and a lunar roving vehicle.

Findings from the widely separated landings can then be tied together and fitted into a total picture of the moon.

Apollo 15 and 17 missions will each deliver small, self-powered subsatellites to lunar orbit. The subsatellites will monitor the variation of magnetic fields and interplanetary-charged particle streams in the vicinity of the moon to determine the electrical body properties of the moon and infer internal physical characteristics. The sub-satellites are equipped with transponders which will provide for refinement and extension of mass concentration and mass deficiency data.

Of particular interest in the latter missions is the increased surface mobility which will be provided to the astronauts by the lunar roving vehicle.

A new experiment to be employed during this mission will be the heat flow experiment which will be placed in holes drilled about 10 feet into the surface. The measurement of heat flow from the interior of the moon is a fundamental geophysical measurement needed to interpret the present internal constitution of the moon as well as its history and evolution. This experiment was originally scheduled on Apollo 13. In addition, another passive seismometer and magnetometer, both of which will provide information about the interior of the moon, along with several instruments that analyze the lunar atmosphere will be deployed to continue the establishment of an instrument network on the moon.

A lunar sounder and lunar seismic profiling experiment will be flown on Apollo 17. Data analysis from the Apollo 12 seismometer implies that moonquakes are analogous to earthquakes generated by slippage, but they always appear to slip in the same direction. This is very likely caused by a source of strain accumulating within the moon and being released by the additional tidal forces that occur at the time of close earth-moon proximity. At present, scientists can only speculate as to the source of strain. Further data from the lunar seismic profiling experiment may provide a clearer insight into this phenomenon.

Since Apollo 16 and 17 are planned as the last opportunities in this decade for manned exploration of the moon by this country, it is important for the Nation to obtain the greatest possible scientific returns from these flights. This rescheduling of Apollo launches increases the interval between missions and a delicate balance must be maintained between the launch intervals and the scientific returns from these flights. Operational efficiency and safety are directly related and depend on a launch rate sufficient to maintain an effective level of competence in the Apollo team. The new Apollo schedule maintains this delicate balance while allowing the scientific returns to be expanded.

By way of conclusion I should now like to ask the gentleman a question. We have spent \$164 million on this Apollo program equipment. This equipment is ready to fly. What are we going to do with it, after we have built it? We have spent 75 percent of the money allocated for the

spacecraft. On the Saturn V, all the money is spent; \$186 million. What are we going to do with these vehicles? Shall we put them in the Smithsonian Institution?

This equipment is ready to go. Even the operations money is partially spent. The savings on this would be minimum.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to answer?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. I believe the equipment we presently have, the hardware, for Apollo 16 and 17, can be stored. There is an improvement, I believe, on the past storage.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. What are we going to do with the equipment and the men who are trained and standing by down at the cape?

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

(On request of Mr. PEYSER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PRICE of Texas was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

I would like to see the space program move forward, but what I would like to have clarified is the experiments that you indicated. Which one of those is involved in Apollo 15, which I do support the launch being carried out on, and those of Apollo 16. The listing I have shows practically all of the same experiments on 15 and 16, and it is not until you get to Apollo No. 17 that they start talking about sounding the signals which are bounced off the moon's surface. So I am wondering if that can be clarified also.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Many of the experiments are of the same type, but the answer is that the moon is one-sixth of the size of the earth. If you pick up the elephant's tail, that is not the elephant. We have to study the moon in great depth.

The second point is that we have had so many promising leads on the core material of the moon. The core is the substance which has been drilled out of the moon's surface. When this material comes in contact with staphylococcus germs, which are the greatest killers on earth, the material has a strong antibiotic effect. We may be able in the future to stop a great deal of our bacteria growth here on earth through the use of antibiotics from the moon. This discovery is indicative of many of the things we are learning. The question then is if we cut Apollo's 16 and 17, as the proponents' amendment says, we have no back-up whatsoever for Apollo 15. We would have eliminated all further Apollo flights.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FREY. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman, and also point out several additional things. To begin with, we have a gap in our manned space flight program of 4 to 8 years. If we were to cancel Apollo's 16 and 17, we would be virtually eliminating

our manned space program. The cost of ever starting up again would be phenomenal.

Second, the gentleman from New York said he was very much interested in the Skylab program. Some of the money he proposes to cut is directed toward the Skylab program and to keep the team intact. If you cut this money, we will be at the point where we will be canceling Skylab. I know you do not want to do that.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PRICE of Texas was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FREY. I would like to make one last point. The gentleman from New York is talking about storing equipment. This is possible, and we have looked into the cost. The storage costs are considerable when you talk of storing this kind of equipment.

It also costs a great deal to put it into storage and then to remove it from storage at some future time, so we are not saving much money by this proposal.

But what concerns me is not so much the matter of storage of mechanical vehicles. I am concerned about the people involved, the human resources. We have a space program which has been cut from 440,000 down to 144,000 people. These people are being stretched to the breaking point and in my area in Florida I know there are personnel problems, morale problems. If we keep stretching it out, I feel we will be jeopardizing the well-being of the entire space program as well as the very lives of our astronauts. I therefore vehemently oppose this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, finally I would like to state that all the flight hardware has been developed and built and is essentially ready to launch. If we stop this program now, we will save at most \$75 to \$100 million, but you will have \$1 billion worth of hardware and human resources which will have been scrapped.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for several reasons. First of all, let me say, I think the answer to the gentleman's inquiry about the similarity of experiments should be to indicate that the similarity of experiments are proposed by NASA on purpose and not by accident. The reason for that, of course, is because Apollo 15, 16, and 17 will be landing at different locations. It is important to conduct some identical experiments in different locations on the surface to see whether you get the same identical results or get a different result. That is why the intended purpose is not valid. It is extremely important that some identical experiments are, in fact, carried on two of the three remaining flights.

Now, let me say, Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, I think it is fashionable today to try to find some place to cut the budget and be able to go back home and say that you have saved some of the hard earned taxpayers' dollars. I think this is particularly true because the space pro-

gram is the least well understood program by the public and it is therefore, a favorite target.

It is also true, and I agree with my colleagues from New York who say that we need more housing, that we need more hospitals, that we need efficient mass transportation systems, that we need more efficient pollution control systems and devices and more adequate health care, and probably a lot more. However, I want to say this, we will never get those things by cutting the heart out of this Nation's primary scientific and technological advancement program. In fact, if you want to guarantee that you will never have those things, you just cut out the scientific and technological programs and in my judgment at least—and I think most professionals agree with it—the most significant of these is the space program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think our colleagues ought to understand well that there has never been a nation in the history of human life, to my knowledge at least, that has educated its young, fed, housed, and clothed its people unless it has spent a lot of money on scientific and technological advancement.

I have found that the two are inseparable; that is, economic development on the one hand and scientific and technological development on the other. You cannot have one without having a great deal of the other also.

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

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

Mr. PEYSER. One point I want to make is the fact that we simply are not trying to save the taxpayers much on this by picking on the space program. What I am trying to do is to remove money from this program, \$300 million, out of a recommended authorization of \$3,400 million. I am trying to bring that money back into another area, with \$300 million still left in the Apollo program which is sufficient to continue the carry-over of the personnel involved.

Mr. KARTH. I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman's statement, but I do not agree with the gentleman. First of all, the gentleman's arithmetic is wrong. The gentleman has indicated his support of the so-called Skylab program, but about \$150 million of his amendment would have to come from the Skylab program. The best estimates I have and our studies in the committee have indicated, that the cost associated with completing flights 16 and 17 is about \$150 million. The other \$150 million contained in the gentleman's amendment has to come out of the Skylab program that he indicates he supports. I do not say it would do irreparable harm to the Skylab program, but it would have a serious adverse effect on it.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I might say that it is not out of the Skylab program.

Mr. KARTH. I want to assure the gentleman from New York that my information comes from the studies of the committee and by the agency itself and it is estimated that \$150 million is required to complete Apollo 16 and 17. If your

amendment would delete \$300 million, then \$150 million will have to come out of the Skylab program.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by stating that this program is the heart and soul, if you will, of our Nation's space program. There have been many nations in the world, including countries on the African, the Asiatic and the South American Continents where they have done little or no scientific and technological advancement.

As a result, 80 percent of their people are ill housed.

Not only do they not have mass transportation, they have little if any transportation at all.

While 95 percent of our people are literate, 95 percent of theirs are not.

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

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

Mr. KARTH. While 85 or 90 percent of our people have a reasonable and acceptable diet, 85 or 90 percent of their people have not.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am saying let us not destroy the goose that laid the golden egg. Let us not cut off our noses to spite our face.

This is a very important program. It is the heart and the guts and the soul, if I may use that expression, of this country's scientific and technological advancement. Mr. Chairman, I recommend that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) for raising a very important question, and for making a very valuable suggestion. I think the concept, for the future, of making our manned space program part of an international program, is a very, very worthwhile suggestion, but I think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is ill timed, and that the gentleman has chosen the wrong target. You cannot solve this problem of priorities with a shotgun. You need a rifle.

The chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee would undoubtedly testify that no one has been more vociferous than I have, as a member of the committee, on the question of priorities, and the question of whether, in the light of our grave national problems, we can afford to spend money on some of the programs that are in this budget.

But I support the budget as reported out by the committee. It was a unanimous report. I still have some grave misgivings on certain proposals adopted: Whether as a matter of priority, for example, we should spend up to almost \$1 billion in making an exploration of the outer planets. But we made a very serious and a very thorough examination of this. We had a very thorough discussion of it. I think that the committee is generally satisfied that we are on the right track. However, I think we certainly should scrutinize this program and one or two others very carefully again next year.

I am also very well aware of the problems of the cities. I have made changing our national priorities one of my principal concerns in Congress. And of course I sympathize with the feelings of the gentleman from Iowa. I voted against the SST as a matter of priorities. But if we are going to move ahead, and if we are going to have a manned space program and a skylab, this amendment is not going to save any money at all. It is going to cost more money in the end.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) even though I share the gentleman's concern about changing our priorities, and about promoting an international manned space program.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) which would cut \$300 million from the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I as much as anyone enjoy the thrill every American feels when we send men out into space to explore its unknown wonders. Space exploration certainly has its place in our research endeavors. However, I do not enjoy seeing the faltering transportation systems we have here on earth. Nor do I enjoy seeing little children destroy their lives through heroin addiction.

Over 10 years ago, President Kennedy announced a national commitment to put a man on the moon. The money was allocated and the goal sought was won. President Nixon too has announced national goals ranging from the conquest of cancer to improving the quality of life in America. Just 2 days ago on national television he announced another goal—a commitment to erradicate the drug abuse epidemic in our land.

How, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, can the President expect to accomplish these goals if he does not allocate our scarce tax dollars to pay for them? It is therefore up to us here in Congress to cut the fat from those programs whose usefulness is less in light of the needs of other more urgent programs.

This amendment will not kill the space program. It will merely slow it down to a more reasoned pace consistent with our national priorities. It will postpone Apollo 16 and 17 so that the funds allocated can be used for improving our mass transit systems or setting up a drug addict rehabilitation program of curing cancer.

These goals are important—far more important than our space exploration effort at this time. Our cities are choked with gas fumes and too many cars, because we have not developed a viable mass transit system both within and between urban centers. Our children are turning on with drugs in ever increasing numbers, because we do not have the money to set up education and rehabilitation programs. And cancer continues to take its toll in lives every day, unabated by a cure that is only a few million dollars away.

I sincerely hope that the majority of my colleagues will vote in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ABZUG

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ABZUG: On page 1, line 8, strike "\$745,275,000" and insert "\$620,275,000."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, did the previous amendment deal with any portion of this money?

The previous amendment set the overall amount. Is any portion of the money covered by this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), upon which the committee just voted, and which was rejected, referred to line 7 of page 1. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) refers to line 8 on page 1, "Space flight operations."

Mrs. ABZUG. It is only as to line 8, page 1; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) applies only to line 8 of page 1.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) that the NASA authorization bill represents much that is wrong with this country and epitomizes the faulty system of priorities that is tearing this country apart.

We will be voting on a \$3½ billion bill for space programs which is \$162 million more than even the administration requested. There is included in this package authorization \$745 million for space flight operations, consisting of a space shuttle system and a sky station.

The \$125 million expenditure for the space shuttle system cannot be justified on economic grounds. Furthermore, the whole argument and discussion of the committee here today indicates that the committee is moving in the direction of phasing out the manned space program.

For what is a space shuttle program but a vehicle by which to increase extravagant manned space programs.

I find it very interesting, listening to the arguments by the various members of the committee, but it is really ludicrous to suggest that because one quarrels with the nature of the space program and the allocation of our funds that we are not in favor of scientific and technological development.

I would like to see a great deal of our money and energy utilized to find a scientific and technological way to wipe out disease, provide better shelter, eliminate hunger, and educate our young. On April

7, we decided that \$728 million was too large an investment to make to insure the proper educational development of our Nation's young. How can we today, in good conscience, authorize \$745 million for an extravagant and apparently economically impractical space project?

Apparently, the Rand Corp. report indicated that the shuttle will only be cost effective if we fund a very expanded space program. Today, we are only asking for \$125 million. The Rand Corp. and others have estimated that the program will cost a minimum of \$12 billion as a starter, and if we fund the more extravagant program we must be prepared to commit at least \$75 billion.

I think the Congress should oppose this bill before we find ourselves in the same position we found ourselves in on the production of the SST and the same position we found ourselves in on the Apollo flights which has been discussed.

It seems to me that one issue here that has not been made clear by the committee, which is about to commit this Congress and the people of this country to tremendous billions of dollars of expenditures is—why should we want to spend money for a shuttle system when we are talking about lowering the effort for manned space activities?

There is no question about the fact that this country through the program being funded here today will go on to make progress with respect to space and the utilization of light weight instrumental flights without man. I am not addressing myself to that subject because we do not need a shuttle system for that. A shuttle system should only be considered for a situation in which you visualize heavy traffic and a heavy payload but the costs of utilizing existing manned launch for this purpose would be prohibitive.

I object to much in this space program. But I have tried very hard to listen to the argumentation presented by those on the committee for the last several hours to see if there can be any justification whatsoever for our making another extravagant expenditure of billions of dollars in the space shuttle.

As a matter of fact, you have argued, I think, effectively against the inclusion of the space shuttle.

I am not only addressing myself to the \$125 million but to the billions of dollars that are going to come after this when you all holler, "It is too late, we have already put the money in and we might as well go on with it."

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all the Members of the Congress to vote to delete this expenditure of the \$125 million and to support the amendment that I have offered.

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

The Rand Corp., which the gentleman mentioned, is in my district at Santa Monica. I can say right here that the Rand Corp. report is not official. The facts in that report are not agreed to by NASA; they are not agreed to by the Air Force. The general report to which she has referred is an independent report made by individuals in Rand, but it is not accepted as authentic or reliable.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the space shuttle.

As I pointed out earlier today, the maintenance of an orderly program in space is vital to our Nation's present and future interests.

And if we are to continue in space, a less costly launch system is essential.

We must replace the present "Throw the can away" type of expendable chemical boosters with a reusable transportation vehicle.

The shuttle will not be another spacecraft.

It will be a space transporter.

We are embarking into the age of space transportation.

The shuttle will itself carry spacecraft and men into orbit, returning to earth for another payload.

This reusable feature will allow a tenfold reduction in payload launch costs, from \$1,000 per pound to \$100.

Other cost savings will result from the ability to repair or retrieve orbiting satellites—instead of sacrificing an entire mission simply because of a minor defect.

The long leadtime required for development of the shuttle demands that we begin now.

We cannot afford to wake up a decade hence facing the reality of an obsolete and overly expensive space capability.

We cannot afford to lose the returns on our space investments whose value here on earth will be immeasurable.

And we cannot afford the risk of being second rate, in an ever smaller world—a world containing other nations which would surely achieve by our default an overwhelming superiority in space.

If we fail to approve the shuttle now, a future change of heart would be an empty gesture.

We would have lost our opportunity.

To cripple the space program now, to discard the chance to reap the benefits of space technology would be tragically shortsighted.

To ignore the very real military potential would be disastrous.

Mr. Chairman, the space shuttle is a necessary program.

It is a cost effective program.

I urge that it be approved by my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. WRIGHT, 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. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 438, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on

the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 303, nays 64, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—303

Abbutt	de la Garza	Howard
Adams	Delaney	Hull
Addabbo	Denholm	Hunt
Alexander	Dennis	Jacobs
Anderson,	Derwinski	Johnson, Calif.
Calif.	Dickinson	Johnson, Pa.
Andrews, Ala.	Dingell	Jones, Ala.
Andrews,	Donohue	Jones, N.C.
N. Dak.	Dorn	Jones, Tenn.
Archer	Dowdy	Karth
Arends	Downing	Kastenmeier
Ashley	Drinan	Kazen
Aspinall	Duncan	Keating
Baker	du Pont	Kee
Baring	Eckhardt	King
Barrett	Edmondson	Kluczynski
Begich	Edwards, Ala.	Kuykendall
Belcher	Edwards, Calif.	Kyros
Bell	Esch	Landrum
Bennett	Eshleman	Lent
Bergland	Evans, Colo.	Link
Betts	Fascell	Lloyd
Bevill	Fish	Long, Md.
Biaggi	Fisher	Lujan
Blester	Flood	McCloskey
Blackburn	Foley	McClure
Blanton	Ford, Gerald R.	McCormack
Blatnik	Ford,	McEwen
Boland	William D.	McFall
Bolling	Forsythe	McKay
Bow	Fountain	McKevitt
Brademas	Frey	McKinney
Brasco	Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald,
Brinkley	Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.
Brooks	Fuqua	Madden
Broomfield	Gallfianakis	Mailliard
Brotzman	Garmatz	Mann
Brown, Mich.	Gaydos	Martin
Brown, Ohio	Gettys	Mathias, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Meeds
Burke, Fla.	Grasso	Michel
Burke, Mass.	Gray	Miller, Calif.
Burton	Green, Oreg.	Mills, Ark.
Byrne, Pa.	Griffin	Mills, Md.
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	Minshall
Byron	Grover	Montgomery
Cabell	Gubser	Moorhead
Caffery	Gude	Morgan
Camp	Hagan	Morse
Carter	Haley	Mosher
Casey, Tex.	Hall	Moss
Cederberg	Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.
Celler	Hammer-	Murphy, N.Y.
Chamberlain	schmidt	Natcher
Chappell	Hanley	Nedzi
Clausen,	Hansen, Idaho	Nichols
Don H.	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara
Cleveland	Harrington	O'Neill
Collins, Tex.	Earsha	Patten
Colmer	Hastings	Pelly
Conable	Hathaway	Pepper
Conte	Hawkins	Perkins
Corman	Hechler, W. Va.	Pettis
Cotter	Heckler, Mass.	Peyster
Coughlin	Holstoski	Pickle
Crane	Hicks, Mass.	Pike
Daniel, Va.	Hicks, Wash.	Pirnie
Daniels, N.J.	Hillis	Poage
Danielson	Hogan	Podell
Davis, Ga.	Hollifield	Poff
Davis, S.C.	Horton	Powell
Davis, Wis.	Hosmer	Preyer, N.C.

Price, Ill.	Schwengel	Van Deerlin
Price, Tex.	Scott	Vander Jagt
Pryor, Ark.	Sebelius	Vanik
Pucinski	Seiberling	Veysey
Quie	Shriver	Vigorito
Rangel	Sisk	Waggoner
Rarick	Smith, Calif.	Wampler
Rees	Smith, Iowa	Ware
Reid, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	Watts
Reid, N.Y.	Springer	Whalley
Reuss	Stafford	White
Rhodes	Stanton,	Whitten
Roberts	James V.	Widnall
Robinson, Va.	Steed	Wiggins
Robison, N.Y.	Steele	Williams
Rodino	Steiger, Ariz.	Wilson, Bob
Roe	Steiger, Wis.	Wilson,
Rogers	Stephens	Charles H.
Roncalio	Stubblefield	Winn
Rooney, Pa.	Sullivan	Wolf
Rostenkowski	Talcott	Wright
Roush	Taylor	Wydler
Rousselot	Teague, Calif.	Wylie
Roybal	Terry	Wyman
St Germain	Thompson, Ga.	Yates
Sandman	Thompson, N.J.	Yatron
Sarbanes	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Fla.
Satterfield	Thone	Young, Tex.
Scherle	Tiernan	Zablocki
Scheuer	Udall	Zion
Schmitz	Ullman	

NAYS—64

Abernethy	Gross	Myers
Abourezk	Halpern	Nelsen
Abzug	Henderson	Nix
Aspin	Hungate	Obey
Badillo	Hutchinson	O'Konski
Bingham	Jonas	Rallsback
Broyhill, N.C.	Keith	Randall
Burlison, Mo.	Koch	Riegle
Carey, N.Y.	Kyl	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Landgrebe	Roy
Clancy	Latta	Ruth
Clay	Lennon	Ryan
Collier	McCollister	Saylor
Dellenback	Mayne	Schneebell
Dellums	Mazzoli	Skubitz
Dow	Melcher	Slack
Eilberg	Mikva	Snyder
Findley	Miller, Ohio	Stokes
Fraser	Minish	Wyatt
Frenzel	Mitchell	Zwach
Goodling	Mizell	
Green, Pa.	Mollohan	

NOT VOTING—66

Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Mink
Anderson,	Frelinghuysen	Monagan
Tenn.	Gallagher	Passman
Annunzio	Giamò	Patman
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Purcell
Boggs	Hanna	Quillen
Bray	Harvey	Rooney, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Hays	Runnels
Carney	Hébert	Ruppe
Clark	Ichord	Shipley
Clawson, Del.	Jarman	Shoup
Collins, Ill.	Kemp	Sikes
Conyers	Leggett	Spence
Culver	Long, La.	Staggers
Dent	McClory	Stanton,
Devine	McCulloch	J. William
Diggs	McDade	Stratton
Dulski	McDonald,	Stuckey
Dwyer	Mich.	Symington
Edwards, La.	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Erlenborn	Mahon	Waldie
Evins, Tenn.	Mathis, Ga.	Whalen
Flowers	Metcalfe	Whitehurst

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Dwyer, with Mr. McDonald against.
Mr. Goldwater for, with Mr. Shoup against.
Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Giamo with Mr. J. William Stanton.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Whitehurst.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Flower.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Carney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 461) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 461

Resolved, That Mendel J. Davis, of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Science and Astronautics.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority whip the program for the rest of today, if any, and the program for tomorrow.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. With the conclusion of consideration of the bill just passed, that ends the legislation for today. At the request of the chairman H.R. 7960 will put over until Monday next.

For Friday there is scheduled to be considered the legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972. That will complete the week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, that is the only bill up tomorrow, and we expect to move on it with dispatch?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to advise the membership that if the Committee on Rules hears us next week and grants the rule which we will ask on H.R. 1, which is the welfare and social security amendments of 1971—after consultation with the Speaker, the majority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), and the gentleman, and others—we hope to bring that bill to the House floor on Wednesday, June 16, and to complete debate and consideration of the bill for final passage on June 17, which will be Thursday.

I make this announcement because many Members have asked me about it.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently that means the gentleman is going to seek another closed rule on the bill and conclude the debate on it in one day, or something like that?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There will be 2 days of debate.

Mr. GROSS. Two days of debate, and then you vote it up or down.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Well, the bill amends every title of the Social Security Act in some form, I think. It amends the Internal Revenue Code, so that amendments to both the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code would, under an open rule, be germane.

Mr. GROSS. Would that be bad if there were some amendments to it?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am sure my friend would agree with me that he would want to pass the bill before the 4th of July.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know why.

PROBLEM OF DRUG ADDICTION AMONG MILITARY SERVICEMEN

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in his press conference Tuesday night, President Nixon spoke at some length on the problem of drug addiction, particularly as it is reaching epidemic proportions among military servicemen.

The President referred to this menace

as a "problem of the highest priority" and promised to "give it the highest priority attention at all levels." He called for a "national offensive" including a "program of treating the addicts."

The President reported that he would be meeting today with the Secretary of Defense, the three service Secretaries, and the three heads of the armed services to discuss Federal activities in this regard.

Surely an excellent place to start in providing meaningful treatment for the pitiful victims of narcotics, many of them returning to civilian life from the armed services, would be to expand the Fort Worth Public Health Service Hospital and open its facilities and its treatment for use by the Veterans' Administration in treating veterans who have become hooked on hard drugs. Surely the country owes these men a chance to be rehabilitated.

As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and I have pointed out several times on the House floor, the Fort Worth facility is the only such institution with a capacity for this type of treatment which the Public Health Service operates anywhere west of the Mississippi. It is one of only two in the United States.

The idea of developing a broad network of locally based community clinics to treat this horrible addiction is still only an idea. As we have heretofore documented, the community-based clinics do not exist. The need is now. It is urgent and it is growing.

In face of the enormity of this problem, and in light of the President's own words, it would seem both cruelly ironic and hypocritical to close out this facility at this time, as recommended earlier by the Public Health Service.

If we are to translate words into deeds, we need not only this full facility and it expanded, but several more of its type throughout the country.

NEW AMERICAN POLICY FOR VIETNAM

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1969, President Nixon outlined a new American policy for Vietnam. It involved the withdrawal of American troops on a gradual basis, the strengthening of the armed forces of South Vietnam, and a renewed effort to negotiate an end to the war.

In a speech on the floor of the House on November 24, 1969, I indicated my support for the President's policy. At that time, I said:

The President's policy of disengagement, of reduction in the American presence, is designed precisely to permit the South Vietnamese people to take their destiny into their own hands. It should be clear to everyone that our policy has changed and we are on the road to withdrawal. Certainly, the leaders of South Vietnam, and those who aspire to that leadership, realize that the days of dependence on and subservience to the Americans are coming to an end.

On December 1, 1969, I participated in the debate on a hastily drawn resolution,

reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee without any hearings and brought to the floor under a closed rule which prevented amendments. The language of the resolution was vague, and I felt it was necessary to explain my vote. I said:

I feel that the central consideration in the President's program is his intention to withdraw American troops in an orderly and gradual manner and to turn the war and the future of Vietnam back into the hands of the Vietnamese people. This is not even mentioned in this Resolution pending before us today. It should be the central theme so that no one can mistake our understanding of U.S. policy. The President has stated that he is taking America out of the war in Vietnam, and this is the policy I endorse. It is regrettable that it is not clearly expressed in the Resolution.

Also the Resolution should not be interpreted as advance approval for future decisions on Vietnam. In all probability, I will be voting to approve the Resolution on final passage, and I do not want my vote interpreted as anything but support for the announced intention of the U.S. to conduct an orderly withdrawal from Vietnam. Only if future decisions implement this policy can House Resolution 613 be considered as an endorsement of those decisions.

During a House speech on June 17, 1970, in which I discussed my thoughts on the spring invasion of Cambodia, I again repeated my support for the policy of gradual withdrawal of American troops. At that time, I raised a question about the Cambodian invasion. I said:

I am concerned that the invasion of Cambodia may mean that the U.S. is now basing its decisions in pursuit of this policy on the events taking place in Cambodia, and not on the degree of progress in South Vietnam itself. I hope that this is not the case.

Since the initial invasion of Cambodia in the spring of 1970, the armed forces of South Vietnam have participated in several military operations within Cambodia against Communist forces threatening the Government of Cambodia. Most recently, units of the South Vietnamese army engaged in an extensive, but short-lived operation in Laos against the major staging areas along the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

I wrote a letter to Secretary Laird on March 9, 1971, raising a number of questions about these South Vietnamese operations and their relationship to what I believe to be the policy of U.S. withdrawal from the war. The Defense Department responded by saying that:

The principal purpose of the activities was to impede the infiltration of Communist weapons and ammunition to South Vietnam.

The Department further informed me that:

The rate of U.S. troop withdrawals from Vietnam is a function of several factors. Paramount among these is the possibility of success at the Peace Talks in Paris. If progress is not possible there, the influencing factors become North Vietnamese and Viet Cong intentions and capabilities, the development of technical capabilities in the ARVN, and the concurrent improvement of ARVN leadership at all levels.

I had felt all along, since the fall of 1969, that the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam was an irreversible process. I felt that the United States was going to withdraw its troops and wind down our participation in the war.

While I realized that we were going to do this on a gradual basis, I also believed that it would be irreversible and would culminate eventually in total withdrawal and total disengagement.

Recent statements by the President, and the remarks of the Defense Department quoted above, now cast serious doubts on these beliefs of mine.

Before proceeding further with this line of thought, I want to point out my support for the actions the President has taken up to the present time. I believe that the speed and the scale of U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam are commendable. When Mr. Nixon assumed office, there were 550,000 men in Vietnam. This figure has been cut roughly in half since that time.

During 1968, combat deaths of Americans averaged 278 each week. During 1969, the average dropped to 180. In 1970, the average dropped even further to 80. Weekly American deaths in Vietnam continue to decline, and this fact is a measure of the U.S. disengagement from the war. It is also an indication that the armed forces of South Vietnam are shouldering more and more of the burden of the fighting.

For these reasons, I think it important to reaffirm, lest anyone misunderstand my intentions, that the President has done a good job in implementing the policy of gradual withdrawal from South Vietnam.

Praising the President for the steps he has taken does not make the doubts go away that this praiseworthy process is not really irreversible. I think the President has to make this clear. I believe that he must tell the American people that the war, as far as we are concerned, is going to be over at this or that point. And then, I think he has to stick to it.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I should like to include the text of a letter I have written to the President, respectfully outlining my views and making some suggestions:

JUNE 2, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Respectfully, I want to share with you again my comments, observations, and suggestions regarding United States policy toward the war in Vietnam.

Undoubtedly, you are aware of the Congressional sentiment in favor of legislating a date for the end of U.S. participation in the war in Vietnam. At this time, I want to indicate to you my intention to oppose legislation which would have Congress ending the war by cutting off appropriations to support it. I know that you would veto such a measure approved by Congress, and I believe that passage of the measure, combined with your veto, would only serve to more deeply divide, confuse and inflame the American people.

I want you to know that I have supported your policy of gradual but irreversible withdrawal and disengagement from the time you first announced it. I would be less than frank, however, if I did not bring to your personal attention my deep anxiety that irreversibility may no longer be a key element in our withdrawal policy. My personal feeling, respectfully submitted, is that disengagement should be irreversible.

In other words, I am urging you, as the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief, to set a date for the withdrawal of all American forces from Indochina.

With regard to the American prisoners, I agree with you that their release into our hands should be the *only* condition holding up the final departure of the Americans from military activities in Indochina.

It is my thought that your public announcement of a withdrawal date, or series of dates, would strengthen your hand at the peace table and would force the North Vietnamese to actively discuss the prisoner issue. I would also think that you would make it clear that while the date has been announced, its implementation would depend on progress on the prisoner issue.

Within the period of time between the date of announcement and the withdrawal date, you could outline a series of other dates which would mark the extent of progress on the prisoner issue, and perhaps other features like a ceasefire.

I believe that if you set a date, the implementation of which is contingent on progress on the prisoner issue, you will be able to show the American people that you irreversibly intend to end the war, and the only problem remaining is the refusal of North Vietnam to release American prisoners. I know, Mr. President, that the American people will support you to the fullest.

We have served the interests of the South Vietnamese people and their governments for a long time. We have sacrificed many lives, much treasure, and untold suffering. We have wrought havoc on some 40,000 military personnel who have become addicted to drugs in Indochina. These acts are stark testimony to the price we have paid, we have done our part.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the fate of the South Vietnamese people and their present government. In the beginning, we Americans justified our presence there on the basis that we were helping them defend themselves and to determine their own future. We have been in Vietnam since 1962. In 1969, the President announced that the end was coming. Enough lives have been lost, enough bodies have been maimed, enough treasure has been expended. Always and ultimately, it has rested with South Vietnam to say what would happen. Let them now say it, on their own, without American interference and without American support. The time has come to end American participation in this war. If the other parties choose also to end their participation, this is much to be desired. If they choose to fight on, it is their business. It will have a sobering effect on the leadership of South Vietnam to realize that the end of American participation is really and irreversibly coming.

My only concern now is that the American prisoners be returned safely, and the remaining troops and support personnel be returned safely. We have done our part. Let it end.

ADEQUATE NUTRITION ACT OF 1971

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1971, the Department of Agriculture issued revised regulations for the food stamp program. At that time I was shocked to learn that 350,000 of our Nation's poor, now participating in the program, will lose their eligibility. Furthermore, 1,750,000 persons will see their

benefits reduced—food stamps will cost significantly more for them.

The consequences of these new regulations will be especially tragic in light of the depressed state of our economy. They come at a time when statistics indicate that we should be expanding the coverage and benefits of the program, rather than cutting them back. Later figures indicate that the number of Americans with incomes below the OEO poverty level has increased 1.1 million to 5.7 million persons in 1971.

Moreover, these new food stamp regulations make a mockery of our supposed national commitment to eradicate widespread and totally unnecessary hunger and malnutrition among our Nation's poor. Mr. Speaker, the total inadequacy of these proposed regulations has convinced me of the need for a comprehensive reform of the Food Stamp Act of 1964. I am today therefore introducing the Adequate Nutrition Act of 1971. This legislation has already been introduced in the Senate by Mr. McGOVERN and I believe it will insure at long last that all Americans have the benefit of an adequate diet. Several important items need to be mentioned with regard to this legislation. First, the proposed bill sets a firm date for finally eliminating hunger in this country July 1, 1972 second, it would provide an adequate and I stress the word "adequate" diet under the food stamp program.

Most importantly, the new legislation would eliminate the redtape which is currently strangling the food stamp program in this country. Finally it would also permit the elderly in our Nation to meet together at mealtime—which would be both a nutritional and social boon to the aged citizens in our country.

I am appending to my remarks a statement by Arthur Schiff, director of the New York City food stamp program which describes the imminent disaster which will befall hundreds of thousands of New York City residents if these proposed regulations are allowed to stand. The administration and this Nation have a long way to go to live up to its promise to end poverty in America. We can begin to fulfill the true intent or our commitment by giving this legislation our serious consideration.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR SCHIFF

It is unfortunate that the United States Department of Agriculture's new food stamp program regulations require me to appear today to appeal for compassion and justice on behalf of New York City's poor people.

In rapid succession New York City's welfare poor have been dealt two staggering blows: First, by the State Legislature which cut welfare grants by ten percent (10%) to all AFDC and General Assistance cases causing the state for the first time to meet only 90% of need. And now, second, by the USDA whose proposed tables on stamp purchase requirements, bonus allocation and "nationalization" of eligibility standards will increase the cost of food stamps for 292,227 Public Assistance cases and in addition reduce the stamp bonus for 239,016 of those cases.

Let me say at the outset, the effect of these proposed new tables following on the heels of the reduction in grants will be to decimate, and that is not too strong a word, the food stamp program in New York City. The Federal government was aware of the

consequences of the new purchase requirement and bonus tables. These tables will result in a sharp reduction of the amount of Federal money needed to finance the food stamp program in New York City next year. The money will flow to other parts of the Nation and we will be left unable to fill the needs of mal-nourished people in New York City. We, of course, don't begrudge more money going to feed the hungry in other parts of the Nation. But we ask a simple question, why must it come out of the mouths of the children of New York City?

I should add, I plead not only on behalf of New York, but of all those urban areas in the northeast and west whose food stamp programs are being cut back. We have not yet had time to analyze the impact of these changes in other areas, but they appear to be considerable.

In the first six months of New York City's program (which began on September 1, 1970) more than two thirds of the Public Assistance households regularly purchased food stamps. More than 40,000 non-welfare households were enrolled in the program by the end of the six month period. When adjustment is made for the first few months of the program when the special half price purchase to new participants was in effect, nearly six million dollars a month in bonus money was being paid out to participants. As of today more than 850,000 persons from nearly 300,000 households regularly benefit from the Food Stamp Program in New York City.

The first setback to the food stamp program will occur tomorrow when all AFDC and General Assistance cases receive their first reduced Public Assistance checks. What had been cut by ten percent is the pre-added allowance, which is the amount of money clients receive exclusive of rent. In the case of a family of four, the cut is from \$231 a

month to \$208 a month; the difference being almost exactly the food stamp bonus they receive, \$24 a month. Thus a program designed to increase purchasing power for food is now used as a cover for reducing benefits. Families who never used food stamps must now use them to reach the dollar level they were at before the cuts. Families who did use food stamps suffer a definite loss of dollars with which to live and buy food.

The United States Department of Agriculture, helpfully and quickly recognized the affect of the grant reductions and authorized us to immediately implement a new stamp purchase table reflecting the decreased grants. The new table will, for example, reduce a Public Assistance four person family's purchase requirement from \$82 a month to \$76 a month thereby increasing the bonus from \$24 to \$30. This table will be implemented by the middle of May. It certainly doesn't make up for the cuts, but it's a helpful step for which we are grateful.

How ironic it is, that the table now proposed by USDA for implementation in September makes vast numbers of Public Assistance clients not only worse off than they are with the ten percent cutback, but worse off than they were before the cut took place!

Having had their grants reduced, Public Assistance clients will soon have to pay more to purchase food stamps and receive in return a smaller bonus. At \$231 a month a Public Assistance family of four spent 35.5% of its allowance to buy stamps, and 40% did not participate. At \$208 a month with the cutback they will be forced to spend 36.5% to buy stamps. How many will buy stamps?

At \$208 a month under the proposed tables, the 82% of the clients with rent in excess of \$83 will be spending 39.9% or 42.8% or 45.7% of their Public Assistance allowances to buy stamps—and the topper is that

their bonus stamps will be reduced from \$30 to \$25 to \$19 to \$13 (depending on their net monthly income.) How many will buy stamps?

One problem is obviously the proposed table. But there is another problem, possibly even more crucial. Presently, USDA allows the City to set a single purchase price for stamps for all cases on Public Assistance; one set price for each household size. All single person households paid \$18 for \$28 in stamps, four persons paid \$82 for \$106, 6 persons paid \$112 for \$144. They changed the purchase price, but not the method when they issued us the new tables effective in May adjusting for the cuts in the Public Assistance allowances.

Now we are told that we calculate net incomes for each Public Assistance case. In other words include the total Public Assistance grant, making adjustments in shelter costs when appropriate, in calculating the purchase requirement and therefore the bonus to which each family is entitled.

What this means is that families with no more money to spend on food have to pay more for stamps if their rent is high. In New York City we give clients the exact amount of rent they pay, with Rent Control determining the amount of rent most clients will pay and with the housing shortage in New York, clients have almost no control over the rent they pay. A family of four that pays \$100 in rent a month gets \$308; if they pay \$150 they get \$358. Both families have \$208 a month to spend for everything else: food, clothing, furnishings, transportation, and incidental expenses. Now please turn to the attached charts (Public Assistance allowances, rents, purchase requirements, and bonus benefits) to see the disastrous effect of this method of calculating purchase requirements.

Household	Public assistance allowance	Rent	Stamp purchase	Bonus	Percent of PA allowance	Number of cases	Percent of cases
1 PERSON (DAB) ¹							
Present program	\$84		\$18	\$10	21.4		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	84		18	10	21.4		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$120	84	\$36	22	10	26.2	18,300	15
\$130	84	70	24	8	28.6	45,140	37
\$140	84	103	25	7	29.8	21,960	18
\$150	84	136	26	6	31.0	8,540	7
1 PERSON (GENERAL ASSISTANCE)							
Present program	84		18	10	21.4		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	76		18	10	23.7		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$120	76	71	22	10	28.9	13,860	42
\$130	76	104	24	8	31.6	3,300	10
\$140	76	140	25	7	32.9	900	3
\$150	76	171	26	6	34.2	330	1
2 PERSON							
Present program	134		36	20	26.9		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	121		36	20	29.8		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$190	121	109	48	12	39.7	30,609	38
\$210	121	176	54	6	44.6	2,416	3
3 PERSON							
Present program	176		66	18	36.9		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	161		64	20	39.8		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$250	161	139	70	18	43.5	17,667	26
\$270	161	203	76	12	47.2	2,718	4
\$290	161	270	79	9	49.1	1,359	2
4 PERSON							
Present program	231		82	24	35.5		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	208		76	30	36.5		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$290	208	83	83	25	39.9	32,940	60
\$310	208	132	89	19	42.8	10,431	19
\$330	208	203	95	13	45.7	1,647	3

¹ The federally aided categories: Old-age assistance, aid to the disabled, aid to the blind.

Household	Public assistance allowance	Rent	Stamp purchase	Bonus	Percent of PA allowance	Number of cases	Percent of cases
5 PERSON							
Present program	\$284		\$96	\$30	33.8		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	256		94	32	36.7		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$330	256	\$74	96	32	37.5	19,656	56
\$360	256	105	105	23	41.0	9,477	27
\$390	256	191	114	14	44.5	1,755	5
6 PERSON							
Present program	329		112	32	34.0		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	296		106	38	35.8		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$390	296	94	115	33	38.9	9,360	40
\$420	296	124	124	24	41.9	12,168	52
\$450	296	220	133	15	44.9	468	2
\$480	296	320	139	9	47.0		
7 PERSON							
Present program	374		124	38	33.2		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	337		114	48	33.8		
United States Department of Agriculture tables September 1971:							
Net income:							
\$390	337	53	116	48	34.4	1,395	10
\$420	337	83	125	39	37.1	3,208	23
\$450	337	113	134	30	39.8	4,603	33
\$480	337	143	143	21	42.4	2,092	15
\$510	337	240	152	12	45.1	558	4
\$540	337	340	155	9	46.0		
8 PERSON							
Present program	419		134	46	31.9		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	378		124	56	32.8		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$420	378	42	126	54	33.3	769	9
\$450	378	72	135	45	35.7	1,282	16
\$480	378	102	144	36	38.1	2,821	33
\$510	378	132	153	27	40.5	2,308	27
\$540	378	162	162	18	42.9	1,026	12
\$570	378	265	171	9	45.2	171	2
\$600 (ineligible)	378	365	171	9	45.2		
9 PERSON							
Present program	464		142	54	30.6		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	419		134	62	32.0		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$450	419	31	135	61	32.3	90	2
\$480	419	61	144	52	34.4	540	12
\$510	419	91	153	43	36.5	855	19
\$540	419	121	162	34	38.7	1,080	24
\$570	419	151	171	25	40.8	1,080	24
\$600	419	185	180	16	43.0	540	12
\$630	419	286	187	11	44.6	135	3
\$654	419	365	171	9	(Ineligible)		
10 PERSON							
Present program	511		150	62	29.4		
Program 5/71 (State legislative cuts)	460		138	74	30.0		
United States Department of Agriculture tables (9/71):							
Net income:							
\$480	460	20	144	68	31.3	27	1
\$510	460	50	153	59	33.3	216	8
\$540	460	80	162	50	35.2	486	18
\$570	460	110	171	41	37.2	702	26
\$600	460	140	180	32	39.1	675	25
\$630	460	170	189	23	41.4	297	11
\$660	460	207	198	14	43.0	243	9
\$690	460	307	203	9	44.1	27	1
\$707	460	364	203	9	(Ineligible)		

Briefly we estimate that the cases below will pay more for the same or a smaller bonus:

[In percent]	
1 person DAB	77
1 person GA	56
2 persons	41
3 persons	32
4 persons	82
5 persons	88
6 persons	74
7 persons	85
8 persons	98
9 persons	96
10 persons	99

Remember that these people have less money as a result of the cuts and are now being asked to spend more to get a smaller bonus. And the only difference is the rent they pay, which makes no difference in amount of money they have to spend. This is an irrational policy and self-defeating if the objective of the food stamp program is to get people to eat better.

Now let's briefly turn to the Non-Public Assistance household; the next two tables (Tables I and II) tell it succinctly. Of the Non-Public Assistance households, 44.3%

will spend more and get less. Based on the current Non-Public Assistance enrollment, 18,594 households are losers in the food stamp program. In fact 8% of the households in sizes one through four will be ineligible for food stamps. That's 8% of the total Non-Public Assistance enrollment; actually 10.4% of household sizes one through four.

We have not calculated it, but a proportion of Public Assistance cases, those with exempt income from employment and paying high rents, as well as a percent of the working poor on General Assistance, will also become ineligible. Even some fully budgeted Public Assistance cases will become ineligible (see household sizes 9 and 10 on Public Assistance charts.)

TABLE I.—DISTRIBUTION OF NONPUBLIC ASSISTANCE HOUSEHOLDS BY NET MONTHLY INCOME

Net monthly income	Household size				
	1	2	3	4	5
\$0 to \$19	572	149	90	39	
\$20 to \$29	278	91	24	0	
\$30 to \$39	498	91	14	14	
\$40 to \$49	630	116	39	14	

Net monthly income	Household size				
	1	2	3	4	5
\$50 to \$59	997	132	52	14	
\$60 to \$69	938	157	24	24	10
\$70 to \$79	1,305	175	76	39	0
\$80 to \$89	1,334	149	76	14	10
\$90 to \$99	1,217	299	76	24	24
\$100 to \$109	1,041	299	104	24	10
\$110 to \$119	1,099	339	104	63	36
\$120 to \$129	1,143	421	90	111	49
\$130 to \$139	1,850	314	90	87	24
\$140 to \$149	806	414	120	39	10
\$150 to \$169	1,158	828	286	72	36
\$170 to \$189	1,792	1,067	427	237	59
\$190 to \$209	1,943	375	285	285	108
\$210 to \$229	1,794	275	261	59	59
\$230 to \$249	1,489	585	396	143	143
\$250 to \$269		1,702	348	167	167
\$270 to \$289		1,547	383	216	216
\$290 to \$309		1,560	473	252	252
\$310 to \$329			396	167	167
\$330 to \$359			1,811	552	552
\$360 to \$389			1,662	1,669	1,669
\$390 to \$419				1,812	1,812
\$420 to \$449					173
Total	14,658	8,267	4,736	4,830	3,486
	14,749	8,849	1,809	1,809	11,554

	Household size				
	6	7	8	9	10
\$0 to \$29	23	19	18		
\$30 to \$59	0	0	0		
\$60 to \$69	0	0	0		
\$70 to \$79	0	0	0		
\$80 to \$89	10	10	0		
\$90 to \$99	0	0	0		
\$100 to \$109	32	0	0		
\$110 to \$119	10	0	0		
\$120 to \$129	10	0	0		
\$130 to \$139	0	0	18		
\$140 to \$149	0	0	8		
\$150 to \$169	428	19	8	9	
\$170 to \$189	66	19	0	0	
\$190 to \$209	33	10	8	0	
\$210 to \$229	23	49	8	0	
\$230 to \$249	66	30	8	0	
\$250 to \$269	75	40	27	0	
\$270 to \$289	55	19	27	0	7
\$290 to \$309	98	100	43	0	7
\$310 to \$329	131	30	35	9	7
\$330 to \$359	229	118	54	26	0
\$360 to \$389	383	148	61	26	7
\$390 to \$419	1350	347	79	51	14
\$420 to \$449	1272	217	79	26	23
\$450 to \$479	1501	1217	196	42	7
\$480 to \$509	1108	1137	1113	168	36
\$510 to \$539		1247	169	51	17
\$540 to \$569		130	196	102	136
\$570 to \$599			169	143	136
\$500 and over				151	165
Total	2,903	1,596	924	504	252
	1,231	1,631	1,443	1,315	1,144

¹ Households hurt by increased purchase price.

TABLE II.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF NONPUBLIC ASSISTANCE HOUSEHOLDS BY NET MONTHLY INCOME

Net monthly income	Household size				
	1	2	3	4	5
\$0 to \$19	3.9	1.8	1.9	0.8	
\$20 to \$29	1.9	1.1	.5	0	
\$30 to \$39	3.4	1.1	.3	.3	
\$40 to \$49	4.3	1.4	.8	.3	
\$50 to \$59	6.8	1.6	1.1	.3	
\$60 to \$69	6.4	1.9	.5	.5	0.3
\$70 to \$79	8.9	2.1	1.6	.8	0
\$80 to \$89	9.1	1.8	1.6	.3	.3
\$90 to \$99	8.3	3.6	1.6	.5	.7
\$100 to \$109	7.1	3.6	2.2	.5	.3
\$110 to \$119	7.5	4.1	2.2	1.3	1.0
\$120 to \$129	17.8	5.1	1.9	2.3	1.4
\$130 to \$139	15.8	13.8	1.9	1.8	.7
\$140 to \$149	15.5	15.0	2.5	.8	.3
\$150 to \$159	17.9	10.0	6.0	1.5	1.0
\$170 to \$189	15.4	12.9	9.0	4.9	1.7
\$190 to \$209		11.4	7.9	5.9	3.1
\$210 to \$229		9.6	5.8	5.4	1.7
\$230 to \$249		18.0	12.3	8.2	4.1
\$250 to \$269			114.8	7.2	4.8
\$270 to \$289			11.5	7.9	6.2
\$290 to \$309			11.8	9.8	7.2
\$310 to \$329				18.2	4.8
\$330 to \$359				16.8	15.8
\$360 to \$389				13.7	19.2
\$390 to \$419					23.3
\$420 to \$449					2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	32.4	170.7	138.1	138.7	144.6

	Household size				
	6	7	8	9	10
\$0 to \$29	0.9	1.2	1.9		
\$30 to \$59	.0	.0	.0		
\$60 to \$69	.0	.0	.0		
\$70 to \$79	.0	.0	.0		
\$80 to \$89	.4	.6	.0		
\$90 to \$99	.0	.0	.0		
\$100 to \$109	1.3	.0	.0		
\$110 to \$119	.4	.0	.0		
\$120 to \$129	.4	.0	.0		
\$130 to \$139	.0	.0	1.9		
\$140 to \$149	.0	.0	.9		
\$150 to \$169	1.7	1.2	.9	1.7	
\$170 to \$189	2.6	1.2	.0	.0	
\$190 to \$209	1.3	.6	.9	.0	
\$210 to \$229	.9	3.1	.9	.0	
\$230 to \$249	2.6	1.9	.9	.0	
\$250 to \$269	3.0	2.5	2.8	.0	
\$270 to \$289	2.2	1.2	2.8	.0	2.9
\$290 to \$309	3.9	6.2	4.7	.0	2.9
\$310 to \$329	5.2	1.9	3.8	1.7	2.9
\$330 to \$359	9.1	7.4	5.7	5.1	.0
\$360 to \$389	15.2	9.3	6.6	5.1	2.9
\$390 to \$419	13.9	8.6	8.5	10.2	5.7
\$420 to \$449	10.8	13.6	8.5	5.1	8.6
\$450 to \$479	19.9	13.6	10.4	8.5	2.9

	Household size				
	6	7	8	9	10
\$480 to \$509	14.3	18.6	12.3	113.6	14.3
\$510 to \$539		15.4	17.5	110.2	12.9
\$540 to \$569		11.9	10.4	120.3	114.3
\$570 to \$599			17.5	18.5	14.3
\$600 and over				110.2	125.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	148.9	139.5	148.7	62.8	57.2

¹Households hurt by increased purchase price.

What can we conclude from all this: First, participation will go way down for Public Assistance cases. There is no way most clients will be able to afford to buy stamps, by common agreement, when the cost of stamps goes above 30% of the money available for all purposes exclusive of rent. For most of the Public Assistance cases the purchase price exceeds 30% of their Public Assistance allowance.

This will mean a dramatic drop in participation and consequently, a drastic reduction in the amount the federal government will have to spend on bonus payments in New York City. How much we cannot exactly tell, but current bonus payments of \$6 million a month should be reduced by at least two-thirds.

Second, for Public Assistance cases, rent, not just income available for food, becomes the factor in how much you pay for stamps. There is no point in commenting on this again. It is absurd to penalize families for paying high rents. It simply does not change the facts of life for these people. A family of four has \$208 to live on whether their rent is \$74 or \$20 a month.

Third, Non-Public Assistance cases will decrease as higher purchase requirements and a reduced bonus become apparent. This, of course, means that people not on welfare, often because they don't want welfare even though they are eligible—I mean the elderly and the working poor—will not participate. Of the cases now eligible, 10.4% will become ineligible. Some cases who would have been eligible will not be eligible.

What does the end of the food stamp program mean for all the Public Assistance and Non-Public Assistance people no longer able to participate in the stamp program? Will they miss it? I'll cite two facts and let the Committee draw its own conclusions: First, as the chart on the following page (Cost of Food Index) shows, since 1967, New York City has experienced the greatest increase in food prices of any urban area in the United States.

Second, because indexes sometimes don't tell the whole story, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, lower budget for a four person family, (Spring 1970) the cost of food in New York City is higher than any other area of the country, with the exception of Anchorage, Alaska and Honolulu, Hawaii; two cities that have been given their own food stamp tables, a consideration that might be given to New York City.

This Committee must do something to restore equity in purchasing stamps and bonus benefits for New York City and other urban areas or stand idly by and watch the food stamp program go down the drain. For New York City's poor it won't be a new experience: They've had Medicaid and welfare cuts to pave the way.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing is as follows:

H.R. 8883

A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964

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 "Adequate Nutrition Act of 1971".

SEC. 2. The Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2011-2025), is amended as follows:

Definitions

(1) Section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new definitions: "(n) The term 'operating agency' means any State agency, the Secretary, or any public agency or private nonprofit organization administering any program pursuant to section 10(g) of this Act.

"(o) The term 'political subdivision' means any county, city, township, or other unit of general local government responsible for administering public assistance programs within a State."

Eligible households

(2) Section 5 is amended by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The Secretary shall require every individual who is a member of a household that is participating in the food stamp program, other than an individual described by clause (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of subsection (d) of this section, to register for employment with the local public employment office or, when impractical, at such other appropriate office as shall be designated in regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor. If the Secretary finds that any such individual has failed to register for employment without good cause, the continued eligibility of the household (of which such individual is a member) to participate in the food stamp program shall not be affected, but the value of the coupon allotment, determined under section 7(a) of this Act, authorized to be issued to such household shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined by subtracting from that authorized allotment the amount charged therefor pursuant to section 7(b) of this Act as the number of such unregistered individuals in such household bears to the total number of individuals in such household. Before any such reduction is made, the individual concerned shall be afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a fair hearing held in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as a hearing under section 10(e)(4) of this Act. A reduction in the food stamp allotment of any household under this subsection shall continue so long as such individual fails or refuses to register for employment as provided herein.

"(d) An individual shall not be required to register pursuant to subsection (c) of this section if such individual is—

"(1) ill, incapacitated, disabled, or over sixty years of age;

"(2) a mother or other relative of an individual under the age of eighteen who is caring for such individual;

"(3) an individual under the age of eighteen;

"(4) an individual eighteen years old or over who is a student regularly attending a school, college, or university, or the equivalent thereof, or regularly attending a course of vocational or technical training designed to prepare him for gainful employment;

"(5) an individual whose presence in the home on a substantially continuous basis is required because of the illness or incapacity of another member of the household; or

"(6) an individual eighteen years old or over and is employed at least thirty hours per week or earns at least \$48 per week.

"(e) If the Secretary of Labor finds that any individual registered under subsection (c) of this section has refused, without good cause, to accept suitable employment in which such individual is able to engage and that such employment was offered through the public employment offices of the State, or was otherwise offered by an employer and the offer of such employer was a bona fide offer of employment, the eligibility of the

household (of which such individual is a member) to participate in the food stamp program shall not be affected, but the value of the coupon allotment authorized to be issued to such household shall be reduced in accordance with the method set forth in subsection (c) above. Before any such reduction is made, the individual concerned shall be afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a fair hearing held in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as a hearing under section 10(e) (4) of this Act. A reduction in the food stamp allotment of any household under this subsection shall continue so long as such individual fails or refuses to accept employment as provided by this section.

"(f) (1) In determining whether any employment is suitable for an individual for purposes of subsection (e) of this section, the Secretary of Labor shall consider the degree of risk to such individual's health and safety, his physical fitness for the work, his prior training and experience, the length of his unemployment, his realistic prospects for obtaining work based on his potential, and the distance of the available work from his residence.

"(2) In no event shall any employment be considered suitable for an individual if any one of the following conditions applies—

"(A) the position offered is vacant as a direct result of a strike, lockout, or other labor dispute;

"(B) the wages for such job are payable at a rate less than the highest of the following:

"(i) the State or local minimum wage;

"(ii) \$1.60 per hour or the minimum hourly rate which is or would be applicable to the job under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6(a) (1) of such Act, as amended, applied to the job, whichever is higher; or

"(iii) the prevailing rate of pay in the same labor market area for persons employed in similar work in the locality; or

"(C) the hours and other terms and conditions of the work offered are contrary to or less favorable than those prescribed by Federal, State, or local law or are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality."

Value of the Coupon Allotment and Charges To Be Made

(3) (A) Subsection (a) of section 7 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In determining the amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household, the Secretary shall take into consideration such relevant factors as he deems appropriate but may not consider the availability or expected availability of appropriations to carry out this Act. In no event shall the amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household be less than the amount which the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture determines to be necessary to permit a household of comparable size to purchase the kinds and amounts of food specified in the low-cost food plan described by such Service and published in the 'Family Economics Review'."

(B) Subsection (b) of section 7 is amended by striking all after "Provided further," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a household may, if it so elects, purchase any amount of coupons less than the full coupon allotment it is entitled to purchase. The amount charged any household for any portion of a coupon allotment less than the full coupon allotment shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would have been charged such household for the full coupon allotment as such portion of the full coupon allotment bears the full coupon allotment such household was entitled to purchase. The Secretary

shall prescribe general guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance services to be provided by State agencies to eligible households, including, but not limited to, matters relating to the places, times, and frequency of coupon issuance services in political subdivisions approved for participation in the food stamp program. Such general guidelines and minimum requirements shall include at least the following provisions: (1) that the issuance of coupons shall take place no less often than once per week, and (2) that any household may purchase its entire month coupon allotment at any time of issuance for that month or may elect to purchase any portion of its monthly allotment having a face value of three-quarters, one-half, or one-quarter at any time of issuance for that month and thereafter may purchase the proportionate remainder of that allotment which has not previously been purchased for that month."

Administration

(4) (A) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 10 are amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to the following conditions, the operating agency shall assume responsibility for the certification of applicant households and for the issuance of coupons. Applicant households shall be certified for eligibility solely on the basis of a simplified statement, conforming to standards prescribed by the Secretary, and such statement shall be acted upon and eligibility certified within seven days following the date upon which the statement is initially filed. The Secretary shall, however, provide for adequate and effective methods of verification of the eligibility of recipients subsequent to certification through the use of sampling and other scientific techniques. If a household, certified as eligible in any political subdivision to participate in the food stamp program or a program of distribution of federally donated foods moves to another political subdivision in which either program is operating, the household shall remain eligible to participate in such program in such other political subdivision for a period of sixty days from the date of such move without regard to compliance with any requirement of the new political subdivision.

"(c) In the certification of applicant households for either the food stamp program or a program of distribution of federally donated foods there shall be no discrimination against any household by reason of race, religious creed, national origin, or political beliefs."

(B) Subsection (e) of section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The State agency of each State shall submit for approval a plan of operation specifying the manner in which such State intends to conduct such program. Such plan of operation shall provide, among such other provisions as may be required, the following: (1) for the use of the eligibility standards promulgated by the Secretary under section 5 of this Act and the certification procedures specified in subsection (b) of this section; (2) safeguards which restrict the use of disclosure of information obtained from applicant households to persons directly connected with the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act; (3) that the State agency shall undertake effective action to inform low-income households concerning the availability and benefits of the food stamp program and encourage the participation of all eligible households; (4) for the granting of a fair hearing and a prompt determination thereafter to any household aggrieved by the action of a State agency under any provision of its plan of operation as it affects the participation of such household in the food stamp program; and (5) for the submission of such reports and other informa-

tion as may from time to time be required. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the State agency shall, in conjunction with the appropriate Federal agency, institute procedures under which any household participating in the food stamp program shall be entitled, if it so elects, to have the charges, if any, for its coupon allotment deducted from any grant or payment such household may be entitled to receive under the Social Security Act and have its coupon allotment distributed to it with such grant or payment. The State agency shall arrange for the issuance of coupons to eligible households and for the collection of sums required from eligible households as payment therefor through the facilities of United States post offices directly or by mail, or in such other manner convenient to participating households as shall best insure their participation."

(C) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 10 are amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) By April 1, 1972, if a food stamp program is not being operated by the State agency in every political subdivision of any State, the Governor of the State shall have the right directly to administer the food stamp program in any such subdivision in which the program is not being operated. If the Governor should fail so to act by May 1, 1972, the Secretary shall directly administer the food stamp program in any such subdivision through any appropriate Federal, State, or county agency or through any public agency or private nonprofit organization approved by the Secretary, and such program shall be in operation by no later than June 30, 1972.

"(2) If, one hundred and eighty days after a food stamp program has begun to operate in a political subdivision in any State, a three-month period should occur in the course of which the number of persons participating in that program is less than 50 per centum of the number of persons in that subdivision who are from households whose annual income is below the poverty level as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (which number shall be determined annually on the basis of the most recent available data from the Secretary of Commerce, the Governor of the State in which such subdivision is located shall have the right directly to administer the food stamp program in such subdivision. If the Governor refuses to exercise his right or fails to do so within thirty days of being notified of said right by the Secretary, the Secretary shall directly administer such program in such subdivision or administer such program through any appropriate Federal, State, or county agency or through any public agency or private nonprofit organization approved by the Secretary. If the Governor accepts administration of the program and participation does not increase to 66 per centum within one hundred and eighty days then the Secretary shall directly administer the program in such subdivision or administer such program through any appropriate Federal, State, or county agency or through any public agency or private nonprofit organization approved by the Secretary. When the Secretary administers a food stamp program through a public agency or private nonprofit organization, he shall require the public agency or private nonprofit organization to observe all the appropriate provisions of this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto.

"(h) Members of an eligible household who are sixty years or over or an elderly person and his spouse may use coupons issued to them to purchase meals prepared for and served to them in any location other than a resident institution or boarding house by a political subdivision or a private nonprofit organization which is operated in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act and

is recognized as a tax-exempt organization by the Internal Revenue Service. Meals served pursuant to this subsection shall be deemed 'food' for the purpose of this Act."

Cooperation With State Agencies

(5) Subsection (b) of section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay to each State agency an amount equal to 75 per centum of the sum of: (1) the direct salary, travel, and travel-related cost (including such fringe benefits as are normally paid) of personnel including the immediate supervisors of such personnel, for such time as they are employed in taking the action required under the provisions of subsections 10(a) and 10(c) (3) and (4) of this Act and in making certification determinations for households other than those which consist solely of recipients of public assistance. In addition, the Secretary shall pay an operating agency in a State 50 per centum of the cost of issuing coupons to eligible households and of collecting the sums required from eligible households as payment therefor and shall pay 100 per centum of such costs if the number of persons participating in the food stamp program administered by such agency is equivalent to or greater than 66 per centum of the number of persons in the political subdivision covered by that program who are from households whose annual income is below the poverty level as established by the Secretary pursuant to section 10(g)(2) of this Act. In the event that a public agency or private nonprofit organization is authorized to administer the food stamp program in any area in accordance with the provisions of section 10(g) of this Act or that such an agency or organization undertakes activities pursuant to section 10(a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to reimburse such agency or organization for all of the costs it incurs in carrying out such program or activities."

Appropriations

(6) Section 16 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 16. To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and not in excess of \$3,500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974. Sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this Act until expended. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotment shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. If the Secretary determines that any of the funds in such account are no longer required to carry out the provisions of this Act, such portion of such funds shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. With funds appropriated under this section, the Secretary is authorized to conduct, or contract with public agencies or private nonprofit organizations to conduct research, demonstration, or evaluation projects designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods to achieve the purposes of this Act."

AIR COLLISION AVOIDANCE SYSTEM NEEDED

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aviation Administration and the domestic commercial airline industry are

falling to meet their responsibilities for safety to the public.

I say this because in 1967 we were advised in our committee by the FAA Administrator, then Gen. William F. McKee, that they had placed top priority on developing a collision avoidance system.

We have had more than 4,000 near misses annually and we have also had some collisions in midair. We now have a developed system, one of which was developed by one company in my own district, the Bendix Corp., and other companies have now developed a tested crash avoidance system. But they have not been placed on airplanes and the FAA has not yet demanded it. I think they are negligent in not seeing that the public is protected by crash avoidance systems that are now feasible and have been tested.

In his testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on July 4, 1967, General McKee advised the committee that intensive work was underway on a collision avoidance system by private industry. Mr. Speaker, this intensive effort to which General McKee referred has produced a proven collision avoidance system, and the state of the art now makes possible the installation of this system in commercial airliners as well as the implementation of the necessary ground stations.

Yet, I have seen no action by the FAA or the domestic airline industry to implement a collision avoidance system.

On a recent trip through my district, I had occasion to tour the avionics division plant of Bendix Corp., in Fort Lauderdale during which I had an opportunity to discuss the progress that has been made in developing an effective collision avoidance system.

Bendix has perfected a system which it calls "IMAGE": intruder monitoring and guidance equipment and it is ready to be marketed. I understand other companies also have perfected similar devices which can work interchangeably with the Bendix system.

I am aware that installation of collision avoidance systems on the approximately 2,000 commercial aircraft will not prevent collisions between commercial aircraft and general aviation aircraft, but I believe it is a beginning, and I am assured that private industry will continue intensive work on a less expensive system which can be installed on general aviation aircraft, and which will be compatible with the systems now available for commercial aviation.

I am also aware that these systems will cost between \$30,000 and \$50,000 per airliner and that the FAA probably will have to spend approximately \$50 million for the necessary ground system, but in light of the more than 4,000 near misses which occur annually in aviation in this Nation, I do not believe the airline industry or the FAA can or should delay implementation of the system, nor should passenger safety be sacrificed by delay.

Must we have 5,000 or 10,000 near misses before the FAA and the airline industry act? Or, do we have to have one or more mid-air collisions claiming hundreds of lives before we get responsible action for passenger safety?

We now have a collision avoidance system, and I urge the commercial airline industry and the FAA to take the appropriate responsible action to implement utilization of this equipment now.

PANAMANIAN TREATY NEGOTIATION SLOGAN: SOVEREIGNTY OR DEATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as all Members of the Congress know the Panama Canal is one of the great strategic crossroads of the world. Isthmian newspapers report extensively on developments in both the United States and Panama. In contrast, U.S. newspapers give very little coverage to events on the Isthmus unless it is unusually dramatic. The result is that the people of that area are far better informed on Panama Canal matters than the people of our country. Also in Panama, the Spanish language press gives much news not covered in the English language press. Only those who read both can understand Isthmian matters in depth; and that is what I have tried to do.

Since the recent visit of Robert B. Anderson, chief negotiator for renewed Panama Canal treaty negotiations, the present revolutionary military government of Panama has been reorganized to include more pro-Communists in highest positions. This has been followed by an almost daily battle-cry for full sovereignty over the Canal Zone under the slogan "Sovereignty or Death." Unfortunately, high officials of our Government never publicly reply to the unreasonable and unrealistic demands of Panamanian leaders until the situation becomes critical, as occurred in January 1964 when Red-led mobs attacked the Canal Zone requiring the use of our Armed Forces to protect the lives of our citizens and the canal.

The latest information from Panama in the form of a page 1 newstory of an Isthmian newspaper should leave no doubt as to what is transpiring.

I quote it as part of my remarks and urge that it be read by all Members of the Congress, especially by members of committees with cognizance over Panama Canal policy questions:

[From the Panama American, May 20, 1971]
"SOVEREIGNTY OR DEATH" BECOMING NEW
BY-WORD IN PANAMA

(By Ray Horton)

PANAMA.—The phrase "sovereignty or death" has become a new by-word in Panama. It is written on storefronts, brick walls and even buses. It is an almost daily press headline.

And with the approach of new talks between Panama and the United States over the future of the Panama Canal, the phrase has become a slogan for leaders of Panama's "revolutionary" government.

A three-man Panamanian negotiating team is scheduled to leave for Washington later this month, or early next month, to reopen the talks.

Panamanian strongman Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, chief of the country's 6,000-man National Guard, told a cheering May Day crowd in a northern port city:

"I want you to have full assurance that Gen. Torrijos will not sell out the country. You can rest assured that the nation's sovereignty is not up for negotiation—it is a birthright of the people.

"You can be sure that you will find the government and Gen. Torrijos in these negotiations on their feet or dead—but never on their knees".

The Panamanian government goes into the new negotiations hoping to achieve sovereignty over the U.S. controlled Panama Canal Zone—a strip of land five miles on either side of the 50-mile long interoceanic canal.

Official sources have told UPI that Panama's three-man team of negotiators is not seeking control over the actual lever-pulling operation of the freshwater lock canal or the defense of the canal.

Instead, these government sources say, Panama wants jurisdiction over the Canal Zone which is now administered by a White House-appointed governor, who by tradition, is a major general in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Three relatively young former cabinet ministers will do the negotiating in Washington with the Chief U.S. negotiator, Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of Treasury during President Eisenhower's second administration.

Anderson is experienced in Canal negotiations. He was appointed by President Johnson to negotiate a new treaty with Panama in 1964.

Panama's ambassador to the United States, Jose Antonio de la Ossa, 39, heads the Panamanian team which includes Fernando Manfredo Jr., 37, who stepped down as minister of commerce and industry in April, and Carlos A. Lopez Guevara, 42, who was foreign minister in 1969.

De la Ossa was general manager of First National City Bank of New York in Panama before joining the government as minister of finance in 1969.

Lopez Guevara, a leading lawyer, is a graduate of Harvard University and Manfredo, who was the nation's youngest cabinet member, did graduate work at Harvard and the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania.

All three negotiators were brought into government service by Torrijos after he took power in October, 1968. Torrijos led his troops in a coup d'etat against President Arnulfo Arias on the 11th day of the latter's new term.

President Nixon agreed to begin new treaty negotiations with the Torrijos government last October, a month after Panama formally rejected the three 1967 draft treaties negotiated during the Johnson Administration.

Those treaties, dealing separately with the existing canal, the defense of the canal, and the construction of a new, level canal, were the result of negotiations that began shortly after anti-American rioting in January, 1964.

But the draft treaties, which were leaked to the public, met congressional opposition in the United States as well as opposition from the Torrijos government.

The 1903 treaty governing the canal has been amended twice, in 1936 and in 1955. The amendments generally gave Panama limited economic concessions such as the increase of the annuity the United States pays to Panama (from \$430,000 to \$1.93-million) and the elimination of unequal work standards for Panamanians and U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone.

But neither revision touched the basic provision of the 1903 contention which gave the United States the power to "act as if it were sovereign" in the Canal Zone "in perpetuity".

This is the disputed section of the 1903 treaty in the eyes of the Torrijos government.

"It simply doesn't follow that for the United States to operate a canal it has to set

up a state within a state", one Panamanian diplomat told UPI.

The Canal Zone is a self-contained community of about 55,000 residents who have their own schools, police, courts, and hospitals.

The same diplomat argued: "Our position has nothing to do with the ditch itself. We're only interested in the 10-mile wide territory. You have an almost sovereign socialist state there. That is a real company town and the United States is the landlord. It owns all the housing and even some of the furniture. It has its own police and courts, runs its own schools, has duty-free automobiles which it buys in Panama, and has most of the benefits of a sovereign state. And this is all going on in our country".

Panama is expected to seek control of all activities in the Canal Zone that are not related directly to the operation and defense of the canal.

Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack delivered a note to the U.S. Embassy in April protesting the presence of commercial interests in the Canal Zone which permits the operation of clubs, recreation centers and restaurants for its 15,000 employees and their families. Seventy-five per cent of those employees are Panamanians.

More than \$29-million worth of merchandise such as food, clothing, and house-ware were sold to Canal Zone residents in 1969, according to the 1970 annual report of the Panama Canal Company.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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.

According to Joseph Kane's publication of "Famous First Facts," the first adding machine which was "absolutely accurate at all times" was invented by Dorr Eugene Felt of Chicago, Ill. The model was constructed in November 1884, in Chicago. A patent was applied for in March 1887 and issued on October 11, 1887. Felt entered into partnership with Robert Tarrant on November 28, 1887. This firm was later incorporated on January 25, 1889, as the Felt & Tarrant Co. Up to 1902 this machine was the only multiple-order key-driven calculator on the market.

ACTION NOW TO RESTORE A SOUND DOLLAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a sense of Congress concurrent resolution calling on the executive to close the gold window, to let the dollar float until equilibrium parity is reached and maintained, and to compensate countries which play the game against any resulting exchange loss.

The full text of the concurrent resolution follows:

H. RES. 328

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate Concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, in the event that an

international monetary conference is not promptly convened, the Executive Branch should:

(1) terminate its option, under the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, to purchase dollars held by foreign official institutions with gold;

(2) following the precedent of the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, and the Netherlands, permit the dollar to float until any disequilibrium has been removed, and then support the dollar by exchange operations;

(3) entertain claims for compensation for any resulting loss to those foreign official dollar-holders, in the amount of their dollar holdings as of June 1, 1971, who (a) cooperate in allowing proper exchange parties to be attained, and (b) affirm their willingness to abide by the March, 1968, two-tier gold agreement.

The dollar's current troubles stem fundamentally from two causes: first, persistent basic balance-of-payments deficits, due to the Vietnam war and the resulting inflation; second, the difficulty of trying to operate a gold exchange standard with \$10 billion in gold against almost \$30 billion in claims against it held by foreign central banks.

These two Achilles' heels make nonsense of the international monetary system.

The basic balance-of-payments deficit of the United States, around \$3 billion a year, can be stopped by ending the Vietnam hemorrhage now, and by using price-wage controls to restore a stable dollar.

But correcting our basic payments imbalance is not enough. The United States under the present system unnecessarily cripples itself by its inability to alter its exchange rate with other currencies. Three administrations have properly pledged never to raise the price of official gold. It would make no sense to pay real resources for more, and more expensive, gold from Russia and South Africa, only to bury it again at Fort Knox.

Another way to restore proper parities for the dollar against undervalued currencies is for those currencies to float or revalue upwards. West Germany and other European countries are now doing this, and considerably relieving the strain on the dollar in the process.

But other countries, notably Japan, refuse to revalue their currencies upward. As a result, Japan maintains a built-in price advantage, enabling her automobiles, radio-TV's, electronics, and textiles to flood our markets, and luring more and more Japanese companies into artificially cheap made-in-Japan investments.

American labor and management in the affected industries are asking for massive import controls. Yet if we go this route, it could be the end of free trade.

Only by closing the gold window and letting the dollar find a newer and sounder relationship with the yen and other undervalued currencies can we avoid the deterioration of our trading position and a return to trade autarchy.

A second reason to close the gold window is simple honesty. Many a country—from Norway, with only \$23 million at the end of 1970 in gold reserves and \$646 million in foreign exchange reserves, mostly dollars, to Japan, with only \$532 million in gold reserves and \$3.2 billion

in foreign exchange reserves, mostly dollars—has grown dollar-heavy in reliance on our pledge not to raise the price of gold. Yet various gold-bug countries—like France, which last month grabbed another \$282 million of our gold—are getting themselves into the position of preferred creditors.

So fairness, too, requires that we shut the gold window. It is perfectly feasible to protect countries that play the game by standing ready to compensate them for exchange losses, if any, due to having held dollars. Playing the game would mean first, not trying to frustrate an interim fiat for the dollar, and second, agreeing formally to abide by the March 1968 two-tier gold agreement.

This save-harmless agreement would apply only to central bank dollar holdings accumulated prior to June 1, 1971. With respect to currencies, like the Japanese yen, generally believed to be undervalued, there will be a tendency for private holders of dollars to unload them for yen at the Japanese central bank, in anticipation that the United States may in fact soon take the action here recommended. Since such post-June 1 dollar holdings would not be eligible for save-harmless compensation, the Japanese central bank may very well conclude that it should take the same action as West Germany has taken—let the dollar float for a bit until its fair parity begins to appear. This would be a good thing for the United States, for the world monetary system, and in the end for Japan, too.

The proposal I make is for unilateral action by the United States. Far preferable, of course, would be the action by multilateral conference proposed in the Javits-Reuss resolution of May 12, 1971, though the end result of dollar stability would be the same. I look forward to hearings in the near future on both resolutions.

NARCOTICS CONTROL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. RODINO, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note President Nixon's comments during his June 1 press conference proposing a narcotics control program. Such a "national offensive" against the drug problem has been long overdue, and I was particularly glad to see that his description of the program is substantially along the lines of my three-pronged comprehensive narcotics control program that I have been advocating since the 91st Congress.

Eight months ago I wrote directly to the President to express my deep concern about the heroin epidemic in our Nation and my conviction that urgent action is necessary to deal with it. I described the comprehensive program I developed to counter this growing national tragedy and sought his support for my proposals, or the submission by the Administration of alternatives.

Unfortunately, the only response 8 months ago was a perfunctory acknowledgment of my letter by a White House

assistant, assuring me that my letter would be brought to the President's attention. I can only conclude that the recent shocking revelations about the extent of heroin addiction among Vietnam servicemen and veterans, and the subsequent public outrage, have finally forced the administration to propose actions to deal with our drug epidemic.

I have been assured that hearings will be held in the near future on the two bills in my legislative program—H.R. 1539 to authorize the President to cut off foreign aid to countries that do not cooperate in efforts to end illegal opium production and traffic; and H.R. 1540, providing for the mandatory medical treatment of known addicts under supervision of Public Health officials. I am therefore again writing to President Nixon to seek his support for my program or similar strong and effective action.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress my bill to cut off foreign aid to illegal opium producing countries was approved by the House, in the form of an amendment to the supplemental foreign aid authorization bill. I hope it will similarly receive support when it is again before the House. In this connection, I include in the RECORD at this point the text of my letter to President Nixon on October 22, 1970, and the reply to me by Mr. William E. Timmons of October 23, 1970.

OCTOBER 22, 1970.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you out of a sense of urgency concerning the epidemic of narcotics addiction, which is having such a devastating effect on our entire Nation.

In some of our major industrial centers—such as New York, Newark, Philadelphia, New Orleans, Detroit, and Los Angeles, the narcotics plague has reached critical proportions. In many cities more than 50 percent of all street crimes are being committed by narcotics addicts. In some cities overdoses of heroin are now the largest single cause of death for persons over 35. Throughout the entire Nation addiction has become so rampant that probably three to four hundred thousand persons are now committing crimes daily out of a desperate need to feed their craving for drugs.

From the very beginning of the 91st Congress I have been working strenuously to develop a comprehensive legislative program designed to abate the addiction epidemic. This program involves a three-pronged attack on the narcotics problem.

First, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 17269, which would allow any person known to be an addict to be placed under medical supervision and control by Public Health officials. Medical treatment would be mandatory and could involve confinement of the addict if and when medical officials consider it necessary. This measure has the support of the American Medical Association as well as a number of state and local narcotics officials.

Second, by using Public Health officials to control narcotics addicts, as is provided for in my bill, law enforcement officials can be made more available to conduct vigorous crackdowns on narcotics pushers and organized drug rings.

Third, the illegal supply of narcotics which is entering our country from abroad should be dried up. To accomplish this, I have introduced H.R. 18397, which would require the suspension of foreign assistance to any foreign government which fails to take adequate steps to curb the illegal drug traffic

and which would also provide affirmative assistance to countries which do cooperate with us. I have written personally to every Member of the House of Representatives concerning this proposal and am gratified that 140 Members of the House—both Republicans and Democrats—are now cosponsoring this bill.

During the course of my formulation of this legislation program, I have conferred at length with a number of Federal officials and in all candor have been dismayed by the inability of the relevant government agencies either to agree on a program such as mine or to formulate constructive alternatives.

I want to assure you that I very much appreciate the efforts that the Administration has made to date to deal with the narcotics problem. However, I am concerned that unless all of us fully cooperate to engage in an all-out war against narcotics, we will be unable to abate the epidemic that is now threatening our Nation.

Under the circumstances, I respectfully request that you give your personal consideration to the proposals that I have introduced in the House of Representatives. I strongly believe that these proposals merit your support. If an agreement can be reached among the relevant government agencies concerning either my program or any constructive alternative, I am confident appropriate legislation can be enacted when Congress returns in November of this year.

Sincerely,

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 23, 1970.

DEAR MR. RODINO: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter to the President regarding legislation which you have pending in the Congress concerning the problem of drug addiction. You may be assured your letter will be brought to the President's early attention.

With cordial regard,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

RACIAL IMBALANCE IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a so-called racial balance is given as a goal for peace by some of our liberal friends and a necessary factor for the achievement of an educational environment by the judiciary.

The 1970 census figures establish immediately that there is no State in the Union that is in racial balance of blacks District of Columbia above the national average and 34 States below the national population. There are 16 States and the District of Columbia, above the national average and 34 States below the national average.

The statistics are further confusing when we consider that of the Nation's black population of 22.3 million, the 1970 census shows that approximately one-half or 10.5 million of the Nation's black population is now concentrated in 50 cities—one-third or 7.6 million of the total black population is in 15 cities. Six cities now have a black majority, and in eight cities the population is 40 percent or more black.

Some individuals contend that segregation is no longer an issue and there is

no longer a race problem. To those I but ask why our large cities continue to become blacker?

There seems to be a direct correlation between those States which fall under the national average in racial balance and the States having the Representatives who are the most desirous and demanding of achieving racial balance. There is little wonder that whites from States which have 2 or 3 percent racial minority and even those who have less than 1 percent black population are opposed to separation of the races—they have no race problem because they have so few to segregate.

With so much clamor these days by Federal judges, Nixon administration bureaucrats, and some legislators to overcome racial imbalance, I thought that each of our colleagues would like to see what progress his State may have made during the past decade toward racial balance. If no one wants busing applied on a nationwide scale to overcome racial imbalance, why has it become a national goal on a local, State, or regional basis?

I include tables of percentage of Negro population by States according to the 1970 census and the 1960 census in the RECORD, followed by similar tables giving the ranking in 1970 and in 1960 of States by total Negro population:

Percentage of Negro population by States 1970

Rank and State:	
1 District of Columbia	71.1
2 Mississippi	36.8
3 South Carolina	30.5
4 Louisiana	29.8
5 Alabama	26.2
6 Georgia	25.9
7 North Carolina	22.2
8 Virginia	18.5
9 Arkansas	18.3
10 Maryland	17.8
11 Tennessee	15.8
12 Florida	15.3
13 Delaware	14.3
14 Illinois	12.8
15 Texas	12.5
16 New York	11.9
17 Michigan	11.2
18 New Jersey	10.7
19 Missouri	10.3
20 Ohio	9.1
21 Pennsylvania	8.6
22 Kentucky	7.2
23 California	7.0
24 Indiana	6.9
25 Oklahoma	6.7
26 Connecticut	6.0
27 Nevada	5.7
28 Kansas	4.8
29 West Virginia	3.9
30 Massachusetts	3.1
31 Alaska	3.0
32 Arizona	3.0
33 Colorado	3.0
34 Wisconsin	2.9
35 Nebraska	2.7
36 Rhode Island	2.7
37 Washington	2.1
38 New Mexico	1.9
39 Oregon	1.3
40 Iowa	1.2
41 Hawaii	1.0
42 Minnesota	0.9
43 Wyoming	0.8
44 Utah	0.6
45 North Dakota	0.4
46 Idaho	0.3
47 Maine	0.3
48 Montana	0.3
49 New Hampshire	0.3
50 South Dakota	0.2

51 Vermont	0.2
National average	11.1

Source: 1970 U.S. Census.

Percentage of Negro population by States, 1960

Rank and State:	
1 District of Columbia	53.9
2 Mississippi	42.0
3 South Carolina	34.8
4 Louisiana	31.9
5 Alabama	30.0
6 Georgia	28.5
7 North Carolina	24.5
8 Arkansas	21.8
9 Virginia	20.6
10 Florida	17.8
11 Maryland	16.7
12 Tennessee	16.5
13 Delaware	13.6
14 Texas	12.4
15 Illinois	10.3
16 Michigan	9.2
17 Missouri	9.0
18 New Jersey	8.5
19 New York	8.4
20 Ohio	8.1
21 Pennsylvania	7.5
22 Kentucky	7.1
23 Oklahoma	6.6
24 Indiana	5.8
25 California	5.6
26 West Virginia	4.8
27 Nevada	4.7
28 Connecticut	4.2
29 Kansas	4.2
30 Arizona	3.3
31 Alaska	3.0
32 Colorado	2.3
33 Massachusetts	2.2
34 Nebraska	2.1
35 Rhode Island	2.1
36 Wisconsin	1.9
37 New Mexico	1.8
38 Washington	1.7
39 Oregon	1.0
40 Iowa	0.9
41 Hawaii	0.8
42 Minnesota	0.7
43 Wyoming	0.7
44 Utah	0.5
45 Maine	0.3
46 New Hampshire	0.3
47 Idaho	0.2
48 Montana	0.2
49 South Dakota	0.2
50 North Dakota	0.1
51 Vermont	0.1
National average	10.5

Source: 1960 U.S. Census.

Negro Population by States, 1970

Rank and State:	
1 New York	2,166,933
2 Illinois	1,425,674
3 Texas	1,419,677
4 California	1,400,143
5 Georgia	1,190,779
6 North Carolina	1,137,664
7 Louisiana	1,088,734
8 Florida	1,049,578
9 Pennsylvania	1,016,514
10 Michigan	991,066
11 Ohio	970,477
12 Alabama	908,247
13 Virginia	865,388
14 Mississippi	815,770
15 South Carolina	789,041
16 New Jersey	770,292
17 Maryland	701,841
18 Tennessee	631,696
19 District of Columbia	537,712
20 Missouri	480,172
21 Indiana	357,464
22 Arkansas	357,225
23 Kentucky	241,292
24 Connecticut	181,177
25 Oklahoma	177,907
26 Massachusetts	175,817
27 Wisconsin	128,224

28 Kansas	106,977
29 Delaware	78,276
30 West Virginia	73,931
31 Washington	71,308
32 Colorado	66,411
33 Arizona	53,344
34 Nebraska	39,911
35 Minnesota	34,868
36 Iowa	32,596
37 Nevada	27,762
38 Oregon	26,308
39 Rhode Island	25,338
40 New Mexico	19,555
41 Alaska	8,911
42 Hawaii	7,573
43 Utah	6,617
44 Maine	2,800
45 Wyoming	2,568
46 New Hampshire	2,505
47 North Dakota	2,494
48 Idaho	2,130
49 Montana	1,995
50 South Dakota	1,627
51 Vermont	761

National total 22,672,570
Source: 1970 Census.

Negro population by States, 1960

Rank and State:	
1 New York	1,417,511
2 Texas	1,187,125
3 Georgia	1,122,596
4 North Carolina	1,116,021
5 Louisiana	1,039,207
6 Illinois	1,037,470
7 Alabama	980,271
8 Mississippi	915,743
9 California	883,861
10 Florida	880,186
11 Pennsylvania	852,750
12 South Carolina	829,291
13 Virginia	816,258
14 Ohio	786,097
15 Michigan	717,581
16 Tennessee	586,876
17 Maryland	518,410
18 New Jersey	514,875
19 District of Columbia	411,737
20 Missouri	390,853
21 Arkansas	388,787
22 Indiana	269,275
23 Kentucky	215,949
24 Oklahoma	153,084
25 Massachusetts	111,842
26 Connecticut	107,449
27 Kansas	91,445
28 West Virginia	89,378
29 Wisconsin	74,546
30 Delaware	60,688
31 Washington	48,738
32 Arizona	43,403
33 Colorado	39,992
34 Nebraska	29,262
35 Iowa	25,354
36 Minnesota	22,263
37 Rhode Island	18,332
38 Oregon	18,133
39 New Mexico	17,063
40 Nevada	13,484
41 Alaska	6,771
42 Hawaii	4,943
43 Utah	4,148
44 Maine	3,318
45 Wyoming	2,183
46 New Hampshire	1,903
47 Idaho	1,502
48 Montana	1,467
49 South Dakota	1,114
50 North Dakota	777
51 Vermont	519

National total 18,871,831
Source: 1960 U.S. Census.

REPORT TO THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Michigan (Mr. Diggs) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS, Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1971, the 13-member congressional black caucus responded to the President's report of May 18, 1971, in which he addressed himself to 60 recommendations for governmental action on major issues of today which said group previously submitted to him on March 25, 1971.

In their response, a "Report to the Nation," the caucus expressed disappointment in the 115-page report which failed to introduce new policy in the way of economic security and development; community and urban development; justice and civil rights, and foreign policy. The President's report merely reiterated policy already familiar to the caucus which we feel is totally inadequate in addressing itself to the areas so stated. We are including statements drawn up by the caucus expressing our reaction to the President's report.

The members of the congressional black caucus are: CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan, chairman; AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, of California, vice chairman; CHARLES B. RANGEL, of New York, secretary; SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, of New York; WILLIAM L. CLAY, of Missouri; LOUIS STOKES, of Ohio; GEORGE W. COLLINS, of Illinois; JOHN CONYERS, JR., of Michigan; RONALD V. DELLUMS, of California; RALPH H. METCALFE, of Illinois; PARREN MITCHELL, of Maryland; ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Pennsylvania; and the Reverend WALTER FAUNTROY, Delegate-Elect of Washington, D.C.

The statements follow:

REPORT TO THE NATION

(Presented by the Congressional Black Caucus, Monday, May 24, 1971)

INTRODUCTION

Holding public office in America has always been viewed by the un-cynical as a public trust. The thirteen black members of the United States House of Representatives are trying to demonstrate that it is still that for us, for the thousands of Black Americans and other minorities and whites who sent us to Washington, and for the unrepresented millions who still have no effective voice in the machinery of their national government.

The political hopes and aspirations of Black Americans have passed through two Reconstruction periods. Both ended with the surrender of national responsibility for the plight of black people to the individual states of the South, or to a laissez-faire benevolence that condemned them to perpetual half-citizenship.

The second Reconstruction was the heady period following the historic May 17th Supreme Court decision and included: the rebirth of black activism with the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1956; the sit-ins of the early sixties when young people showed some of the determination that their elders were lacking; the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act when American blacks began to believe that freedom, like the end of the war in Vietnam, was "just around the corner."

Those beginnings began to end in 1968, but not simply because one man and one party won the Presidency and another was defeated. The circumstances of death for the Second Reconstruction were many and complex. But they were deeply rooted in the American notion that once granted the already Constitutionally guaranteed right to vote, Black Americans had been "given enough!" A not unrelated, if unspoken, decision seems to have been made in some quarters about the poor.

Through the 1960's, as the black movement struggled into politics, escalated into protest, culminated in rebellion, one theme was constant: the belief held by the overwhelming majority of Black Americans that the political process is one—not necessarily the best or only one—of several problem-solving devices open to us. As the democratically selected representatives of a cross-section of black people, we embody some of that belief. We intend, therefore, to represent, to the best of our abilities, the political dreams and concrete demands which spring from our constituents and from all other Americans, similarly situated.

REPORT TO THE NATION

Sixty days ago the members of the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Richard Nixon in what we felt to be a useful and, hopefully, fruitful exchange. In the statement with which we opened that meeting, we expressed our deep conviction that, as we said then, "large numbers of our citizens are being subjected to intense hardship, are denied their basic rights, and are suffering irreparable harm as a result of current policies."

Sixty days later, with unemployment and the impact of the nation's skewed priorities falling most heavily upon our constituencies, we found much less reason to alter our convictions than we had hoped.

Clearly, no President and no Administration should be expected to stand accountable for the entire legacy of historic wrongs, of calculated neglect and bland unconcern which has for too long crippled the lives and restricted the options of millions of black, brown, red and poor Americans of every age and color. But neither can any President nor any Administration expect that their deeds—and words—will be exempt from the sober judgment of those whose lives are inevitably shaped by the decisions or non-decisions, the programs and policies of these national political leaders.

We felt many months ago, and continue to feel that, no matter what party occupies the White House, it is an unhealthy state of affairs if there is not continuing communication between the Chief Executive and those elected officials who are most looked to by minority and poor Americans as both the symbolic and real political expression of their aspirations and needs.

But, that communication, if it is truly to further the national good, must be serious, and as candid as political realities will permit. From the beginning, the Congressional Black Caucus has been interested not in a sterile and formalistic exchange of words and documents, but in a genuine mutual coming to grips with the forces and failures which have the greatest potential for ripping this country asunder. For we continue to believe that the most profound threat to America's future lies not beyond its borders but here at home, in our continuing refusal to face up to the perils of our future posed by racism, class cleavages, poverty and governmental unresponsiveness.

It was against this backdrop of purpose and concern that the Caucus attempted to measure the statements and actions of the President and the Administration in the period since our meeting.

Last week we received the President's reply to the sixty-one recommendations we had left with him. We want to be fair in characterizing this document and we intend to point out such instances of forward movement as we think it contains. But we would be less than honest if we did not admit that, for most of its 115 pages, we found it deeply disappointing.

Let us say at the outset that we were initially heartened by the evidence offered by the report itself, that the President had taken our March 25th meeting with him sufficiently seriously to respond to our concerns. But in reality the document constitutes less a response than a reply, couched

predominately in the form of bureaucratic reports intent on justifying the status quo. The challenge we tried to catalyze—fresh thinking, the matching of implementation with need, the degree of courage and commitment national leadership has brought to other efforts in the past—appears for the most part to have been ignored.

Time and again, throughout the 100-odd pages, the Administration shut off the possibility of new and, we believe, promising initiatives. Too often it proposed no genuine alternatives at all. Instead, government officials devised tortuous and sometimes disingenuous explanations for the shortcomings of existing policies and programs affecting minorities, the poor and the cities.

We, on the other hand, are acutely aware that the current state of the nation, which may be mildly inconvenient to the majority of white America, is for the black, brown, red and poor we represent a true crisis which approaches the intolerable. Given this situation, business as usual, bureaucracy as usual, politics as usual simply is not good enough.

What is gained for example by suggesting that blacks do not need special federal guarantees for community economic endeavors when mortgage banks and savings and loan associations have enjoyed these privileges for decades? Why juggle figures, comparing bad with worse, on the number of blacks in policymaking positions in federal agencies, when the overall percentage of blacks in such slots has scarcely changed? Why say to us and the presidents of black colleges and universities that a speech by one cabinet officer on a ceremonial occasion is responsive to our request that there be action-oriented meetings with Cabinet officers in order to increase the token 3 percent of federal resources these institutions now receive? The Administration has given valuable support to the important Emergency School Aid and Quality Integration Act of 1971 now before the House of Representatives. But can we now be certain that the recent announcement requiring Austin, Texas, to adopt a busing plan (in conformity with the Supreme Court's ruling) actually means that the Administration has firmly decided to reverse its earlier position in opposition to busing?

The "federal dinosaur," as described recently by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights may have "at least opened one eye." But with all due respect to the efforts of that agency, we do not feel that dinosaurs are equipped to help us deal adequately with the crying needs of the Seventies. Strong and vigorous Presidential, Cabinet level and Congressional leadership is needed, guided by a clear comprehension of the need and opportunities for change.

The President, in the transmittal letter which accompanied the replies from the various federal agencies, stated that we and his Administration are in agreement on "broad goals." We would very much wish that to be so. But "goals" are undergirded by basic assumptions which give words their meaning. We of the Congressional Black Caucus place the dignity of human beings above the perfection of management techniques and the balancing of books at people's expense. We place constitutional guarantees for citizens above preservation of order through force. We believe that our constituencies have the right and the ability to determine their own affairs. In our view, voluntarism is no substitute for effective enforcement of the law. There is no better evidence of our differences with the Administration on these basic issues than our respective views on economic development, welfare reform, and revenue sharing.

We are, indeed, committed to what the President described in his letter as "a concerted drive for expanded economic opportunities for minorities and all Americans—a drive to validate with jobs, income

and tangible benefits the pledges this society has made to the disadvantaged in the past decade." But when we make concrete proposals for bringing this about, what is the Administration's reply?

The Caucus, in its March report, called for the commitment of at least \$1 billion to assist minority business. The President, in his answer, cited an increase in total Federal support for this purpose of \$115 million from 1969 to 1970. The Caucus called for the creation of a Federally-funded independent development bank. The President described the Administration's bureaucratic reorganization plans. The Caucus called for tax legislation favoring investment in urban centers by organizations of minorities and the poor. We were told that tax incentives are not proper . . . for inner cities. We were further advised by the authors of the highly-touted Philadelphia Plan that fixed percentage set-asides for minority non-construction contractors are "neither necessary or desirable." It is of course encouraging to note that plans are underway to provide increased and more effective technical assistance to minority enterprises. But what is essentially communicated in the President's report is that there is no disposition to see that individual and community minority enterprises shall enjoy the benefits and assists which our system has always accorded white business and financial interests.

The Caucus also shares with the President "a determination to reform the welfare system." What happens to our agreement on this "broad goal" however when we find the Administration supporting a demonstrably worse welfare bill than its own inadequate Family Assistance Plan? How should we interpret statements by the President since our meeting in March containing 'workfare' rhetoric which only reinforces existing welfare myths?

The President, in his letter to us, stated that we "attach high priority," as does he, "to a program of revenue sharing that will enable our cities and states to serve the people better." In our report of March 25, 1971, we described the central issue as one of block grants versus categorical grants, for "the federal government has been sharing federally-collected tax money revenues with states, cities, counties, and individuals for the past forty years." We then went on to describe the form of fiscal relief to state and local governments we would favor; including assurances that funds would be spent in ways and amounts that would benefit poor and minority citizens least likely to prevail; allowance for participation of neighborhood and other community units in planning and decisions on expenditures; enforcement of civil rights laws with respect to such funds; and incentives for states to shift from regressive forms of taxation, that fall most heavily on low and low-middle income families, to more progressive income taxes.

We think it is safe to say that what the Administration proposed in its reply differs in kind and degree from what we outlined in March. No one feels the crushing fiscal burdens of our cities more than we and we are pledged to join with others, without regard to party, in getting prompt and effective solutions. But we do wonder why states and cities cannot be helped without jeopardizing the interests of minorities and the poor? The Administration's Education Revenue Sharing proposal has assumed that it is more important to deliver funds to states than to provide: civil rights protection and accountability through federally approved state plans; comparability guarantees; and requirements that assure community residents the right to participate in decisions, as in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We are also disturbed that proposal after proposal in our March report was rejected with the explanation that solutions would be provided under revenue sharing or

governmental reorganization plans. It is in fact hard not to conclude that funds which might otherwise be available are being held hostage to the eventual, but by no means certain, passage of this legislation.

We have no intention of cataloguing in the body of this Report to the Nation what we feel to be all of the pluses and minuses for our constituencies in the Administration's reply. A representative sampling of these will be found in the Appendix we have prepared and a more complete version of our analysis will be released in the near future.

There are some indications of forward movement reflected in the document. Although the funds requested by the Administration fall far short of the total recommended by the Caucus for summer jobs, we note that the President asked on April 9, 1971 for an extra \$64.3 million to put disadvantaged teenagers to work, and we hope that his continued leadership on this question will be forthcoming. We view as a step in the right direction the Administration's declared intention to request an additional \$15 million for black colleges and universities for Fiscal Year 1972. The Administration endorsed our recommendations that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation provide technical assistance to black banks and that an investigation of the quality of justice for black servicemen be made. We are gratified, too, that our presentation concerning the drug crisis stimulated the Administration's interest, as the space accorded this issue in the White House document reflects.

But at the same time certain disturbing themes are consistent and pronounced. Not only do we not share basic assumptions and definitions, but we have sharp disagreements concerning priorities; the relative sense of urgency; the scale of solutions proposed in relation to the magnitude of the problems; our methods for arriving at answers based on the basic assumptions held; the degree of initiative and self-determination permitted minorities and poor people under given policies or programs; and even on what is meant by "implementation" and "result orientation," a point of particular importance in view of the Administration's own desire to be judged not by its rhetoric but its deeds. The following examples are representative:

BASIC DIFFERENCE IN ASSUMPTIONS

The Congressional Black Caucus does not share the opinion that suspension of constitutional rights is justifiable for any purpose. Accordingly, we have expressed alarm that the D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 has been advertised as a model for the nation. Although the Attorney General was quoted in the President's Report as saying that the Administration has never indicated "all these provisions should be adopted in the states," we are aware of legislation proposed by him on May 17, 1971, authorizing preventive detention of suspects accused of "dangerous or organized crime activity" in all federal courts. This belies the assertion made in the reply and bears witness to our fundamentally differing positions on this question.

DIFFERENCES IN PRIORITIES

The Caucus feels that the Vietnam war has been the most grossly disruptive force in distorting our national priorities. Now, even as the President talks of winding down the war, he has requested a rise in defense expenditures for Fiscal Year 1972, while raising technical and ill-supported arguments in his reply to us for the continuation of the freeze and the limitation on the spending of funds for the human needs of our constituencies. We are painfully aware that when the Nixon Administration took over in FY 1969, total military outlays were \$78.7 billion, including about \$23 billion for Vietnam. Despite the fact that Vietnam out-

lays will have declined by \$17 billion in FY 1972, the Administration projects total defense spending only \$2.7 billion below the 1969 level. In addition, the \$315 million in federal funds available for all minority economic development is less than one-half of the Administration's proposed guarantees of \$750 million for temporary relief of Lockheed and Penn Central, and less than one-third of the billion dollars the federal government will have spent in the aborted C5A program.

SENSE OF URGENCY

The Congressional Black Caucus requested that the sugar quota for South Africa be discontinued immediately. The Administration replied by saying that it is recommending a two or three year extension of the \$20 million annual subsidy under sugar quota laws for South Africa, which presently has a quota equal to that of four developing black African nations.

SCALE OF EFFORT

In reply to the Caucus recommendation concerning the need for an adequate stock of low and moderate income housing, the Administration cited the fact that in urban renewal projects, commitments by the Department of Housing and Urban Development would make 25,000 dwelling units available in FY 1972. When contrasted with the need for 200,000 such units in Washington alone, the President's reply constitutes not even a token reply to our concern. Further, it is clear that solutions on a scale that would provide the amount of low and moderate income housing required cannot come until there is the "equal access to the total housing market", which the Caucus projected as a goal in its report to the President. This goal was at the heart of Caucus Housing Recommendations 2, 3, 4, and 5—and of the question put to the President in the March meeting, concerning the status of the legal opinion on which the Administration might determine its policy in regard to race and income barriers to suburban housing. Meanwhile, Administration statements on "forced integration", and the confusion over the import of the Valtierra Case, further limit the probability of dealing adequately with problems of housing and the intimately interrelated problems of jobs and education.

VOLUNTARISM VS. ENFORCEMENT

According to a recent Civil Service Commission report, at least 70 percent of the black employees in every federal department are in grades GS 1-3, and less than one percent of decision-makers in supergrades is black. In citing progress in this area to date, the Administration pointed to an increase in minority employment in the federal government of .6 percent in three years. The method of implementation used to achieve this imperceptible gain, "advising federal departments and agencies that the establishment of goals and timetables is a useful management concept", explains the failure of achievement. The Administration has consistently confused the issuance of guidelines, the conduct of studies and the endorsement of voluntary agreements with effective enforcement of the law.

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR MINORITIES AND THE POOR

The Caucus is dismayed by the Administration's apparent support of provisions of the revised Family Assistance Plan which even more seriously erode "individual freedom of choice and self-respect" than did the President's original proposal. We note further that while the updated version of the Welfare Reform Bill would require registration for work or training for mothers of children over three, the Administration endorsed the voucher payment method for day care services. This approach would seriously handicap parents and communities in providing and controlling developmental child care programs for their children.

"RESULT ORIENTATION" IN PERSPECTIVE

The Administration stated that its revision of the food stamp purchase schedule would provide free food stamp allotments to those with little or no income. In fact, new regulations published in April by the Department of Agriculture, if instituted, would have just the opposite effect. Over 2 million present participants in the program would be seriously hurt by the new schedules; 350,000 would be eliminated entirely, and 1.7 million would receive substantially reduced benefits.

To the degree that these differences in perspective and concern are mirrored in segments of the larger society, any shared shortfall of perception and commitment on the part of the President and his advisors takes on even more disturbing significance for the future of relations between races and classes in our society. And it does no good to suggest that decisions are being made without regard to race or class. We do not even have to go to the alienated young, the blacks in Northern ghettos, or the Chicanos in the barrios of East Los Angeles. We hear daily from established organizations and well-known human rights leaders, among others, who are disturbed about what they see as basic shifts in racial policy and accelerated steps toward national disaster.

In summary, the predominant thrust of the Administration's reply places one central fact in harsh perspective. National decision-makers do not define the critical problems facing blacks, the poor, our youth and our nation in ways which may result in their resolution and are not yet prepared to commit the necessary power and resources to achieve their own stated goals.

LOOKING AHEAD

We have only begun.—As of today, May 24, 1971, there can be no escaping the undeniable facts which tell us that Black Americans, despite the much heralded and often exaggerated progress of the Sixties, are slipping further and further behind most of their white fellow citizens.

Whether we look at the infant mortality rates, unemployment and underemployment, median family income, the percentage of population on welfare rolls at the poverty level, in low-income housing and in the lower echelons of military service, it is undeniable that the old folk saying still applies: "if you're black, get back!"

But by 1971, it ought to be clear that the American black community is not prepared to get back one more inch. Certainly it is clear to us as black elected officials, and to our brothers and sisters who hold office in growing—though still inadequate—numbers across this country. Those who are elected, as some of us are, from districts which include not only Black Americans, but Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Caucasians and Indians, know that blacks do not have a monopoly on impatience and distrust of unresponsive politicians and governments.

The Congressional Black Caucus is committed to doing its part in making politics and government more responsive to our constituencies, as it has been—and is—to others. We fully intend, as we told the President in March, to do all that is within our power to reverse the retreat from a commitment to make all Americans equal in the eyes of government. And we intend to continue making clear to the Administration and to the leaders of both parties that for us that commitment means the only kind of equality with any real significance—*equality of results*.

And let us set the record straight on why we have agreed to establish a mechanism for receiving contributions to the Caucus and for raising funds. We are interested neither in a slush fund for Caucus members nor a war chest for the support of any national candidate—either from within our own ranks or elsewhere. Long before we first requested a meeting with the President, we realized

how handicapped we were in not having the staff resources needed for the Caucus in order to effectively play the role it must play in championing in the national political arena the cause of black people, poor people and the dispossessed and alienated of all races. We have not had at our command the thousands of employees and the hundreds of technicians available to the White House in the preparation of the exchange between us on a variety of critical issues. It is a tribute to black organizations, technicians and leaders across the country—and to others who volunteered assistance without regard to race—that what we have attempted was possible at all. The range and enthusiasm of the support has astonished us. It came from civil rights groups, elected and appointed officials at every other level of government, the black caucuses of professionals and students, poverty and community groups, women's organizations, religious and working class leaders. As politicians, we were surprised at the spectrum of ideologies and political beliefs represented among those who wished to see our efforts succeed.

But now, they and we have acknowledged that the Congressional Black Caucus must develop a capable, independent staff to assist it in its future efforts. Indeed, we cannot effectively screen and evaluate at present the requests for assistance on vital issues which come to us from all over the nation, nor can we make the best use of the contributions which knowledgeable black technicians, professionals and activists have made and are prepared to make. The staff we hope to assemble will be headed by an Executive Director, selected by the Caucus, and will include program specialists in the following seven multi-disciplined areas: health, education and welfare; civil rights, law and justice; manpower and economic development; housing and urban affairs, foreign affairs, political action and the press. Under the direction of the Caucus, the staff will refine and expand the present recommendations into a continuous black agenda for national and international action. In addition to conducting individual research, the staff will establish permanent two-way channels of input and exchange on programmatic issues and ideas with every major black fraternal, civil rights, professional, religious, beneficial and social action organization, all significant black leadership in business, government, labor, academia and in the grass roots community and all black elected official leadership groups and organizations.

The Caucus action agenda will outline on a regular basis with specific proposals target areas for executive action by the White House, legislative action by the Congress, regulatory action by federal departments and agencies, and national action by the American people. It is contemplated that the agenda will be the most complete summarization available of black views on a comprehensive range of subjects, and it will be ideally structured to reflect the ever-changing ideas and realities in the nation's black community.

The Caucus, with its staff, will also develop the resource linkages to enable it to mount a much needed program of political action technical assistance. Such assistance would seek to develop new mechanisms and expanded roles for black participation in the political process. Educational programs would be developed to systematically increase the effectiveness of present black elected officials, to encourage and assist black candidates running for public office, to develop mechanisms for political action by young black people, to assist black people in gaining a greater role at the decision making levels of the local, state, and national political party structure and to establish an ongoing new and informational exchange concerning the activities of the Caucus and other black elected officials.

Census figures released a few days ago in-

dicate that nearly half the country's black population is concentrated in 50 cities, that a third of that total is in 15 cities, and that six cities now have black majorities—with eight others having black populations of 40 percent or more. These facts and the accompanying figures have political implications of which some of our sisters and brothers at the local and state levels are already acutely aware. Along with them, we must help bring about a broader and deeper understanding of what these political bases can and must mean in economic, social and human terms. Questions are already being asked, for example, about the meaning of metropolitan and area-wide planning and government when viewed from the perspectives of the blacks and other minorities, the poor and near poor. Similar questions are being raised about the trade-offs between central cities and suburbs, not simply on water and sewers, but on jobs, transportation, housing, schools and the delivery of health and other services.

We intend to assist other groups and leaders who will be educating our constituencies to an awareness of, and strategies for dealing with such issues of critical import for their survival. On another level, we do not expect that other organizations representing minority and low-income interests will be indifferent to the actual delivery by the government on the pledges made to the late Whitney Young—to involve, for the first time, a major private group representing such interests in the implementation and evaluation of programs designed to help poor and minority citizens. And, while applauding the action taken by the Justice Department in rejecting what it found to be discriminatory reapportionment in Virginia, we will be joining the NAACP and other groups in watching carefully the government's role in protecting black voters in those Mississippi counties where states and localities have moved to require re-registration, re-districting and changes in the method by which officials are elected.

We do not intend to have our vision obscured by partisan blinders where the interests of our constituencies and our ability to serve them effectively are concerned. We complained, rightly we feel, when for months President Nixon would not honor our request for an audience with him. After our meeting with the President, we sent identical letters to the Democratic and Republican leadership of both Houses of Congress and followed up with telephone queries. We have since met with the House Democratic and Republican leadership, and are scheduled for a meeting with the Senate Republican leadership to discuss those legislative issues of particular concern to our constituencies. As of this date, however, we have not been assured a meeting of the Caucus with Democratic leaders in the Senate.

We serve notice here and now that, if we have anything to do with it, the days of taking black and poor voters for granted is over. Let it be understood that we say this not in a spirit of self-serving arrogance, but as a natural consequence of our firm belief that the legislative and executive branches of government particularly must be more accountable than they have been in the past to the most neglected of our citizens. As elected officials, we expect to be held no less accountable.

We intend to go forward resolutely in seeking implementation of the recommendations we have already made, and in formulating and seeking action on proposals which we and others will be able to advance more precisely in the months ahead. Where there has been agreement between ourselves and the White House on a course of action, we will be taking the Administration at its word and judging it by its deeds. But we do not intend to surrender all the initiative to others here in Washington. We plan to help draft and sponsor legislation to achieve the ends

we seek and we shall be particularly interested in forming coalitions to bring about the changes we desire.

Our viewpoint on coalitions is not too different from that already expressed by some of our members. With the help of other minority elected officials and national and local leaders representing poor and low-income citizens, women and youth, we hope to effect coalitions of interest with those who share our deepest concerns. But we do not delude ourselves that we are necessarily talking about permanent coalitions, permanent friends, or permanent enemies. It is the interests of our constituencies which are permanent—and we are convinced that the national interest will not be truly served until America justly and adequately meets the needs and aspirations of those citizens who too often have been treated as aliens.

We have been asked over the past several weeks by black leaders and others around the country if we are shaping issues and strategies for 1972. To date, the Caucus has not addressed itself as a body to this concern, but we would be derelict in our duty if we did not at some point in the not-too-distant future. Hopefully, we will have a staff which can assess the communications and suggestions we have already received and which can help position us to respond to the invitations we have received to sit down with those elected officials and leaders of private groups who are most likely to converge around common agendas. We are tentatively inclined at this point to be concerned about whether the platforms of the major parties reflect the central interests of our constituents. Civil rights is clearly one of these. But now, in the months leading up to 1972, and in the period beyond, we think it is important that the nation know clearly that our concerns are not bound by what is conventionally known as civil rights.

Certain black speakers used to refer wryly to the fact that Southern blacks often sang the old spiritual "Take all the world, and give me Jesus"—and that in too many cases the whites in power did precisely that. Except for the fact that blacks in this country do not yet have their civil rights, there is more than a slight correspondence between the situation the speakers mocked and the tendency of certain politicians to feel that they have dealt sufficiently with the problems of blacks when they have made a few gestures in the direction of civil rights, or have given some visibility to a black appointee or employee. We urgently want more blacks hired and appointed with real power to act, and we want to collect finally on the long overdue civil rights pledges. But when people are poor or only one pay day away from poverty, when they cannot get decent houses, when the schools their children attend do not educate, when their civil liberties as well as their civil rights are insecure if they happen to be dark-skinned, or young or shabbily or unconventionally dressed—then it must be clearly understood that they cannot be treated to a speech or a few lines in a convention platform about civil rights and then dismissed.

Standing on the threshold of this summer and what may be for many families a bleak winter beyond, we cannot permit ourselves the luxury of thinking and acting only in terms of 1972. If the country does some of the things it should and must, we would hope to have a less polarized and less inequitably balanced society by 1972—as well as some significant increase in the membership of the Congressional Black Caucus.

But today, May 24, 1971, at this moment of peril and challenge, we call upon the organizations and leaders of blacks and other minorities, on young people whose awareness and political potential can make a difference, on all those who truly care about the poor and near poor and the wholeness of this nation, to join with us in making the country and its political leaders aware that a new

political and social consciousness is beginning to stir in this land. And that if all of us are to survive, political leaders and governments at all levels must become as responsive to those whose needs that consciousness stirs as they have been in the past to other segments of our society.

As for us, we are not romanticists. We know that we may experience setbacks. As politicians, we have known both victory and defeat—and we hope we have learned how to profit from one and not be lulled into complacency or apathy by the other. But we are determined that, with the help of those who will join us, our setbacks will be only temporary. We are prepared to be followers as well as leaders, and we welcome the struggles immediately ahead. For we are committed to putting such skills, resources and energies as we can muster into challenging the forces and institutions in this nation which are blocking change. It is, of course, important that people be heard. But it is not enough for us that the voices of the blacks, the poor, the browns, the reds, the marginal workers, the young—who make up so significant a part of our districts and our national constituency—be heard. We want them answered. And we want them answered in the only way that can ultimately justify politicians and governments—that they pragmatically empower people in ways that free them to change for the better their lives, and the future prospects of their nation.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS STATEMENT OF GOALS, MARCH 25, 1971

Our people are no longer asking for equality as a rhetorical promise. They are demanding from the national Administration, and from elected officials without regard to party affiliation, the only kind of equality that ultimately has any meaning—equality of results.

If we are in fact to be equal in this country, then the government must help us achieve these results:

The eradication of racism within the United States and in its dealings with other nations;

The earning of a decent living, or the means to survive in dignity when work is not available;

Decent housing for our families and equal access to the total housing market;

Fair and impartial justice and adequate protection against drug abuse and crime;

The enforcement of civil rights and other constitutional guarantees through vigorous affirmative action by the government;

A fair share of the public funds used to support business and community development and full participation in determining how tax dollars are spent in our communities;

The guarantee by the federal government of ample health care for all citizens;

The protection of federal standards and guarantees in programs financed by federal funds; and

The full participation by the members of our communities in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our government at every level.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS MEMBERS AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Chairman, Michigan, 2464 Rayburn House Office Building, Foreign Affairs Committee, District of Columbia Committee.

Augustus F. Hawkins, Vice-Chairman, California, 1124 Longworth House Office Building, Education and Labor Committee, House Administration Committee.

Charles B. Rangel, Secretary, New York, 226 Cannon House Office Building, Public Works Committee, Science and Astronautics Committee, Select Committee on Crime.

Shirley Chisholm, New York, 123 Cannon House Office Building, Education and Labor Committee.

William L. Clay, Missouri, 328 Cannon

House Office Building, Education and Labor Committee.

George W. Collins, Illinois, 1504 Longworth House Office Building, Government Operations Committee, Public Works Committee.

John Conyers, Jr., Michigan, 222 Cannon House Office Building, Government Operations Committee, Judiciary Committee.

Ronald V. Dellums, California, 1417 Longworth House Office Building, Foreign Affairs Committee, District of Columbia Committee.

Walter E. Fauntroy, District of Columbia, 1330 Longworth House Office Building, District of Columbia Committee.

Ralph H. Metcalfe, Illinois, 1110 Longworth House Office Building, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Parren Mitchell, Maryland, 1228 Longworth House Office Building, Banking and Currency Committee, Permanent Select Committee on Small Business.

Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania, 2201 Rayburn House Office Building, Foreign Affairs Committee, Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Louis Stokes, Ohio, 315 Cannon House Office Building, Appropriations Committee.

APPENDIX. HIGHLIGHT COMMENTS ON WHITE HOUSE REPORT

A. Economic security and economic development

1. Manpower and employment rights

Recommendation 1 and 2: The Administration's reply essentially rejected the Caucus recommendation for a comprehensive national manpower planning program and the call for the creation of 1,100,000 productive jobs in the public sector. Instead, the report cited the President's revenue sharing proposals, his proposed program for 200,000 jobs for welfare recipients, and existing job programs as meeting the critical needs of the unemployed. With over 5 million Americans unemployed, with the national rate of unemployment for black people at 10%, with black teenage unemployment in poverty neighborhoods standing at a terrifying 44.7%, there is a national employment emergency for black people, which warrants immediate attention and action by the Administration and Congress.

Recommendation 3: The Administration failed to agree to provide one million NYC jobs for youth during the summer. Instead, the Administration stated that it would provide 514,000 summer jobs in this category. Further, since the President intends to reduce the number of weeks for each job to 9 weeks, NYC workers will actually receive less money than last year. With over a third of the black teenagers in the year-round labor market unemployed, with an additional one million in-school black youth joining the competition for summer jobs, and with the past inability of private employers to meet unemployment needs in years when the job market was more open, the necessity of an expanded Federally-supported summer job program is incontrovertible.

Recommendation 4: a. The Administration did not make, nor did it propose basic changes in the hiring, placement and promotion of black people in the Federal government. These broad changes are clearly necessary because black people are still concentrated in the lowest paying jobs.

Using the same Civil Service Commission report which formed the basis for statistical data in the Presidential reply, we are alarmed that:

1. In every department of the Federal government, at least 70% of the black employees were in grades 1-8. Ironically, the Justice Department was the worst offender with 90.8% of the black employees placed in these low grades; and that,

2. Less than 1% of the black employees of any department were in the supergrades (16-18).

In citing the progress to date, the Adminis-

tration is apparently proud of the fact that minority employment increased from 18.9% in 1967 to 19.4% in 1970: a mere .6% in 3 years.

b. To change this pattern the Administration is relying on previous programs and voluntarism. The Civil Rights Commission has, "advised Federal departments and agencies that the establishment of goals and timetables is a useful management concept which should be used wherever appropriate." We take strong exception to the use of advice instead of strict enforcement. Token programs to recruit or promote a few more blacks will neither change the system nor provide redress for the thousands of black employees inequitably placed in and restricted to the lowest ranks of the Civil Service.

Recommendation 5: a. The Administration has not enforced Executive Order 11246 in the non-construction industries, nor in the construction industry. The Administration has regressed to emphasizing voluntary compliance, which historically has been ineffective. Order No. 4, requiring nonconstruction Federal contractors to develop affirmative action plans with goals and timetables, allows the contractor to set the acceptable standard for EEO compliance. Even this Order, which affects the majority of jobs, is not being enforced.

b. Furthermore, the Administration has not extended to the entire construction industry the concept embodied in the Philadelphia Plan of including specific goals and timetables in construction contracts. The Administration has focused on voluntary hometown plans which are not substantially increasing the number of jobs for blacks. In a memorandum to the Under Secretary of Labor recommending a response to the Congressional Black Caucus, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) stated:

"Unfortunately, in view few cities can the hometown solution (voluntary plan) be said to be producing results. In most of the other cities, the hometown plan is not working. . . ."

Continuing, he said that OFCC's experience with the voluntary approach had "convinced us of the legality, the practicality and the necessity of developing a national program with national goals."

c. Of the two Government-imposed plans, the claimed results of the Philadelphia Plan are still disputed by many non-government observers in Philadelphia and the Washington Plan remains unenforced.

Recommendation 6: a. The Administration flatly refused to give support for the granting of cease and desist power to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Without this power, EEOC is rendered impotent in ensuring equal employment opportunity and in providing redress for the victims of discrimination in employment.

b. The Administration did state its support for extending the jurisdiction of EEOC to employees of state and local governments. Yet, without the cease and desist authority the extension of coverage of employees is meaningless.

2. Welfare Reform

Recommendation 1: a. The Administration clearly rejected the recommendation of the Congressional Black Caucus that \$6,500 a year, \$440 less than what has been calculated as the minimum income needed by an urban family of four, be provided to assure minimum standards of health and decency for Family Assistance recipients.

b. The Administration has already given its support to the Family Assistance Plan, approved by the House Ways and Means Committee on May 13, 1971, (H.R. 1). Although the bill raises the payment level for recipients in states that now pay the least and provides substantial benefits for the aged, disabled, and blind, in crucial ways, this sup-

port represents a backward step. For example:

(1) The Family Assistance Act sets payment levels at \$2,400 a year for a family of four. Payments will never go above that amount and there is no commitment to maintain present payment levels in the 45 states where they now exceed \$2,400. In fact, 9 out of 10 welfare families could be worse off, since \$2,400 a year is above present payment levels for only 10 percent of them.

(2) The \$2,400 amount proposed by the Ways and Means Committee is actually less than the \$1,600 proposed earlier by the Administration. The earlier bill provided \$1,600 in cash plus \$864 in food stamps. The Committee's action has made recipients ineligible for food stamps.

(3) States would be encouraged to actually reduce payments. If states increased payments above the amount recipients received in cash and food stamps combined as of January 1, 1971, the states will have to pay the entire cost of these increases.

(4) Some states have been providing increased payments under the present welfare system in accordance with the rising cost of living. There is no provision, in fact, allowing increases of the federal payment of \$2,400. Thus, cost of living increases, essential in our unstable economy, will be denied for the poor.

c. We feel that the burden is on the Administration to prove that there would be a \$75 billion cost to the government as a result of establishing a \$6,500 payment level. Since the Caucus did not suggest in its March Report moreover, that these funds be raised through a 58 percent surtax on income, we believe the Administration raised a false issue in its reply which might have the effect of inhibiting serious discussion of our proposal.

d. In light of an unemployment crisis of massive proportion, the forced work requirements of the Family Assistance Plan can only be seen as punitive and unrealistic. The plan, while helping only the lowest wage earners, would deny them the protection of the federal minimum wage. As presently written, the bill does not guarantee that recipients would be assigned to suitable employment. Further, the provision of 200,000 public service jobs in light of a 10 percent unemployment rate in the black community is ludicrously inadequate.

Recommendation 2: a. We note with interest that the Administration stated its willingness in its Report to back provisions for suitable work opportunities and requirements. The Caucus shall anticipate the President's efforts to change H.R. 1 to reflect these views.

b. The overall support given the present Family Assistance Plan by the Administration would indicate, however, a failure of commitment to principles we set forth in this recommendation. For example:

(1) Families would still be required to register for work even though the lack of adequate training, child care services and employment opportunities would result in more harassment than help for the poor.

(2) We find it difficult to comprehend why the already obnoxious provisions of the original FAA, requiring mothers of children over six to register for work, now require mothers of children over three, to turn their preschoolers over to a third party to raise.

c. Recipients will have fewer legal rights under the Family Assistance Plan than they now have. People who lose their jobs can be denied assistance. Welfare recipients are assumed to be guilty before trial. The right to appeal unfavorable decisions is curtailed. Illegal residency requirements may be imposed. In short, in countless ways, the Administration's endorsement of such provisions violates the letter and spirit of our original recommendation.

Recommendation 3: a. The President's Re-

port indicated that over 10 million persons are now assisted by the Food Stamp Program, and this is triple the number aided just 16 months ago. It further stated that new and more liberal regulations on food stamps have been published in the Federal Register and will be implemented during the summer. What the Administration failed to mention, however, is that under the new regulations over 2 million present participants in the program would be seriously hurt by the new schedules; 350,000 eliminated altogether and 1.7 million receiving substantially reduced benefits.

In addition, testimony before the Senate has disclosed that an additional two million persons would be excluded because of the new restrictive definition of what constitutes a "household" in the regulations. The blind, aged and disabled in 10 states would be rendered ineligible for the program in the one and two person category. It is estimated that hundreds of thousands would also be eliminated because of the new regulations regarding proposed "maximum allowable resources".

The Administration is recommending to Congress that the Food Stamp Program be eliminated when the welfare reform bill is passed. The new Department of Agriculture regulations might accomplish that task prematurely.

b. Although the Department of Agriculture supports a "standstill" budget for child nutrition programs based on an estimated 6.6 million eligible children, testimony before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on April 26, 1971, placed the figure at 10 million eligible children. We remind the Administration of its pledge and our recommendation that no children in America go hungry.

c. The Caucus recommended a fully operational cash assistance program whereby welfare families would receive additional cash in lieu of food stamps. Yet, the Administration's proposal of a maximum benefit of \$2,400 includes the cash value of the stamps and is actually less than the cash-food stamp package originally proposed.

3. Federal Assistance to State and Local Government

Recommendation 1: a. The President stated in reply to our March Report that the bulk of the frozen funds are being held for legal and technical reasons: the coverage of long term disbursements to many fully appropriated projects which require massive construction (military and shipping); the withholding of low rent public housing monies because of tight credit conditions; and Congressional restraints on spending within debt and statutory outlay ceilings.

The Caucus finds it difficult to accept legal and technical reasons for failure to release funds to meet critical domestic needs, especially when it is recalled that the earlier position of the Administration related the freezing of funds to control of inflation. In addition, the Caucus is convinced that given the accelerating collapse of the social fabric of our urban cities, releasing frozen funds as part of next year's budget and predicating action on the passage of revenue sharing, is an extremely hazardous way to plan. By not spending urban funds appropriated for this fiscal year until next fiscal year, and by not planning to seek further funding for programs that are to be bumped under revenue sharing, the Administration is in effect ensuring a doubling of needs next year with only this year's money to pay for them.

b. Further, to justify the freezing of funds by the debt and statutory outlay ceiling is to ignore the fact that the President could just as well have withheld \$1.3 billion from the \$70 billion Department of Defense budget rather than to have withheld about one billion from the \$3.3 billion budget of the Department of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment. The Caucus contemplates with dread the possibility that this Administration is prepared to accept the suffering of millions of poor people this year in order that it may strategically release funds at some other time.

Recommendation 5: The Caucus is pleased that the Administration supports extending Titles VI and VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to state and local governments to insure compliance with equal employment guidelines for recipients of general and special revenue sharing funds. To make this meaningful, however, there should be White House support of a provision requiring the shared revenues to be integrated with the general revenues of the recipient government. Otherwise, it would be far too easy for any unit receiving funds to establish a separate account for federal revenues, from which would be made only those kinds of capital expenditures that would be untouched by civil rights enforcement guidelines. Federal funds could be used accordingly to buy trucks, buses, concrete, lumber, pencils and paper while state or local funds could then be used to hire white employees to use them.

4. Minority Economic Development

Recommendation 1: a. The President stated that the Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE) had been an effective vehicle for economic development and he cited \$315 million in federal grants and loans and guarantees as evidence. The Congressional Black Caucus is aware, however, that the \$315 million is less than one-half of the Administration's proposed guarantees of \$750 million for temporary relief of Lockheed and Penn Central, and less than one-third of the billion dollars the Federal government will have spent in the aborted C5A program. This is the real measure of the Administration's commitment in this most vital area.

b. The Administration placed great emphasis on the \$115 million increase in funding available for minority development from 1969 to 1970. Again, to place this issue in perspective, the Administration's major effort to achieve social justice and equal opportunity for 25 million Black Americans is little more than one-tenth of what was initially allocated in the under-financed War on Poverty for 32 million poor Americans.

c. The President's own Advisory Council on Minority Business Enterprise recommended \$500 million for minority enterprise over the next three years, substantially more than the President is willing to spend.

d. SBA programs, which again the President cited as further evidence of the adequacy of the Administration's efforts in this field, have done little to increase the size and scale of minority enterprise. The average minority loan is still \$24,000 while the average non-minority loan is \$65,000.

e. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans announced at the outset of the Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Company (MESBIC) program, the Administration's intent to establish 100 MESBIC's by June 1970. As of March 1971, fewer than 30 were in existence. Many of them are under-capitalized and received no federal funds for staff and administrative expenses. Disenchantment is setting in because when MESBIC's encounter losses, current federal regulations demand that the private sector invest more capital before the MESBIC can become eligible for government matching funds.

Recommendations 2 and 5: a. Community Development Corporations (CDC) have in a three and one-half year period contributed significantly to the accomplishment of the objectives the President claims to support: creation of jobs, increased community income, and expanded minority ownership opportunities. These results were made despite inadequate funding, bureaucratic resistance to innovation and little federally provided management assistance. Their success has

been directly proportional to the amount of funds available to them. Nevertheless, the President chose in his reply to the Caucus to regard CDC's as unproven experiments and budgeted \$20 million less for them in Fiscal Year 1972 than he says was available in 1971.

b. The Congressional Black Caucus finds incredible the President's rejection of the concept of a federally-financed guarantee organization to insure securities and obligations of CDC's on the grounds that "this would stigmatize CDC's" and "be contrary to this Administration's policy of opposing the establishment of permanent narrow-purpose discount facilities." Apparently only the poor and disadvantaged are stigmatized by market support mechanisms. Mortgage bankers and savings and loan officials have long utilized the services of the Federal Mortgage Association and the Government National Mortgage Association without embarrassment.

c. The President refuted his own statement and logic by pointing up the role of the Opportunity Funding Corporation (OFC), a special financing mechanism. He also neglected to add that OFC had received as of May 1971 only \$1 million of a \$7 million grant announced in June 1970.

Recommendation 3: a. The President asserted that under SBA's 8A program, the participation of minority contractors in federal work expanded from \$10.4 million to \$22 million. The Caucus is not impressed. Federal work received by minority firms under 8A still amounts to .022 percent of all federal contracts, or \$22 million out of nearly \$100 billion.

b. There is a basic inconsistency between Administration support of hiring goals set under the highly touted Philadelphia Plan and opposition to such goals for non-construction contractors. This is particularly disturbing in view of the President's obligation to enforce Section 153 of the Economic Opportunity Act and Section 3 of the Housing Act of 1968, which requires OEO and HUD, respectively, to take action so that minorities might receive a greater share of all federally-financed work, not just construction.

Recommendation 6: The Congressional Black Caucus notes with satisfaction that the Administration agreed to have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation provide technical assistance to minority banks. We shall anticipate more detailed plans for implementation.

5. Poverty Programming

Recommendation 1: a. The Caucus is not satisfied with Administration claims that OEO programs, as they "mature," should be spun off to the various line departments so that OEO can be "free" to "continue its primary mission as innovator and advocate of the poor." Nor do we believe that such a procedure will "increase awareness in the line departments of the special needs of the poor." The concept of OEO was, from its inception, to challenge existing bureaucracies by showing that new ways of meeting the real needs of the poor could be developed. The "spinoff" theory is sure to result in regression to prevalent conditions of maladministration of federal benefits intended for the poor.

b. Additionally, we must reiterate our contention that the matching requirement for local communities be eliminated. We are concerned about the needs of communities such as Mound Bayou, Mississippi, which lack sufficient financial resources even to be eligible for such programs. Although the Administration claimed that it decided not to increase the matching share from 20 to 25 percent, this reply still did address itself to our request that this requirement be eliminated to ensure universal community participation.

Recommendation 2: Tragically, the Ad-

ministration bill for a legal services corporation makes a mockery of the very laudable sentiments expressed by President Nixon in his statement of May 5, 1971. In that statement he promised that he would propose legislation which would see that the "lawyers in the program have full freedom to protect the best interest of their clients . . ." and he proposed further that "the Nation be encouraged to continue giving the program the support it needs in order to become a permanent and vital part of the American system of justice."

Yet as the hearings have progressed in both House and Senate, it has become clear to us that the Administration's bill in fact poses grave Constitutional threats to the ability of the legal services lawyer to protect his client's legal rights. Provisions which would institute such devices as "appellate reviews," screening devices, and negotiation by the Corporation with government agencies likely to be the subject of multiple litigation are particularly undesirable. The latter for example would establish a procedure which would prevent an attorney from exercising independent professional judgement on behalf of the poor person who seeks timely appeal or court adjudication of his rights. Any legal services corporation which would seek to intervene between the poor man and his right to a hearing in court would be a disservice to the American people for indeed, "justice delayed is justice denied."

B. Community and human development

1. Education

Recommendation 1: The Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) found the White House Report unresponsive concerning every principle recommended for child development legislation. Some specific examples are:

a. The Caucus called for significant expansion of child development programs. There are 3.3 million children under 6 whose family incomes fall below poverty levels. Yet the Family Assistance Plan day care provisions would provide for only 450,000 children, up to 14 years old. In addition, Administration budget requests for Head Start for 1972 provide for no more children than are presently being served. Further, the Administration's reference to increases in Title IV A funds, although real for the present, is deceptive since these and FAP funds are to be eventually pooled.

b. The Caucus called for developmental rather than custodial care. According to HEW's own estimates such care costs from \$2,100 to \$2,400 per child annually. Yet the Administration has endorsed provisions of FAP which permit maximum \$750 yearly exemptions for child care and has called for \$410 million for direct project funding under FAP which, equitably distributed, would amount to only \$910 per child.

c. The Caucus called for educational reform and self-determination by minorities, and the Administration replied by citing research efforts and advisory not decision-making roles for black people.

d. The Administration advocated the use of vouchers for the purchase of child care services which would clearly benefit franchisors, businesses and established agencies with sufficient start-up capital to set up day care centers. Thus the consumer's choice would be limited to day care services he cannot possibly control. Direct project grants on the other hand would permit parents to organize and administer their own child care programs. It is symbolic of the communication gap that the Administration interprets "control" for black people solely in terms of individual rather than community efforts.

Recommendation 2: a. The Congressional authorization for Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), is \$2.7 billion. The Administration's request of \$1.5 billion does not constitute the full-funding requested by the Congressional Black Caucus.

b. The revised guidelines to which the Administration's Report referred are deficient in important ways. (One example is the exclusion of longevity pay from the formula for the computation of comparability.) In addition, the administrative regulations cited were issued over a year after statutory reforms were enacted on April 13, 1970.

Recommendation 3: Difficulties already experienced in enforcing federal civil rights, parent participation and other guidelines would be increased manifold if the Administration's Education Revenue Sharing proposals are adopted. Some defects are:

a. There is no federal approval of state plans proposed, nor is it likely that state plans would even be on file.

b. There is no requirement that community residents be involved in the decision-making process as presently exists under the Title I regulations. Representation of minorities and other persons served is not mandatory for state advisory councils.

c. The key to comparability, the requirement of maintaining state and local contributions, has been deleted.

Recommendation 4: The CBC acknowledges the Administration's support of S. 1557, the proposed Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education Act of 1971, and urges it to continue to work for its passage without weakening amendments in the House.

Recommendation 5: The CBC acknowledges that recent steps have been taken by the Administration reflecting a commitment to universal literacy. We are concerned, however, that the level of funding for Right to Read be appropriate to the priority given the effort by the Administration itself, and note in that regard, that the Administration has no way of enforcing any guideline concerning the distribution for the Right to Read program of the \$460 million received by states from the Office of Education.

Recommendation 6: a. The CBC requested full funding of Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 at \$91 million. We note with interest that the Administration now proposes to request \$15 million more than the original 1972 budget request. The total resulting figure, however, is still \$36.1 million short of requested full funding.

b. Not all developing institutions funded under Title III are predominately black. Yet the President pledged in his reply that 75 percent of the total \$53.9 million requested under Title III will go to these schools. Since 23 percent of Title III by law must go to junior/community colleges, we are curious to know how the group of non-black colleges, which would have received slightly more than 12 percent of Title III funds under the 1972 initial budget request, would now have to make do with two percent. Full funding would alleviate this dilemma, as would the increase of funds to black colleges from other Federal agencies.

Recommendation 7: The President appeared to have missed the point of his recommendation entirely. Meetings and speeches for their own sake were not requested by the CBC, but rather the targeting of funds so that the minimal percentage of Federal funds for black colleges and universities (three percent of over \$4 billion) from seventeen Federal agencies supporting higher education might be increased.

Recommendation 8: The Administration's reply to this recommendation constituted a rejection. Black and poor students presently enrolled in educational institutions and those who hope to attend college in the future, given the burden of racism they already bear (black college graduates earn \$3,000 less per year than white graduates), simply cannot afford to incur debts of nearly \$7,600 over a four-year period.

We note further that the Administration failed to reply to any other parts of the recommendation.

Recommendation 9: The use of percentages

rather than actual dollar amounts, particularly when those percentages are mandated by law, is often deceptive. For example, 23 percent of the \$38.9 million request for two-year colleges under Title III for FY 1972 is only \$9 million. It should further be noted that the position of Special Assistant to the Associate Commissioner for Higher Education is not likely to be one wielding a great deal of clout within the bureaucracy of the Office of Education.

2. Housing and Urban Development

Recommendation 1: The President's Report indicated that the \$75 million earmarked for operating subsidies would not be needed in either 1971 or 1972.

The Caucus finds this reply difficult to comprehend in view of the fact that one of the most critical housing issues is the financial condition of public housing authorities and their ability to manage and maintain units. Some 30 metropolitan areas are in desperate need of operating expenses to manage, repair and rehabilitate units which are currently "off the market" for the seriously crowded inner city. We fail to see the logic of spending funds to produce new public housing while withholding funds to maintain the units already available.

Recommendation 2: Given the urgent need for housing for our constituents the Caucus cannot view the issuance of guidelines as immediate action. In replying to our recommendations, the Administration could have required states to lift their restrictions on municipal bond indebtedness to a level that adequately serves the mortgage market in a given community.

Recommendation 3: a. The Administration's reply said that no additional legislation was necessary to achieve the objectives of this recommendation. HUD's 1972 commitments would make 25,000 dwelling units available. But the 25,000 unit estimate for rehabilitation can be used in metropolitan Washington alone according to a March 1971 HUD financed study, which estimated an area need of 200,000 units.

b. The Administration also did not indicate whether renewal agencies would be required to give priority to maintaining and rehabilitating dwelling units in a renewal area rather than setting business development as the primary goal.

Recommendation 5: Although the President's reply indicated support of the Caucus' recommendation, critical questions concerning implementation remain unanswered. We do not know for example the criteria to be used in determining that housing around federal installations is in fact available on a non-discriminatory basis, nor has the report stipulated who will enforce the amendment or what means of enforcement will be utilized.

3. The Drug Crisis

Recommendation 1: a. In replying to our call for the declaration of drug abuse as a national crisis, the Administration indicated that it announced in March, 1970 the formation of a National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information. A national informational clearinghouse, however, does not convey to the American people a convincing sense of urgency on the part of the Administration. It does nothing moreover about stopping the flow of drugs into the country or providing real alternatives to drug victims.

b. The Administration stated that it cannot suspend military and economic assistance to countries which produce, process and export drugs to this country. Its view was that such action might be considered precipitous and cause counter-productive tensions. There are, today, an estimated 500,000 drug addicts in the United States. Co-operative arrangements with France and Mexico are not stemming sufficiently the flood of drugs causing that number to grow everyday. In addition, results of a United Nations study reported to the 20th session of

that body, indicated that Indochina is the second largest producer of opium in the world. The situation there is becoming so critical that during the recent Laotian invasion, servicemen were observed undergoing withdrawal symptoms in the field because they had been temporarily cut off from their sources of supply.

With the continuing increase in addiction among our young adult population, the health and well-being of the nation is at stake. Could any country to which we might apply sanctions under these circumstances reasonably consider such action "precipitous"?

c. The Administration also referred to its drug programs budgeted at \$123.2 million. The bulk of the programs discussed by the Administration concern the expansion of educational and training programs, and do not deal directly with the problems cited above. The \$123.2 million budget represents a beginning, but in New York City alone \$80 million was spent last year and reached no more than 40 percent of the city's addict population.

Recommendation 2: The Caucus hoped that in replying to this recommendation, the Administration would have indicated some response to the growing problem of drug addiction among returning Vietnam Veterans. Experts within the Veterans Administration estimate that one-fourth of all addicts in the country are veterans and their treatment would cost at least \$20 million annually. The Caucus hopes that the Administration will include in its drug efforts plans to establish centers affiliated with Veterans Administration Hospitals in all of the major urban areas.

Recommendation 3: The Administration indicated that the new Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 imposes stricter controls over the legitimate production and distribution of amphetamines. The Caucus felt that the controls must extend to production ceilings since there is no real "legitimate" need for the current production of more than 8 billion amphetamines and barbiturates. The Caucus is also as seriously concerned about the "no-knock" provision of Section 509 of the new drug act as it is with this same provision in the District of Columbia crime bill.

Recommendation 4: a. The Caucus does not believe that \$400,000 is enough money to adequately study the social and physiological effect of methadone. We are not aware of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's initial studies referred to in the White House reply. Our perusal of available data indicates that methadone is a potentially dangerous drug, particularly in over-dosage.

b. The Caucus would also urge, in evaluating the 255 applications received proposing investigations into new drugs, that the Administration not approve any application which might seek to explore a heroin maintenance program.

C. Justice and civil rights

1. Criminal Justice

Recommendation 1: The President maintained that since the Legal Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) was established, "special emphasis has been placed on such efforts as prevention and control of juvenile delinquency . . ." Yet, recent hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency revealed that only 1/7 of LEAA action grants have gone to the juvenile programs, despite the fact that recidivism among offenders under 20 is 74 percent, and 48 percent of all arrests involve children between the ages of 10 and 17 (16 percent of the population). The problem is so critical that the Subcommittee may consider calling for the creation of a special agency to deal with juvenile crime alone.

Recommendation 3: The Congressional

Black Caucus expressed alarm at the fact that the D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 had been advertised as a model for the Nation. The President's Report quoted a recent statement by the Attorney General which represents the Administration's view of the Act:

"We have never said that all these provisions should be adopted in the States."

Yet on May 14, the Attorney General proposed legislation which would authorize preventive detention of suspects accused of "dangerous or organized crime activity" in all federal courts. The inconsistency here is only too obvious.

2. Civil Rights

Recommendation 1: The results of findings of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, based on follow-up questionnaires to 27 federal agencies, revealed that with few exceptions no significant progress has been made in implementing the Commission's recommendations made in the October, 1970 report. This lack of movement in the face of public exposure of the problem in October, 1970 adequately demonstrates the need for executive leadership if the law is to be implemented as Congress intended.

Recommendation 2: a. With respect to the recent primary election in Gary, Indiana, the reply from President Nixon indicated that personnel were present from the Justice Department for investigative purposes, but did not find sufficient evidence to warrant the bringing forth of judicial action. However, it is evident that either these lawyers ignored the obvious purpose of their assignment to detect and correct voting abuses in Lake County (e.g., the obvious attempt by county officials to prevent at least 3,500 qualified voters from voting), or they concluded that there was no basis for judicial action because of their lack of understanding of the methods and practices of county registration and election officials.

The Caucus is pleased, however, that the extraordinary efforts of the Mayor and his supporters enabled many qualified voters to exercise their right to vote. We are hopeful that the Justice Department will intervene more vigorously in the future when threats to voting rights are involved.

b. The President's reply indicated that the Department of Justice sent several groups of officials to Mississippi to consult with local black leaders in the 34 counties in question, as well as other counties. However, there are strong reasons to doubt the accuracy of this statement. For example, in Coahoma County, the home of Dr. Aaron Henry (head of the State NAACP and one of the most widely known black leaders in the South) re-registration, redistricting and a change in the election for the Board of Supervisors from district to county-wide (at large) are occurring simultaneously. Yet, black civil rights leaders have indicated that they are totally unaware of the presence of Justice Department officials in this county. Furthermore, there has been no evidence that redistricting and other election changes are being carried out with regard to the Federal Court decisions or compliance with Title V of the Voting Rights Act.

3. Veterans' Affairs

Recommendation 1: a. The Administration's willingness to make another study of discrimination in military justice was laudable, but, the President did not indicate who would be conducting the new study, that the Department of Defense (DOD), Justice and State would be involved, or that selected members of the bar, including minority representatives, would be used.

b. Reference was made in the President's reply, to a 1970 DOD study regarding the reasons why a disproportionate number of blacks were punished under the military system of justice. This report has never been released and one must wonder whether that

is because its findings were too embarrassing to the military. Surely, there is reason to question whether, if the new study suggested by the President confirms the earlier one, it will meet a similar fate.

c. The Caucus has some doubt that the services will cooperate fully in the DOD's efforts. When the Congressional Black Caucus attempted recently to get figures on one highly relevant question—what is the racial breakdown on all discharges other than honorable?—this was the response: The Navy said it would answer by May 20, but did not do so. The Marine Corps did not reply. The Air Force said by telephone it would be an enormous job but it would try to make some response; it has not yet done so. The Army said it would take three weeks and cost \$7,000 to have its computer records print out such data, so it refused. We hope the Secretary of Defense will be more successful in his efforts.

d. Although the new or broader study might be useful, earlier investigations, particularly, the NAACP study, have already established that serious injustices exist and are occurring daily. Action to correct them must not be further delayed with the excuse that the problem is under study.

Recommendation 2: a. In framing its recommendations, the Caucus was aware that the Department of Defense now has a civil rights unit headed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary. This unit is within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Manpower and Reserve Affairs. There is overwhelming evidence, documented by the Department of Defense itself and by independent studies of military discrimination and injustice perpetuated against black servicemen. From both within and outside of the United States, for example, have come reports of excessive Article 15's, numerous and unwarranted pre-trial confinements, inordinate rates of other than honorable discharges and ineptness in handling civil rights complaints. The Caucus felt that in view of the magnitude and pervasiveness of these problems, only a full civil rights division vested by law with authority and guidelines could effectively begin to correct the serious situation that now exists in the military. The Caucus felt that placing responsibility for these matters in the hands of an Assistant Secretary and not a Deputy would be more appropriate to the urgency of the task.

b. It has been almost a year since the Department of Defense began to issue directives fixing civil rights responsibilities, according to the President's Report. During that period the above listed grievances have not diminished. The addition of four generals and flag rank black officers will make little change in the percentage of blacks among all black officers (2.1%), nor has there been any impact at the other end of the ladder, where discrimination in promotions is still prevalent. Nothing also seems to have changed concerning the use of the discriminatory, academic and white-culture-oriented Armed Forces Qualification Test, which functions to shut blacks into combat units, or into low skill areas such as service and supply. There they are not trained in skills which can be transferred to civilian life, and pile up in the lower ranks because promotions in such units are fewer and slower.

Further, we notice no progress in black civilian employment opportunities in the Department of Defense, where black employees represent only 7.8% of the labor force, where 80.4% of those are in GS grades 1-8 and where only 0.1% are in GS grades 16-18.

4. District of Columbia

Recommendation 1: a. The District of Columbia is a city of over 850,000 people. It has a population greater than that of eleven states, and those eleven states, have a total of 39 representatives in the House and Senate. On a per capita basis there is one Mem-

ber sitting in the Congress per every 143,000 people in those states. Yet, the 850,000 citizens of Washington are restricted to one non-voting Delegate.

Non-voting the President's reply appeared to reaffirm his commitment to a constitutional amendment granting full voting representation to the District, it must be remembered that his April 7 message on affairs of this city stated that "establishment of the non-voting House delegate position (came about) by legislation which my Administration introduced and advocated. . . ."

The Black Caucus cannot agree with the President's piecemeal approach to Home Rule for the District or to Congressional representation for its citizens.

b. The six-month extension to the life of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, cited by the President as an indication of his willingness to consider Home Rule, is no substitute for a firm commitment from this Administration to provide immediate redress of this legitimate grievance.

D. Foreign Policy

Recommendations 1 and 2: It is clear that the positions of the President and the Congressional Black Caucus on Vietnam and budgetary priorities for domestic spending are irreconcilable.

Recommendation 3: a. The Congressional Black Caucus had recommended that Africa be given priority and attention on an equal basis with the rest of the world. Africa now receives approximately 8.4 percent of the total U.S. AID assistance. Our request that this amount be significantly increased was not even addressed.

b. The Administration rejected the Caucus' request for a special Task Force composed of a broadly representative policy group to provide a comprehensive review of the variety of U.S. policies affecting Africa. But, there is no better evidence of the need for such input than the few visible results of the review of "key African issues" by the National Security Council, such as the relaxation of our arms embargo policy against South Africa and the relaxation of our adherence to UN sanctions against Rhodesia.

Recommendation 4: a. The Caucus does not find the Administration's advocacy of the use of communication to support peaceful change in South Africa persuasive since the reply lacks any evidence that the policy is being pursued to establish communication links with the majority Black South Africans or among those liberal elements working for peaceful change in South Africa.

b. The Caucus finds it impossible to reconcile either our denunciation of the use of violence by the liberation movements or the President's statement ("The United States will not condone the violence to human dignity implicit in apartheid") with the nation's continuing moral, economic, and military support of South Africa, which subjugates the people of South Africa and of Namibia (South West Africa) by force and violence.

c. We welcome the Administration's advocacy of the goal of attracting private business interests to Black Africa. We would have also welcomed a more concrete explanation of its specific efforts to implement that commitment and accomplishments to date.

d. The Administration rejected our recommendation that the annual outright subsidy to South Africa of \$20 million under sugar quota laws be ended. This is a clear reflection of this Administration's policy towards South Africa. Four developing countries of Black Africa each will now have approximately one-fourth of the sugar quota of South Africa, a developed country. There is absolutely no economic or political justification for continuing this support of South Africa for a two or three year period.

e. The Caucus endorses the Administra-

tion's interest in increased support for the majority-ruled states of Southern Africa, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. The U.S. should further implement this interest by facilitating and actively supporting feasibility studies into the mineral resources of these nations to lessen their dependence on South Africa.

f. The citation of a limited scholarship program, which is currently being substantially reduced, cannot be considered a serious answer to the recommendation that the U.S. implement its UN obligations and pronouncements, to support self-determination for minority-ruled Africa. The Caucus believes that a decision not to support a violent solution cannot excuse the failure to provide other types of significant assistance (e.g., health and educational) directly to liberation movements to persons within the liberated areas.

g. In view of U.S. recognition, in the present case before the International Court of Justice of Namibia (South West Africa), of our obligation to respect and assist the UN's responsibility for the international territory, the Caucus can only characterize as frivolous the Administration's reply, which ignored our recognized obligations and equated the Ad Hoc Subcommittee with the Council for Namibia. The Caucus called upon the United States to join the Council and to cooperate fully with the UN.

Recommendation 5: The Administration's treatment of the recommendation for allocation of one percent of the gross national product to international development assistance was specious and failed entirely to address the point that priority attention be directed to Africa.

Recommendation 6: Statistics, as given by the Administration on improved hiring policies for black foreign service officers, however commendable, do not correct the overall picture. Instead of a numbers game, the Caucus called for an all-out effort to secure black representation in the foreign service, worldwide, at all levels and in all career specialties.

REPORT OF VISIT TO INTERMOUNTAIN INDIAN SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCKAY), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, after reading an article in the Washington Post of May 25, 1971, which described certain difficulties at the Intermountain Indian School in Brigham City, Utah, I decided that it would be advisable for me to make a firsthand inspection and examination of that facility and the conditions which exist there. Consequently, on Thursday, May 27, I spent the bulk of the day talking with the staff, faculty, and the students of that institution and found several things which I feel should be called to the attention of this House as well as to the attention of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and others who may be interested in this program.

I was immediately impressed, as any visitor to this facility would be, by the excellent attitude and demeanor of the students. Although a large number of the students had already returned to their homes for the summer, there were still a number there with whom I visited during the day. Without exception, those students with whom I visited were happy about the educational experience they were receiving at the school. They desire to return and they

expressed sincere concern to me that the school be allowed to continue its operation. I was especially impressed with the way that skills were being taught as part of the student training program and were also utilized by the staff and administration of the school for care, upkeep and improvement of the school facilities. This gives the students a feeling of belonging to the school and a sense of accomplishment and commitment to what is being done there. The students also receive on-the-job experiences in the northern Utah area which are not available to them on their reservations. I was told of a number of success stories of Indians who are now productive citizens holding important jobs in several communities. These former students now return to the school to recruit students who have the skills to meet similar occupational opportunities.

I was equally impressed with the dedication of the staff and the administration of the Intermountain Indian School. They carry a deep commitment to Indian education which, in some ways, has prompted them to continue their work under difficult circumstances. The dedication of the staff was especially apparent in the manner they have continued operation of the school in the absence of a permanent superintendent for an unduly long period of time. I was impressed with the way in which the acting superintendent filled the position but it is unfortunate that the school was without a permanent superintendent for over a year.

I would like to suggest a few recommendations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and particularly to the director of education.

First. Although the present facilities are extremely well kept and maintained, there is a need for a new vocational education building and for some limited remodeling of present facilities. The buildings now being used are in good condition and the dorms are sufficient but new equipment and furnishings are needed.

Second. Considering the existing investment and the great need for vocational education for the Indians, I would hope that the Bureau of Indian Affairs will seriously consider not only maintaining at least a vocational training center at the Intermountain school, but will also consider enlarging that center for even wider, perhaps multitribal use.

Given the present capacity of the school, perhaps it would even be more efficient to enlarge the student body to at least 2,000 students in order to make more efficient use of the existing facilities. This would not require new dorms, merely one additional training building.

I would hope that the Bureau of Indian Affairs does not again leave affairs of the school to be so unsupervised that a situation would ever again develop wherein the school would be without a top administrator for an extended period of time.

In summary, I would like to say that I was very impressed with the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City and with the young Indian students there. As

you are aware, objections to the school have been raised by one or two persons. But, in visiting at the facility and in talking with the students, I did not find these objections to be valid. Rather, I found there is a great deal of sincere, dedicated effort going on at the Intermountain School to educate young Indian students. The desires and actions of a very few should not be allowed to restrain the marvelous educational opportunity which this school holds for Indian students.

I might add, this facility has the complete support of the community. I met with elected officials and they each pledged continued support for the Intermountain School. They have always been interested in the facility and have worked to see that it serves a useful purpose within the community and for training the students. The school is accepted by the community as are the students.

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly heartened by an article which appeared recently in the Syracuse Herald American. The story appeared in association with an essay written by William Piekielek, a 7th grade student in Marcellus, N.Y.

Billy participated in an essay contest sponsored by the Marcellus Jaycees. The topic was "What Americanism Means to Me." Reading this, one can readily understand how Billy won the essay contest. Obviously, our Nation has an outstanding young citizen in the making.

I commend this excellent essay to my colleagues:

AMERICA

(By Billy Piekielek)

Americanism to me, means and stands for the country in which our ancestors fought and gave their lives for, to make it an independent nation. Every time I look at the flag I think of how lucky I am to live in an independent country and not in some country behind the Iron Curtain, or any other place where people are not allowed to own a house of their own, or to speak what they think and believe, and where the government runs their lives.

Nowadays when I look around I wonder why people act the way they do. They fight wars just to take over one another and to gain power, and build factories that pollute our air and water and help to destroy our natural resources and our wildlife, and without realizing it, they are destroying everything that the colonists fought and died for.

Sometimes I wonder about what it would have been like to live back when the colonists were fighting for freedom and independence and how they gave their lives for what they thought was best for future generations. They saw their families killed and homes burned and still went on fighting to make our fine country.

Americanism is the way one feels about his country. It is one man trying to do his part as a citizen of America. It means you are able to say what you feel, and fight for what you think is right, and to disagree with what you think is wrong. To me it also means you should protect your values of freedom and independence just as the patriots had to. But not only are people able

to speak and think as they feel, but, because this country is based upon all people as individuals, then people MUST say what they think and feel. This country is based on what a group of colonists thought and wrote up in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Lastly, Americanism to me is pride, love, dedication, courage, willingness to help others, and all the many other human traits it takes and took to make this country what it is today. To look at our flag waving in the breeze against a free sky and becoming choked up from love and sometimes hurt in knowing it is mine, and, knowing what a dear price has been paid for it already.

This is my country—with all its flaws—it is beautiful. I love it, it is mine, I was born here in freedom. I am glad.

OCEAN RESOURCES—FOOD FROM THE SEA

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution intended to place the United States on record with respect to certain principles which I believe are fundamental to the long-term welfare of our fisheries. These principles are, in summary, that it is the policy of the United States to promote measures which will maximize our supply of food from the sea without jeopardizing the continued survival of these resources, and that the United States recognizes the right of coastal nations to establish and enforce conservation practices governing the taking on the high seas of the anadromous fish such as salmon which spawn in the fresh waters of the coastal nation, and also governing the taking on the high seas over the Continental Shelf of the coastal nation of those species of fish which live exclusively in the waters over the Continental Shelf or depend upon those waters for reproduction of survival during the major part of their life cycle. These fish may be considered indigenous species to the coastal nation and are species over which the coastal nation has a special interest. They may be contrasted with the so-called pelagic fish species which range broadly across the oceans migrating from one area to another during different seasons of the year. The pelagic fish are truly international creatures of the oceans, and as in the case of tuna may be found in the mid-Pacific during one season and thousands of miles away off the coast of South America during another season.

The declarations set forth in this concurrent resolution conclude by expressing our considered judgment that current international arrangements, primarily bilateral agreements for the conservation of these fishery resources, are inadequate, and that the resources are in many instances in danger of extinction if adequate measures are not adopted and enforced promptly.

While the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas has not been ratified by many of the principal fishing nations of the world, it is nevertheless part of the body of international law related to world

fishery problems. The concurrent resolution cites articles 6 and 7 of the convention which recognize the special interest of a coastal State in maintaining the productivity of the living resources of the high seas in areas adjacent to its territorial sea, and authorize coastal States to adopt unilateral measures of conservation provided negotiations with other interested States for the adoption of such measures have not led to an agreement within 6 months. While it is true that most of the nations which the United States would wish to negotiate with do not adhere to this convention, the United States has ratified it, and I believe it is proper to act in conformity with the terms of the convention whether others wish to or not.

Following this recitation of fundamental principles and expressions of our national concern over the state of the fisheries, the resolution calls upon the President to convene an international conference on the conservation of our anadromous fish and Continental Shelf fishery resources. It further requests the President to inform interested nations that unless appropriate conservation measures are agreed upon within 6 months of the convening of such a conference, the United States will move unilaterally to protect these resources pursuant to article 7 of the aforementioned convention.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution requests the President to convene this international conference as soon as possible but no later than 6 months following the adoption of this resolution. I am fully cognizant of the fact that the Congress cannot easily dictate to the President in the conduct of foreign policy. I believe it is essential, however, that the Congress inform the President through a mechanism such as this resolution of our convictions and our determination that these fishery resources will be preserved.

A law of the sea conference has been proposed for 1973. There will undoubtedly be many items on the agenda for that conference, including the President's draft convention on the Seabed. I am somewhat concerned that the more glamorous law of the sea problems involving exploitation of the mineral resources of the deep seabed and military considerations involving breadth of the territorial sea and passage through international straits will overshadow fishery problems. Too many times in the past the United States has used the fisheries as a convenient bargaining point in order to achieve other goals in the law of the sea considered more important.

To the majority of nations, however, the mineral resources of the deep seabed and even those of the Continental Shelf are long-range and nebulous sources of wealth. The majority of nations also do not share our preoccupation with the national defense aspects of the law of the sea. They are interested in the wealth of the sea which is immediately available to meet a very basic human need, namely food. We can approach the law of the sea conference with one of two viewpoints; that either we will again let the rest of the world

dictate the terms of any new fishery agreement in return for their acquiescence with respect to a narrow definition of the territorial sea, or we will recognize the true importance of our own fishery resources and adopt a very strong position regarding the preservation of these resources independent of any other considerations. I hope it will be the latter, Mr. Speaker, and I trust that the Congress of the United States will go on record in support of a strong U.S. position with respect to the preservation of our great fishery resources.

Other Members of the House who have joined with me in cosponsoring this resolution for optimum sustainable yield from the living resources of the oceans are:

Mr. STEELE of Connecticut.
Mr. VAN DERLIN of California.
Mr. ANDERSON of California.
Mr. HICKS of Washington.
Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.
Mr. BOB WILSON of California.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
Mr. DON CLAUSEN of California.
Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.
Mr. WYATT of Oregon.
Mr. CLEVELAND of New Hampshire.
Mr. DELLENBACK of Oregon.
Mr. MEEDS of Washington.
Mr. McCLOSKEY of California.
Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

EXPERT INDIANS RATHER THAN INDIAN EXPERTS—THE KEY TO SELF-DETERMINATION IN INDIAN EDUCATION

(Mr. BEGICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to join with a number of my distinguished colleagues in introducing legislation which seeks to change the direction of Indian education in the United States. All of us who join in sponsoring this bill believe that this is an area where many studies have been made, where many fine recommendations have been put forward, but where little action has taken place. Comprehensive reform is long overdue.

Among the many areas of current social concern, Indian education gives rise to a list of grave problems which is almost unequaled.

The curriculum and working materials for Indian education have become increasingly irrelevant for the students; the number of Indian teachers is distressingly low; the self-concept Indian students hold of themselves is more self-critical than any comparable group; and the phenomenon of Indian children doing progressively worse as they remain in school is now well known.

Statistical evaluations are similarly revealing in their disclosure that Indian schoolchildren achieve at low levels as measured by evaluation standards which are themselves inappropriate measurements. The dropout rates are double the national average, while the average level of formal education is only one-half the national average.

The evidence which verifies the magni-

tude and nature of the problem is formidable, and it is unnecessary to dwell further on it at this time because it has been said so well and so often by others. What is important is that something must be done.

I want to make it very clear that I am not one of those who put the blame for this situation on one or a few Federal or State agencies, because I believe the problem is too complex for such simple analysis. It degrades the difficulty of the task ahead to characterize it only as the need to replace one administrative plan with another. I am certain that all the bureaucratic adjustments in the world will be of little value unless changes in the hearts and minds of those in the area of Indian education do not adjust as well.

In Alaska, about 19 percent of the population is composed of Indians and Eskimos. The effort to provide quality and relevant education for Alaska Natives is made even more difficult by considerations of distance and transportation, high costs, poverty, climate and a period of transition in which the State of Alaska is assuming the responsibilities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

At the present time in Alaska, Native schoolchildren can expect to go to school in their own village only until the eighth grade. The schools in the home village are often subject to understaffing, a lack of supporting services, and the problems of irrelevancy and insensitivity which are common in all Indian education.

After the eighth grade, about one out of every seven students will have to leave not only their home village, but also the State, to continue their education. These students will go to Indian schools as far away as Oklahoma and New Mexico. Five more of the seven students will have to leave their home and village to attend boarding or other schools throughout the State. At a formative time of life in a culture which places strong values on family solidarity, such removal causes problems. This is saying it gently, for only a small percentage finally gain a high school degree when it means separation from their homes for the school years from ninth to 12th grades.

The psychological, social, and cultural toll of such removal is extremely high. Many adult Natives who did not finish school were the victims of this situation. Many who did finish school find that the degree is not the key to success which was promised them if they did finish. Like so many factors in Indian education, removal for education is not undesirable if offered only as an alternative, but as an inevitable fact in the education of nearly every Alaskan Native, it is intolerable.

Although this is but one problem relating to the education of Alaskan Indians and Eskimos, and their problems are but a few among the many relating to all American Indian education, I believe this problem of removal for education is representative of many others. More importantly, it is exactly the type of problem to which this legislation addresses itself.

This bill has been ably prepared by the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

MEEDE) and has incorporated many of the provisions of the similar Senate bill constructed by Senators MONDALE and KENNEDY. In my view, the theme of the legislation, and the factor which offers the best opportunity for increased sensitivity in the area of Indian education is very clear; it is self-determination.

In each of its aspects, this theme is carried out:

First, the bill establishes a National Board of Indian Education, of which at least 10 of its 15 members will be Indians. Such a Board, which will assume all tasks relating to Indian education formerly carried out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has been recommended in nearly every study of this problem over the last 10 years. I believe such a Board can bring an increased sensitivity and unity of thinking to this area that is highly desirable, and my hope is that a freshness of approach will emerge as well.

Second, the bill provides for the establishment and funding of special programs and projects in the area of Indian education. Such projects, which will include exemplary experimental programs, Indian culture curriculums, and programs which will address themselves to cultural change, will be all the more important because the nature of the programs and projects will be self-determined.

An important aspect of this specific bill provides for the grants under this title to go directly to Indian tribes or nonprofit Indian organizations, who are then enabled to make their own contractual agreements with the State or local school administration. The result is that the Indians themselves hold the power of the purse strings and are not limited to the traditional "consulting" role. Where legitimate differences of opinion regarding the substance or administration of such contracts arise, the dispute is to be settled by the National Board, thus giving the Board a measure of real authority.

Third, the bill addresses itself to those generations of American Indians which have been left behind by the presently existing system. It does this by creating a special program of adult education for American Indians. At present, about 75,000 adult Indians have not completed elementary school and the relationship of this statistic to poverty is very clear. The programs created to allow these adult Indians to recoup what was lost at one time will be in tune with the entire bill by providing for maximum self-termination of programs to solve the problem.

In his remarks when taking part in the introduction of a similar bill in the Senate, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) described this legislation very well when he said:

It puts Indian education into the hands of not Indian experts, but expert Indians. Local control has been the foundation of public education in this country since its inception, yet we continue to let a Washington-based bureaucracy to control the education of thousands of Indian children.

It is my intent that this legislation end the present era of Indian education,

and the era of consulting power and advisory boards. I commend this legislation to the attention of Congress, the executive branch, to the many American Indians, and to the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska who will have gained an important part of their own fate if it should pass.

SUMMARY OF MAIN PROVISIONS OF COMMITTEE SUGAR BILL

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the numbering of this summary corresponds to the internal numbering of H.R. 8866.

There are nine sections in the bill. Section 1 is the popular act citation and section 9 deals with effective dates. Sections 2 through 8 amend specified sections of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The main provisions—by section—are as follows:

SECTION 1

This legislation is cited as the "Sugar Act Amendments of 1971."

SECTION 2 (AMENDS SECTION 101 OF THE SUGAR ACT)

- (1) Defines the mainland cane areas as Louisiana and Florida;
- (2) Eliminates reference to the present quota for the Virgin Islands.

SECTION 3 (AMENDS SECTION 201 OF THE SUGAR ACT)

- (1) Requires the Secretary to issue his initial determination of quotas during October of the preceding year (rather than during the last three months of the year);
- (2) Changes the 12-month basis for statistics from September 30 to August 31 of the preceding year;
- (3) Starting in January 1972, establishes a target price objective which reflects the simple average of the parity index (the year 1967=100) and the wholesale price index (the year 1967=100).
- (4) Defines the term "wholesale price index."

SECTION 4 (AMENDS SECTION 202 OF THE SUGAR ACT)

- (1) Section 202(a) is amended as follows:
 - *Maintains the existing relationship between U.S. and foreign quotas (approximately 62 percent domestic and 38 percent foreign) at 11.2 million tons annual consumption;
 - *Sets total domestic quotas at 7,055,000 tons divided as shown in paragraph (1);
 - *Permits Hawaii and Puerto Rico to market in a subsequent year sugar prevented from being marketed because of conditions beyond the control of producers or shippers;
 - *Increases the mainland cane area by 300,000 tons and eliminates the 15,000 ton quota for the Virgin Islands;
 - *Maintains the present formula of 65 percent of the growth in the U.S. market for domestic areas and 35 percent for foreign nations;
 - *Sets the Puerto Rican quota at 855,000 tons for 1972 and 1973;
 - *Starting with 1973, provides up to 100,000 tons of quota for new cane producing area or areas.
- (2) Section 202(b) is rewritten to express the basic quota for the Philippine Islands as 1,126,020 short tons, raw value.
- (3) Section 202(c) is amended as follows:
 - (1) deletes obsolete language in paragraph (2) of Section 202(c);
 - (1) Establishes quotas for individual na-

tions. Quotas are increased for 11 countries, decreased for five, and three new quotas are established. The French West Indies quota is eliminated. The basic quotas of nearly all countries are increased, and the total quotas for most countries are generally unchanged. The Cuban quota is cut in half (by 750,000 tons). (See Table for quotas of individual nations.);

(iii) Sets Ireland quota at 5,351 short tons, raw value.

(4) Section 202(d) is amended as follows:
(a) Deletes the "10 million ton-OAS bonus" clause;

(i) Makes technical correction in paragraph (3) of Section 202(d);

(ii) Moves up the date by which foreign countries must notify the Secretary of a deficit from August 1 to June 1;

(iv) Updates to 1971 the provision in paragraph (6) of Section 202(d) requiring foreign nations to give assurance of delivery.

(5) Section 202(e) is amended by adding technical amendments to conform it to the exercise of expropriation sanctions under Section 408.

(6) Section 202(f) is amended to give the Secretary administrative discretion in regard to cargos enroute to the United States.

(7) Section 202(g) is amended as follows:
* Changes current quota administration by restricting quarterly quotas except under prescribed conditions;

* Establishes a "corridor" of price fluctuation above and below the target price objective that would precipitate a change in the consumption estimate. The perimeters of the "corridor" would be 4 percent above or below the price objective for seven market days;

* Provides that no regulation may be issued by the Secretary to restrict the importation, shipment, or storage of sugar on a geographical basis.

SECTION 5 (AMENDS SECTIONS 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, AND 212 OF THE SUGAR ACT)

I. Section 204 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection 204(a) is amended as follows:

(i) Provides for review of deficits every 60 days;

(ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi) Requires that deficits be declared and allocated when known; provides that if deficits are not reported promptly, the secretary shall reduce the quota and reassign it elsewhere; makes

technical changes in Section 204; and permits Central American Common Market nations to share in common deficits allocated from other nations;

(vii) Reduces the share of the Philippine Islands in the domestic deficit from 47.22 percent to 37.6 percent.

(2) Subsection 204(b) is amended to permit domestic areas to fill Hawaiian or Puerto Rican local direct consumption quota if they are unable to produce their own requirements.

II. Section 205 is amended to provide for allotment of beet quotas among persons subject to an area quota so as to permit a new or enlarged facility and reasonably efficient operation for the 3-year life of this legislation.

III. Section 206 is amended by making beet sugar molasses subject to quotas which may be established by the Secretary.

IV. Section 207 is amended as follows:

(1) Uses the preceding year for the basis of the formula to determine Hawaiian direct consumption quota;

(2) Calculates the Puerto Rican direct consumption quota as 1½ percent of first 11 million tons and ½ percent of the consumption estimate above 11 million tons.

V. Section 209 is amended by adding all U.S. territories and possessions as jurisdictions from which sugar cannot be imported into the United States without a quota.

VI. Section 211 is amended by allowing bonded ex-quota sugar to enter Hawaii and Puerto Rico as well as the continental United States.

VII. Section 212 is amended to permit importation (up to 10 tons per country) of brown sugar mixtures such as "gur" or "panella."

SECTION 6 (AMENDS SECTIONS 302, 303, AND 307 OF THE SUGAR ACT)

I. Section 302 is amended as follows:

(1) Permits the transfer of personal beet production history under certain circumstances;

(2) and (3) Provides for new beet areas by allocating up to 100,000 tons from the growth of the national beet quota;

(4) Provides history credit to growers receiving abandonment or deficiency payments;

(5) Preserves for three years the history of beet production for a producer who has lost a market because of the closing of or discontinuance of a sugar beet processing plant;

(6) Sets forth the criteria for establishing the new cane quota (up to 100,000 tons) provided in Section 202(a) (4) of the Sugar Act.

II. Section 303 is amended to provide abandonment or deficiency payments to growers suffering natural disaster losses regardless of their location.

III. Section 307 is amended to remove a reference to the Virgin Islands.

SECTION 7 (AMENDS SECTIONS 404, 408, AND 412 OF THE SUGAR ACT)

I. Section 404 is amended to generally make the Secretary's regulations under the Act subject to review in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act.

II. Section 408 is amended to give the President two new powers to deal with nations expropriating American property as follows:

* Provides the President with discretionary authority to withhold a portion of or the entire sugar quota of a nation taking the property of U.S. citizens without due process of law, and/or

* Provides the President with discretionary authority to impose a special impost (up to \$20 per ton) on sugar imported into the United States from nations taking the property of American citizens subsequent to January 1, 1969, without due process of law. Subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, payment of claims by U.S. citizens would be made from any funds collected by the special impost.

III. Section 412 is amended to extend the Sugar Act to December 31, 1974, or to March 31 of the year that the excise tax on sugar might end as the result of a payment limitation being enacted.

SECTION 8 (AMENDS SECTION 4501(B) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE)

Extends the excise tax to June 30, 1975, but provides that if a payment limitation is enacted, the tax would end on June 30 of the year following the effective date of the statute imposing the limitation.

SECTION 9

Provides that the effective date of these amendments to the Sugar Act will be January 1, 1972, except with respect to certain provisions which must be used by the Secretary to plan and administer the sugar program for 1972 and subsequent years.

TABLE 1.—SUGAR

Production area	1965 Sugar Act amendments				Total sec. 202 quotas	Deficits and deficit prorations	Total quotas and prorations
	Final quota for 1970 ¹	Demonstration of 1971 quota computed at 11,200,000 tons	Basic quotas	Temporary quotas ²			
Total domestic areas.....	6,410,486	6,110,000	6,910,000	0	6,910,000	(500,000)	6,410,000
Philippines ³	1,301,020	1,503,780	1,126,020	0	1,126,020	187,998	1,314,018
Mexico.....	652,559	588,249	357,382	116,470	473,852	57,751	531,603
Dominican Republic.....	678,209	575,312	349,521	113,908	463,429	56,480	519,909
Brazil.....	638,210	575,312	349,521	113,908	463,429	56,480	519,909
Peru.....	455,991	458,881	278,785	90,856	369,641	45,050	414,691
West Indies ⁴	216,645	199,579	127,682	41,611	169,293	20,633	189,926
Ecuador.....	92,860	83,710	53,682	17,495	71,177	8,675	79,852
French West Indies.....	68,149	62,782	0	0	0	0	0
Argentina.....	78,509	70,772	50,686	16,518	67,204	8,190	75,394
Costa Rica.....	75,133	67,728	43,433	14,155	57,588	7,019	64,607
Nicaragua.....	75,133	67,728	43,433	14,155	57,588	7,019	64,607
Colombia.....	67,537	60,880	48,841	15,917	64,758	7,892	72,650
Guatemala.....	63,314	57,074	36,602	11,929	48,531	5,914	54,445
Panama.....	39,500	42,616	42,318	13,791	56,109	6,838	62,947
El Salvador.....	46,429	41,852	26,840	8,747	35,587	4,337	39,924
Haiti.....	26,176	31,962	20,497	6,680	27,177	3,312	30,489
Venezuela.....	32,079	28,918	24,482	7,979	32,461	3,956	36,417
British Honduras.....	15,782	14,539	22,301	7,268	29,569	3,604	33,173
Bo livia.....	7,599	6,850	11,168	3,639	14,807	1,805	16,612
Ho nduras.....	7,599	6,850	11,168	3,639	14,807	1,805	16,612
Ba hamas.....	10,000	10,000	22,301	7,268	29,569	3,604	33,173
Pa raguay.....	0	0	10,137	3,304	13,441	1,638	15,079
Au stralia.....	206,270	203,785	158,697	45,088	203,785	0	203,785
Re public of China.....	85,946	84,910	66,123	18,787	84,910	0	84,910
India.....	82,508	81,514	63,479	18,035	81,514	0	81,514
South Africa.....	60,735	60,003	46,728	13,275	60,003	0	60,003
Fiji Islands.....	45,265	44,719	34,825	9,894	44,719	0	44,719
Thailand.....	18,909	18,681	14,547	4,134	18,681	0	18,681

See footnotes at end of table.

Production area	1965 Sugar Act amendments					Total sec. 202 quotas	Deficits and deficit prorations	Total quotas and prorations
	Final quota for 1970 ¹	Demonstration of 1971 quota computed at 11,200,000 tons	Basic quotas	Temporary quotas ²	Total			
Mauritius.....	18,909	18,681	23,363	6,637	30,000	0	30,000	
Malagasy Republic.....	9,740	9,623	11,681	3,319	15,000	0	15,000	
Swaziland.....	7,448	7,359	23,363	6,637	30,000	0	30,000	
Malawi.....	0	0	11,681	3,319	15,000	0	15,000	
Uganda.....	0	0	11,681	3,319	15,000	0	15,000	
Ireland.....	5,351	5,351	5,351	0	5,351	0	5,351	
Total foreign.....	5,189,514	5,090,000	3,528,319	761,681	4,290,000	500,000	4,790,000	
Total.....	11,600,000	11,200,000	10,438,319	761,681	11,200,000	0	11,200,000	

¹ As adjusted for deficits and deficit reallocations, such adjusted entitlements of foreign countries supplied in full except for following shortfalls in short tons, raw value: Philippines, 2,475; Ecuador, 1,710; Haiti, 4,544; India, 29; Malagasy Republic, 69; Mauritius, 605; and Panama, 2,740.

² Cuban reserve, 750,000 tons; Rhodesia, 11,681 tons.

³ In order to fund quota increases for 11 countries and new quotas for 3 countries, the entitlement to deficits for the Philippines was reduced from 47.22 to 37.60 percent and the combined basic and temporary quotas of Mexico, Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Peru were reduced by about 6.48 percent. Each of the 5 countries named above then sustained the same proportional reduction in their total entitlements except that the Philippines having a larger than proportional share in deficit reallocations sustained a larger than proportional reduction due to the smaller quantity of

deficits to be reallocated. Quotas for OAS countries include all growth in the Cuban reserve between requirement levels of 10 and 11.2 million tons.

⁴ Includes Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad, Tobago, and Barbados.

Note: In 1972 only, the total quotas and proration for Malawi will be zero and for Panama 42,616 tons. Hence, 35,331 additional tons will be available that year for distribution to other foreign countries—25,349 tons in basic quotas, 7,773 tons in the Cuban reserve, and 3,209 tons as deficit prorations.

Source: USDA/ASCS, June 2, 1971.

A TRIBUTE TO REINHOLD NIEBUHR

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay tribute to a man who, in my humble judgment, is one of the most significant figures of the 20th century.

I speak of Reinhold Niebuhr, the distinguished American theologian who died on June 1, 1971.

Dr. Niebuhr is a man whose writings and sermons had great impact on thinking not only in the world of religion but in the field of politics as well.

I, myself, remember, as a student at Harvard University many years ago, listening to the eloquent and prophetic sermons of Dr. Niebuhr and being deeply impressed both with the range of his intellect and with his capacity to relate the teachings of the Christian faith to the problems that confront men and nations.

Perhaps Dr. Niebuhr's most seminal contribution to religious thought was his book, "The Nature and Destiny of Man."

Of particular interest, I believe, to all those concerned with the relationship between human nature and political action was his book entitled, "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness," in which Dr. Niebuhr said, in effect, that men are good enough to make democracy work but bad enough to make democracy necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the thought and the life of Reinhold Niebuhr will continue for many years to come to be a significant and constructive influence on our time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert two editorials, one from the New York Times and the other from the Washington Post, both dated June 3, 1971, paying tribute to Reinhold Niebuhr:

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1971]

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Reinhold Niebuhr blended theology and practical politics as articulator of the concept of "liberal realism." His writings provided the intellectual underpinning for much of what was most constructive in the anti-totalitarian left.

Beginning in the late 1930's, Dr. Niebuhr was profoundly influential in moving American Protestantism away from pacifism and a utopian view of politics toward a more complex, more tragic and politically more realistic view of man and society. In his masterpiece, "The Nature and Destiny of Man," and in his lesser books, he brought to bear old Christian insights into man's fallibility and pride and made them relevant and convincing in this secular age. Because of his great gifts as public speaker and lucid, forceful writer, there were few within the Protestant community who did not feel his influence, while many who shared other beliefs or rejected religion also responded to his arguments.

Not one to be a theorist only, Dr. Niebuhr tested his concepts in the arena of electoral politics. He was among the founders of New York's Liberty party in 1944 and an architect of Americans for Democratic Action. In the years following World War II his influence on the thinking of many key Government policymakers was so profound that George F. Kennan saw him as "the father of us all"—the "all" being the liberal trendsetters of the fifties and sixties.

Dr. Niebuhr's ideas were not, of course, always accepted with the grace and facility with which he propounded them. But even his adversaries of the right and the left cheerfully conceded the effervescence of his mind and the humanitarianism of his philosophy. Dr. Niebuhr helped infuse vigor into the American democratic process. In a time of moral confusion and rapid political change, he was a frequent source of political wisdom and an illuminating spokesman for the moral values that sustain human freedom.

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1971]

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Large numbers owe large debts to the teaching of Reinhold Niebuhr. For secularists who sought to make sense out of the mysterious ways of politics—never mind the mysteries of religious faith—he was a careful explainer of the creative role that law can play in causing positive social change. For believers, whether in God, Christianity or some form of metaphysical truth, he insisted that the religious experience should be less a form of parochial loyalty than a commitment to values that help men to overcome hate, injustice, ignorance. For pragmatists who wanted here-and-now results, he was the pastor of a Detroit church who, more than 50 years ago, daringly spoke out against what he considered the callous management practices of Henry Ford.

All these different roles might suggest a

man on the run, a part-time specialist touching many bases but never fully covering any. Yet diversity was a main reason for Mr. Niebuhr's excellence, because essential to anything he did or thought was a tie-in to Christian realism. He wrote:

"The finest task of achieving justice will be done neither by the Utopians who dream dreams of perfect brotherhood nor yet by the cynics who believe that the self-interest of nations cannot be overcome. It must be done by the realists who understand that nations are selfish and will be so till the end of history, but that none of us, no matter how selfish we may be, can be only selfish."

Because his writing and preaching on religion had little or none of the revival tent to it, Mr. Niebuhr attracted a wide following in those seminaries where students demand that the church help solve the problems of war, racism and poverty. More than a few of the clergymen jailed in recent years for civil disobedience, or those who work to organize the poor or the ethnic communities, were first nudged that way by Niebuhr. He disdained what he called "a simple pietistic version of the Protestant faith" by which celebrity-preachers try to prove "that prayer can harness divine power to human ends, particularly to the ends of business success and happiness."

Although he could be as abstruse as the next theologian when the moment was right, Mr. Niebuhr's writing and speaking style generally remained simple. A tribute many will pay him is not only to go back and reread his better-known works, but make the effort to go forward and apply them to one's daily life. His notions of Christian realism apply so well, perhaps because they are needed so much.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert two articles about Reinhold Niebuhr from the New York Times and the Washington Post:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1971]

REINHOLD NIEBUHR IS DEAD; PROTESTANT THEOLOGIAN, 78

(By Alden Whitman)

The Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr, the Protestant theologian who had wide influence in the worlds of religion and politics, died last evening at his summer home in Stockbridge, Mass., after a long illness. He was 78 years old.

Mr. Niebuhr had been under orders from his doctors in recent years to cut down on his sermons and lectures.

Throughout his long career he was a theologian who preached in the marketplace, a philosopher of ethics who applied his belief to everyday moral predicaments and a polit-

ical liberal who subscribed to a hard-boiled pragmatism.

Combining all these capacities, he was the architect of a complex philosophy based on the fallibility of man and the absurdity of human pretensions, as well as on the Biblical precepts that man should love God and his neighbor.

The Protestant theology that Mr. Niebuhr evolved over a life-time was called neo-orthodoxy. It stressed original sin, which Mr. Niebuhr defined as pride, the "universality of self-regard in everybody's motives, whether they are idealists or realists or whether they are benevolent or not."

It rejected utopianism, the belief "that increasing reason, increasing education, increasing technical conquests of nature make for moral progress, that historical development means moral progress."

As influential as he was in the disputatious world of religion, it was in the arena of practical politics that the effects of his thought were most apparent to the general public. He was the mentor of scores of men, including Arthur Schlesinger Jr., who were the brain trust of the Democratic party in the nineteen-fifties and sixties, George F. Kennan, the diplomat and adviser to Presidents on Soviet affairs, called Mr. Niebuhr "the father of us all" in recognition of his role in encouraging intellectuals to help shape national policies.

In addition to Mr. Kennan and Mr. Schlesinger, the "all" included such well-known intellectual movers and shakers as Paul H. Nitze, Dean Acheson, McGeorge Bundy, Louis J. Halle, Hans J. Morgenthau and James Reston.

"I suppose the thing Niebuhr has done for me more than anybody else," Mr. Reston once said, "is to articulate the irony of our condition as a country in the world today."

Mr. Niebuhr advocated "liberal realism." "The finest task of achieving justice," he once wrote, "will be done neither by the Utopians who dream dreams of perfect brotherhood nor yet by the cynics who believe that the self-interest of nations cannot be overcome. It must be done by the realists who understand that nations are selfish and will be so till the end of history, but that none of us, no matter how selfish we may be, can be only selfish."

"The whole art of politics consists in directing rationally the irrationalities of men," Mr. Niebuhr said. He thought of intellectuals as a "collective leaven" in a democratic society, men and women who could apply their learning to the practical problems of power and social justice. To them Mr. Niebuhr often served as an adviser, as when he lectured to the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department.

Mr. Niebuhr was himself active in politics, as a member first of the Socialist party, and then as vice chairman of the Liberal party in New York.

ACTIVE IN AD HOC GROUPS

He was an officer of Americans for Democratic Action and active in numerous committees established to deal with specific social, economic and political matters. He was a firm interventionist in the years before United States entry into World War II. He was equally firm in opposing Communist goals after the war, but at the same time he was against harassing American Communists.

Much of Mr. Niebuhr's political influence was subtle, embodied in a virtually continuous outpouring of articles on topics ranging from the moral basis of politics to race relations to pacifism to trade unionism to foreign affairs. He did not offer pat solutions, but what he called "Christian realism," which emphasized the importance of arriving at approximate, rather than absolute, answers to public questions. Public morality, he argued, differed from private morals in this respect.

Mr. Niebuhr had been associated with

Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 121st Street, since 1928. He was, successively, associate professor of the philosophy of religion (1928-30); William E. Dodge Jr. Professor of Applied Christianity (1930-55); and Charles A. Briggs Graduate Professor of Ethics and Theology from 1955 to his death. He was vice president of the seminary after 1955.

Hundreds of seminarians jammed lecture halls for his courses, and thousands of laymen heard him preach or lecture. He spoke at many colleges across the country, preached at scores of churches, large and small, and appeared on innumerable public platforms. He was a sparkling talker, exerting a magnetism that kept his listeners excited and alert through lengthy and profound expositions.

Mr. Niebuhr possessed a deep voice and large blue eyes. He used his arms as though he were an orchestra conductor. Occasionally one hand would strike out, with a pointed finger at the end, to accent a trenchant sentence.

He talked rapidly and (because he disliked to wear spectacles for his far-sightedness) without notes; yet he was adroit in building logical climaxes and in communicating a sense of passionate involvement in what he was saying.

Many who heard him lecture on secular matters were incredulous when they found that he was a clergyman, for he wore his erudition lightly and spoke in common accents. When he preached, one auditor recalled, "he always seemed the small-town parish minister, able to relate the Christian faith simply to contemporary problems."

A high forehead and premature baldness, except for a ring of hair above his ears, made Mr. Niebuhr appear taller than his 6 feet 1 inch. His frame was large and his hands were big-knuckled.

OFFICE FILLED WITH BOOKS

He looked outsize in his snug office on the seventh floor of the seminary, which he occupied during his teaching years. Its walls were so hidden by books, mostly on sociology and economics, that there was space for only one picture, a wood engraving of Jonah inside the whale. On his desk, amid a wild miscellany of papers, was a framed photograph of his wife and children. When students dropped in, as they frequently did, he liked to rock back in his swivel chair, cross his legs, link his hands on top of his head and chat.

In those informal moments he was a gay and witty talker, tossing off ideas in virtually every sentence and drawing upon a seemingly inexhaustible store of quotations from books he had read. Some students were disquieted by his eyes.

"He didn't really look at you," one of them recalled, "so much as measure you."

Mr. Niebuhr was a nonstop conversationalist. A scheduled 15-minute consultation with a student had a way of lasting for three hours. At its conclusion, the student was limp and Mr. Niebuhr as fresh as a daisy. He spoke so rapidly that note-taking was a challenge, even for adepts at shorthand, and interviewers found a tape recorder a great boon.

Mr. Niebuhr had an easy way about him, one that dispelled barriers of communication. He was "Reinie" to friends and acquaintances; in public references he preferred "Mister" to the honorific "Doctor." His highest earned academic degree was Master of Arts, which he received from Yale in 1915, but he collected 18 honorary doctorates, including a Doctor of Divinity from Oxford.

For many years, Mr. Niebuhr was virtually a chain smoker of cigarettes, and he unabashedly sipped Scotch whisky at the cocktail hour. At such times he was able to call upon a fund of small talk that delighted his companions.

Mr. Niebuhr's diversions were few. He was

fond of walking on Riverside Drive with his wife and his large black poodle, but the family conversation was mostly about religion. Mrs. Niebuhr was a lecturer on that subject at Barnard College for a number of years. Otherwise Mr. Niebuhr worked from 7:30 A.M., when he had breakfast, until he retired at midnight.

WROTE BOOKS IN SUMMER

When he had classes, Mr. Niebuhr taught a total of eight hours a week and prepared his lectures in the evening at his apartment on Claremont Avenue. He wrote his books in summer—he usually vacationed near Lenox, Mass.—and his articles whenever he could fit them in. He had the knack of so organizing his thoughts in his head that his first draft of an article, which he typed himself, was likely to be the finished copy.

His writing appeared in the most diverse publications. For several years in the nineteen-thirties he edited and contributed to *The World Tomorrow*, a Socialist party organ; from the forties on he edited and wrote for *Christianity and Crisis*, a biweekly magazine devoted to religious matters. In an ecumenical spirit, he wrote for *The Commonweal*, a Roman Catholic magazine; for *Advance and Christian Century*, Protestant publications; and for *Commentary*, a Jewish publication.

Because Mr. Niebuhr did not employ Biblical citations to support his political attitudes, some associates were skeptical of the depth of his faith.

"Don't tell me Reinie takes that God business seriously," a political co-worker once said.

The remark got back to Mr. Niebuhr, who laughed and said:

"I know. Some of my friends think I teach Christian ethics as a sort of front to make my politics respectable."

Troubled agnostics, Catholics, Protestants and Jews often came to him for spiritual guidance. Only half facetiously, one Jew confessed: "Reinie is my rabbi."

Men and women of other faiths felt equally close to him, for he did not seek to convert so much as to counsel.

FRANKFURTER AN ADMIRER

Among Mr. Niebuhr's admirers was Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter. After listening to one sermon, the late Justice said:

"I like what you said, Reinie, and I speak as a believing unbeliever."

"I'm glad you did," the clergyman replied, "for I spoke as an unbelieving believer."

Although Mr. Niebuhr was acclaimed as a theologian, the closest he came to systematizing his views was in his two-volume "The Nature and Destiny of Man," published by Scribner's in 1943. He began an "Intellectual biography" issued in 1956 by saying:

"I cannot and do not claim to be a theologian. I have taught Christian Social Ethics for a quarter of a century and have also dealt in the ancillary field of apologetics. My avocational interest as a kind of circuit rider in colleges and universities has prompted an interest in the defense and justification of the Christian faith in a secular age . . ."

"I have never been very competent in the nice points of pure theology; and I must confess that I have not been sufficiently interested heretofore to acquire the competence."

There was, nonetheless, a Niebuhr doctrine. In its essence it accepted God and contended that man knows Him chiefly through Christ, or what Mr. Niebuhr called "the Christ event." The doctrine, in its evolved form, suggested that man's condition was inherently sinful, and that his original, and largely ineradicable, sin is his pride, or egotism.

"The tragedy of man," Mr. Niebuhr said, is that he can conceive self-perfection but cannot achieve it."

He argued also that man deluded himself most of the time; for example, he believed

that a man who trumpeted his own tolerance was likely to be full of concealed prejudices and bigotries.

Mr. Niebuhr asserted that man should not passively accept evil, but should strive for moral solutions to his problems. He urged man to take advantage of his finitude, to deal realistically with life as it is and to have Biblical faith.

In the ceaseless battle between good and evil, man must recognize the heights," for there is no sinful life in which there is not a point where God's grace may find lodgment."

The Christian faith cannot deny that our acts may be influenced by heredity, environment and the actions of others," he once wrote. But it must deny that we can ever excuse our actions by attributing them to the fault of others, even though there has been a strong inclination to do this since Adam excused himself by the words, "The woman gave me the apple."

Mr. Niebuhr also insisted that when the Bible speaks of man being made in the image of God, it means that he is a free spirit as well as a creature; and that as a spirit he is finally responsible to God."

In struggle for the good, institutional change is likely to be more effective than a change of heart, Mr. Niebuhr suggested. He decried clergymen who offered salvation on what he considered simplistic terms.

Billy Graham, the evangelist, and the Rev. Dr. Vincent Norman Peale, the expositor of the power of positive thinking," were among the clergymen Mr. Niebuhr contradicted. Their wholly individualistic conceptions of sin," he said, were almost completely irrelevant" to the collective problems of the nuclear age.

Mr. Niebuhr objected especially to the notion that religious conversion could cure race prejudice, economic injustice or political chicanery. The remedy, he believed, lay in societal changes spurred by Christian realism. In this sense, man could be an agent in history by coming to terms with it and working to alter his environment.

Mr. Niebuhr's own life illustrated his beliefs. He was born June 21, 1892, in Wright City, Mo., the son of Gustav and Lydia Niebuhr. His father was pastor of the Evangelical Synod Church, a German Lutheran congregation, in that farm community. At the age of 10 Reinhold decided that he wanted to be a minister because, as he told his father, you're the most interesting man in town." At that point his father set about teaching him Greek.

From high school Reinhold went, with his brother Richard to Elmhurst College in Illinois, a small denominational school, and from there, after four years, to Eden Theological Seminary near St. Louis. After the death of his father in 1913, Reinhold was asked to take his pulpit in Lincoln, Ill. He declined in order to enter Yale Divinity School on a scholarship. He received his Bachelor of Divinity degree there in 1914, and his Master of Arts a year later.

ONLY PASTORATE IN DETROIT

Upon his ordination by the Evangelical Synod of North America, he was sent to his first and only pastorate, the Bethel Evangelical Church of Detroit. He remained there 13 years, nurturing the congregation from 20 members to 650, and becoming the center of swirling controversy for his support of labor, and later for his espousal of pacifism.

"I cut my eye teeth fighting Ford," Mr. Niebuhr said in recollection of his Detroit years. Whereas Henry Ford was usually praised in those days for his wage of \$5 a day and the low price of his automobiles, he was condemned by Mr. Niebuhr as ravaging his workers by the assembly line, the speedup, periodic layoffs for retooling and by summary dismissal of men in middle age.

"What a civilization this is!" Mr. Niebuhr said. "Naive gentlemen with a genius for

mechanics suddenly become arbiters over the lives and fortunes of hundreds of thousands."

Mr. Niebuhr not only preached against what he regarded as Mr. Ford's callousness, but he also wrote stinging articles in *The Christian Century* that were read by Mr. Ford, among others. Mr. Ford was neither amused nor converted. Mr. Niebuhr emerged as a public champion of social justice and as a Socialist.

A SOCIALIST WITHOUT MARX

Recalling this phase of his career in after years, the clergyman said:

"Mr. Ford typified for my rather immature social imagination all that was wrong with American capitalism. I became a Socialist in this reaction. I became a Socialist in theory long before I enrolled in the Socialist party and before I had read anything by Karl Marx.

"I became the prisoner of a very cute phrase which I invented, or it seemed to me at least to be cute. That phrase was, 'When private property ceases to be private, it no longer ought to be private.'

"The phrase, which was prompted by the unprivate character of these great motor companies, does not seem to be so astute in the light of subsequent history in which justice was achieved by balancing various types of collective power."

For a number of years Mr. Niebuhr preached what was termed "the social Gospel," a jeremiad against the abuse of laissez faire industrialism. He was a much-prized speaker at labor and liberal gatherings and on college campuses.

He castigated capitalists not only for their inhumanity to man but also for their spiritual blindness. He called for labor brotherhood, and racial and religious brotherhood as well.

At the same time, he tolled the doom of capitalism. "Capitalism is dying and it ought to die," he said in 1933. He was then teaching at Union Theological Seminary and agitating for the Socialist party. He was a founder, in 1930, of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians, whose membership included Paul Tillich, the theologian.

All during the thirties, however, Mr. Niebuhr was reassessing his ethical, social and political beliefs. He had never been a thoroughgoing Marxist, an advocate of class struggle and revolution; and now he turned from Socialism. He was never a Communist; indeed, he was a vigorous critic of the Soviet Union for the "brutality" of its economic system.

Mr. Niebuhr's dispute with Socialism, and his ultimate break with it, was on religious and ethical grounds, and later on realistic grounds. It was idolatry, he thought, to suggest that human beings could blueprint and bring forth the Kingdom of God on earth. He also had mounting doubts about the inevitability of progress.

In 1939 Mr. Niebuhr was invited to deliver the Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh University. This offered him a further opportunity to refine his views, which came more and more to be centered on man's pretensions about himself.

"A Christian justice will be particularly critical of the claims of the self against the claims of the other, but it will not dismiss them out of hand," he said. "A simple Christian moralism counsels men to be unselfish. A profounder Christian faith must encourage men to create systems of justice which will save society and themselves from their own selfishness."

Although Mr. Niebuhr recanted his Socialism, he did not lessen his interest in social change. Instead, he saw it in a different light—as a continuous adjustment of tensions between power groups in society. Nor did he diminish his concern for the plight of minorities and the rights of labor. Their cause, he contended, was part of a grander

social adjustment within the general framework of American capitalism.

At the outset of World War II Mr. Niebuhr favored American intervention.

"The halting of totalitarian aggression is a prerequisite to world peace and order," he declared. He headed the Union for Democratic Action, a committee formed in 1941 by liberal former pacifists to encourage participation in the war.

In the war period Mr. Niebuhr worked with the World Council of Churches' Commission on a Just and Durable Peace. He also joined the Liberal party in 1944, and was an untiring spokesman for the anti-Communist left.

"Perhaps our gravest fault as a nation," he said, "is our exalted sense of American virtue. We see the United States as something unique in the world, a nation whose concerns soar above petty national ambitions, whose generosity and goodwill are unequalled. God, we assume, is invariably on our side, thanks to a special covenant with the Almighty."

Mr. Niebuhr was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, a group of 50 distinguished Americans. He received the President's Medal for Freedom in 1964.

Mr. Niebuhr's principal writings were "Does Civilization Need Religion?" (1927); "Leaves From the Notebook of a Tamed Critic" (1929); "Moral Man and Immoral Society" (1932); "Reflections on the End of an Era" (1934); "An Interpretation of Christian Ethics" (1935); "Beyond Tragedy" (1937); "Christianity and Power Politics" (1940); "The Nature and Destiny of Man" (1941-43); "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness" (1944); "Discerning the Signs of the Times" (1946); "Faith and History" (1949); "The Irony of American History" (1952); "Christian Realism and Political Problems" (1953); "The Self and the Dramas of History" (1955); "Pious and Secular America" (1958); "The Structure of Nations and Empires" (1959); and "Man's Nature and His Communities" (1965).

He leaves his wife of 40 years, the former Ursula Keppel-Compton; a son, Christopher Robert of Albany, and a daughter, Mrs. Elizabeth Sifton of Brooklyn.

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1971]

THEOLOGIAN REINHOLD NIEBUHR

(By William R. MacKaye)

Reinhold Niebuhr, who died Tuesday in Stockbridge, Mass., at 78, was one of the intellectual giants of the 20th century, a man who shunned the titles of theologian and political philosopher but was those and more.

He came as close as any man of his time to marrying the immiscible strands of the American past—the society's biblical, Christian inheritance and the secularist, utilitarian origins of its political institutions—into a unified view of the world.

He was one of those rare church leaders who spoke with power not only to the church on churchly matters but also on the world on worldly matters.

Dr. Niebuhr's principal pulpit during his long public career was as professor of applied Christianity at New York's Union Theological Seminary, on whose faculty he served for more than 40 years. But even as he taught new generations of ministers and academic theologians, he took on such assignments as adviser to the State Department's Foreign Policy Staff and officer of the Liberal Party, a political third party in New York state.

An early Socialist and pacifist, he abandoned these positions in the 1930s in favor of staunch support of the New Deal and a conviction that the United States was morally obligated to intervene internationally to put down Nazism.

The nature of his times, an era that saw the rise of a multiplicity of totalitarisms,

and his own reading of the Bible and of history stimulated in Dr. Niebuhr a skepticism about man and society that he called "Christian realism." His understanding of man was in effect an emphasis on human limitation and fallibility that set him in opposition to the easy optimism preached for opposite reasons by both the theological liberals and by fundamentalists.

Dr. Niebuhr's dark vision of the human situation is illustrated in typical fashion in the closing paragraphs of his major work, "The Nature and Destiny of Man," a two-volume essay that grew out of his delivery of the Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh in 1939:

"The freedom of man transcends the flux of nature in such a way that the hope of completely severing the spirit from the integuments of nature is an understandable illusion. The processes of growth in history are, furthermore, so obvious that the modern error of confusing growth with progress may be regarded as an equally inevitable mistake.

"Yet both these mistakes also rested upon a willful disregard of some of the obvious evidences.

"It is obvious that man does not have the power to extricate himself from flux and finiteness, as idealists and mystics of the ancient and the modern world believed.

"It is equally obvious that history does not solve the basic problems of human existence but reveals them on progressively new levels.

"The belief that men could solve his problem either by an escape from history or by the historical process itself is a mistake which is partly prompted by the most universal of all 'ideological' taints: the pride not of particular men and cultures, but a man as man."

The rolling sentences of this passage also illustrate the sonority that was characteristic of most of his writing, lecturing and preaching. One Niebuhr admirer recalled that a woman rushed up to him at the conclusion of one of his appearances saying that she couldn't understand a word he said but that she would be content to hear him recite the alphabet.

Reinhold Niebuhr—his friends called him "Reinie"—was born in Wright City, Mo. He was the son of an immigrant father who was a pastor of the Evangelical Synod of North America, a denomination of German origin that is now a part of the United Church of Christ.

Of the Niebuhr children, three achieved exceptional ecclesiastical distinction. In addition to Reinhold Niebuhr there were also H. Richard Niebuhr, for many years a professor at Yale Divinity School, whose theological impact on American Christendom was nearly as profound as his brother's, and Hulda Niebuhr, a sister, who had a long career as a teacher at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago.

Reinhold attended Eden Theological Seminary, a seminary of this denomination, and graduated from Yale Divinity School in 1914.

After receiving a Master of Arts degree in 1915 he was ordained to the ministry of the Evangelical Synod and thereupon took up the only pastorate of his career, a 13-year stint as minister of Bethel Evangelical Church in Detroit, a struggling congregation composed principally of laborers on automobile assembly lines.

Before long the young minister found himself locked in struggle with Henry Ford. Mr. Niebuhr's outrage at the conditions under which auto workers of that era labored led him into his temporary espousal of socialism, an embrace, he later confessed, that preceded his reading of the works of Karl Marx.

In 1928 he moved on to the faculty of Union Seminary, where he spent the remainder of his life.

The multifariousness of Dr. Niebuhr's interests and activities and the prodigiousness of his energy led him over the years into close associations with such disparate

figures as diplomat George Kennan, Episcopal Bishop William Scarlett, Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Scottish theologian John Baille, Jewish scholar Rabbi Abraham Heschel, lawyer and public figure Dean Acheson and a list that could run on much longer.

Many of these men kept up with the unfolding of Dr. Niebuhr's thought by following his writing in "Christianity and Crisis," a Christian Journal of opinion he founded in 1941 to promote the activist, interventionist stance he espoused.

During World War II and thereafter, Dr. Niebuhr relied more and more firmly on historical analysis of issues he saw confronting his nation and world.

Ronald H. Stone, one of his students and the collector of the most recent volume of his essays, noted:

"As his thought became more historically oriented, it also grew more pragmatic. The results of the New Deal and Franklin D. Roosevelt's pragmatic foreign policy convinced Niebuhr of the dangers and irrelevance of ideology to the problems confronting the United States. . . .

"His influence on purging Protestantism of absolutisms in social ethics has been one of his more important contributions in American life. No man or political idea was good enough to be trusted completely; both had to be checked by other men and ideas and continually evaluated in the light of their contribution to the common good."

Dr. Niebuhr suffered the first of a long series of crippling strokes in 1952, when he was only 60, and physically he was a semi-invalid thereafter.

But if his body was weakened, his mental energies remained undaunted, and commentary and analysis continued to flow from his pen at a scarcely lessened pace.

In addition to innumerable articles in newspapers and magazines, Dr. Niebuhr was the author of more than 20 books. Besides "The Nature and Destiny of Man," some of the more memorable are "Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Critic," "Moral Man and Immoral Society," "Beyond Tragedy," "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness," "Faith and History," "Irony and American History" and "The Structure of Nations and Empires."

Dr. Niebuhr's participation in the exchange of ideas covered so long a span of years and grappled with such a variety of public issues that at least one younger scholar forgot too soon that he was still alive and active.

This writer imprudently suggested a few years ago that Harvard Divinity School theologian Harvey Cox was "this generation's Reinhold Niebuhr." The scholar was promptly assailed by an angry swarm of Niebuhr disciples who retorted that "Reinhold Niebuhr is this generation's Reinhold Niebuhr."

Dr. Niebuhr's funeral will be conducted at 3 p.m. Friday in the United Church of Christ in Stockbridge, Mass., the western Massachusetts town where he died. Friends said a memorial service would probably be conducted later in New York.

He is survived by his wife of 40 years, the former Ursula Keppel-Compton, a son Christopher, Albany, N.Y., and a daughter, Elizabeth Sifton, Brooklyn.

RAY HACKNEY SCHOLARSHIP AWARD WINNERS

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, recently I participated in a multinational scholarship awards program that I think will be of interest to the House.

Four young Latin Americans and two North Americans received scholarships under a program conducted by the Communications Workers of America. The program is called the Ray Hackney Scholarship Fund, and it is named after an executive vice president of the union who died accidentally several years ago.

Joseph A. Beirne, the president of the communications workers, told the group at the ceremony that Ray Hackney was very interested in Latin America, especially in educating Latin American labor leaders and workers, and so when he died tragically, the Ray Hackney Scholarship Fund was set up in his memory.

In the United States, families of members of the communications workers are eligible. In Latin America, families of the communications and allied workers affiliated with labor are eligible. This year, on May 19, I had the privilege of drawing the names of the winners.

This is the 5th year of the scholarship program, and it has seen its first graduate—a young man, Danny Ferguson, son of a communications worker, who has graduated from the University of Arkansas. In a letter to President Beirne, the young man said that the scholarship literally put him through college.

The new North American scholarship winners were Jane Banks, a Fredericksburg, Va., high school girl who is in the national honor society and whose father is a central office repairman; and Miriam Nunnelee, a Montgomery, Ala., high school girl who is also in the national honor society, and whose father is a PBX installer-repairman.

There were four Latin American winners:

Elizabeth Vega, of Quito, Ecuador, a 14-year-old daughter of a postal worker who is a member of the Association of Postal Workers of Pichincha, who will use her scholarship to complete high school.

Jayme Toledo, Jr., of Espirito Santo, Brazil, 19, son of a member of the Telephone Workers Union, who will go to college to study engineering.

Persido Lizardo, 24, of Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, a member of the Federation of Telecommunications and Postal Workers, who will use her scholarship to go to medical school.

Herman A. Rodriguez, 19, of Guatemala City, Guatemala, son of a member of the Light and Power Workers Union of Guatemala, who will study agronomy.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity provided by the Ray Hackney Scholarship Fund to these six deserving young men and women is not only a worthy living memorial to the many contributions Ray Hackney made to the labor movement during his lifetime, but also a tribute to the continuing concern of the membership of the Communications Workers of America for improving international understanding and the lives of the younger generation throughout the Americas.

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, support of H.R. 7657 is increasing. The bill which would extend for an additional 5 years the children and youth comprehensive health projects, maternal and infant care projects, and crippled children's services which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 47 cosponsors. These projects deliver comprehensive health care to children and youth of lower socioeconomic levels in central cities and rural areas throughout the country. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country. I urge our colleagues to become cosponsors of this legislation. I am appending to my statement further information on one of these programs.

The information follows:

BRIEF RESUMÉ OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS' MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT

The Maternity and Infant Care Project for the State of Arkansas is entering its sixth year of operation. During this period of time better than 5400 high risk maternity patients have received total financial support which has placed them within the bounds of truly optimum Obstetrical and Newborn Care. Their babies have all received a further year of supported Pediatric Care. Certain of these high risk mothers have been further helped during the interconceptional period and, in many instances the initiating high risk element originally discovered during pregnancy has been eliminated entirely or ameliorated to the extent that a future pregnancy will not be a repetition of a crisis situation. This Obstetric-Pediatric venture has resulted in a dramatic improvement in Perinatal Mortality for all races but especially the black race.

The State of Arkansas Maternity and Infant Care Project is fiscally managed by the State Department of Health and, clinically, the responsibility of the University of Arkansas Medical Center. The Project is unique among all of the 53 other Projects in that it is oriented toward the rural patient. The area served by the Project encompasses ten counties in central Arkansas and reaches about two-thirds of the State's population. Except for Little Rock, which is a small city entirely surrounded by a rural setting, the entire geographical distribution of the project's services are to a distinctly rural population. State and County Public Health Clinics are utilized to care for and identify the patients requiring care of a searching and definitive nature. Systems have been devised to bring modern Obstetrical and Pediatric methods and thoughts to these formerly isolated regions. All patients attending these rural clinics are delivered at the Medical Center or admitted for study, if indicated, during the antenatal or post partum periods. All of these rural clinics have been upgraded to the level of the antenatal clinics at the Medical Center. This has been accomplished through the use of a consultant service, contracted laboratory work, and personnel employment. All patients receive total Para medical support in the form of Nutritional guidance, Public Health Nurse help, and Social Work services. Transportation support is available for safe and easy access to the Medical Center in Little Rock when labor begins or complications develop.

During this period of the Project's existence approximately thirteen thousand (13,000) women have been delivered at the Medical Center and better than one-third of

this number have required the financial support of the Project. It must be established at this point that the non-financially supported patients receive the same services as the supported patient except for the monetary factor.

It is inconceivable for this Project Director to comprehend how this Project can ever be curtailed. It would mean a return to the "Granny" midwife solution and a Perinatal Mortality rate equal to that of Uganda in Africa!

This State of Arkansas is not a wealthy State and its community Medical facilities are totally unable to accommodate the needs of the indigent maternity patient. If these patients are high risk in nature the medical facilities available at the community level in the rural areas are hopelessly inadequate. Consequently, the University of Arkansas Medical Center remains, as it has always been, the only referral center in the State for complicated Maternity problem patients. The Project has augmented the Maternity-Pediatric facilities at the Medical Center so that now it may be said that the finest in professional and hospital facilities are available to all.

The restrictive boundaries of the Project's responsibility have been breached many times to rescue extremely high risk patients from totally unacceptable Obstetrical environments in some of the more distant rural counties.

If the height of a pilot program can be said to have been reached by providing "The greatest good to the greatest number" then this can be assigned to the Arkansas State Maternity and Infant Care Project. It must continue.

BYRON L. HAWKS, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.,
Professor, Obstetrics and Gynecology
Director, Arkansas Maternity and
Infant Care Project.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING—ITS ERADICATION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, childhood lead poisoning will claim 200 lives this year. Eight hundred children will be so devastatingly poisoned that they will be sentenced to permanent institutionalization. Another 3,200 will suffer moderate to severe brain damage.

This is incredible. It is incredible because childhood lead poisoning is preventable.

Dr. Jane S. Lin-Fu has written in "Childhood Lead Poisoning—An Eradicable Disease," Children's Magazine, January-February, 1970:

In the history of modern medicine, a few childhood diseases occupy a position as unique as lead poisoning. It is a preventable disease. The etiology, pathogenesis, epidemiology, and symptomatology have been well defined. Methods for screening, diagnosis, and treatment have long been available.

What can be done to defeat this man-made epidemic, which afflicts some 400,000 children nationally? Clearly, the most direct and sure assault would be mounted if the slums of our Nation were leveled and adequate housing for the disadvantaged provided. That would accomplish destruction of the sources of the lead-tainted paint and plaster chips which the victims of lead poisoning pick

up and eat, slowly ingesting the lead into their systems.

But, short of that, there is still a great deal that can be done.

First, massive screening programs should be undertaken in our cities—particularly those parts of the urban centers characterized by decrepit housing—to identify those children who are the victims of lead poisoning. This is essential because often the symptomatology is not immediately clear. In addition, it may take several months for the amount of lead in the child's system to build up to the acute level. Screening programs can identify those children who need treatment before irremediable damage has been done. Most recently, new devices called microblood detectors, by which lead poisoning may be detected with a few drops of blood from a finger-prick, have been developed.

Second, large scale treatment programs must be established to treat those youngsters who show elevated lead concentrations.

Third, areas of incidence of lead poisoning must be identified, so that action can be particularly concentrated in those areas in terms of screening, treatment, and eradication.

Fourth, programs of lead paint eradication must be undertaken, so that the sources of the lead-tainted paint and plaster chips which the children eat can be permanently removed from the youngsters' environment. Recently, portable detectors using X-ray fluoroscope technique have been developed which reveal the lead content in painted surfaces.

All these steps can be taken under the programs authorized by the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-965.

Childhood lead poisoning is a preventable disease, and we can, given the funds, end its terrible toll of helpless children.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts), for today and June 4, 1971, on account of official business.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), for week of June 2, 1971, on account of official business.

Mr. HILLIS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 4, 1971, on account of official business.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 4, on account of official business.

Mr. HUNT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 4, on account of official business.

Mr. KEMP (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from 3:30 p.m. today and balance of week, on account of official business.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts), for Friday, June 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, Monday, June 7, for 1 hour.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TERRY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GROVER, for 15 minutes, on Friday, June 4.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KEE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BIAGGI to revise and extend his remarks in support of the Peyser amendment.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TERRY), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. STEELE in 10 instances.

Mr. QUIE in two instances.

Mr. GUBSER in two instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. SCHWENDEL.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. DUNCAN in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. LUJAN in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, in two instances.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. WARE.

Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.

Mr. KING in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. MORSE.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM), and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. CAREY of New York.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ROBINO in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. KAZEN.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.

Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HICKS of Washington in two instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MCKAY.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. BEGICH.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. BERGLAND in three instances.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. DENHOLM in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned in accordance with a previous order until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 1971, at 10 o'clock a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 8883. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 8884. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERGLAND (for himself and Mr. BLATNIK):

H.R. 8885. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments to producers for crops of oats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERGLAND (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FRASER, Mr. KARTH, Mr. LINK, Mr. OBEX, Mr. ROY, Mr. THONE and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 8886. A bill to assist producers of agricultural commodities by providing an orderly means of bargaining with the handlers of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8887. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, to assist producers in the marketing of their commodities at a fair price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. KARTH, and Mr. NELSEN):

H.R. 8888. A bill to provide for the establishment and enforcement of certain interim safety standards for power rotary lawnmowers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 8889. A bill relating to the use of the Naval Air Station, Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8890. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8891. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the civil service retirement benefits of employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. FISH, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STEPHENS, and Mr. BROWN of Michigan):

H.R. 8892. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 8893. A bill to establish methods of payment for national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8894. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 8895. A bill to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 8896. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 8897. A bill to provide implementation of the Federal Trade Commission Act to give increased protection to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 8898. A bill to prohibit the display of the flags of the Vietcong and the Government of North Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8899. A bill to establish a Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 8900. A bill to repeal section 212(B) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 8901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 8902. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 8903. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 8904. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKEVITT:

H.R. 8905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8906. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 8907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8908. A bill to provide financial assistance for the construction and operation of senior citizens' community centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8909. A bill to make it unlawful for persons engaged in insuring motor vehicles or selling motor vehicle insurance to refuse to sell insurance to any individual because of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of all expenses for medical care of a taxpayer and his spouse if either of them attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8911. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for the elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 8912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired policemen or firemen or their dependents, or to the widows or other survivors of deceased policemen or firemen, shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 8913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to help secure safe community water supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8914. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish standards and programs to abate and control water pollution by synthetic detergents; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 8915. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8916. A bill to amend section 832(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANNUN-

ZIO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MEEDS, and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 8917. A bill making an appropriation to continue or resume funding of certain nutrition projects under title IV of the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TEERNAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 8918. A bill making an appropriation to continue or resume funding of certain nutrition projects under title IV of the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BARDILLO, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. McCLORY):

H.R. 8919. A bill making an appropriation to continue or resume funding of certain nutrition projects under title IV of the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 8920. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies, and committees and members thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 8921. A bill to amend the Federal Water Project Recreation Act to provide that all project and operational costs for anadromous fish enhancement programs operated by non-Federal agencies shall be borne by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. FUQUA and Mr. DRINAN):

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution relating to the war power of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.J. Res. 682. Joint resolution to designate Route 70 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as the Eisenhower Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. ROY, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. THONE, Mr. WINN, Mr. ZWACH, and Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts):

H.J. Res. 683. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling for a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution praising the President of the United States

with respect to his handling of current public demonstrations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Con. Res. 326. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the proposed asset depreciation range system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY (for himself, Mr. STEELE,

Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. FREY, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. DON H. CLAUSER, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. WYATT, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DELENBACK, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. SCOTT):

H. Con. Res. 327. Concurrent resolution to express the policy of the United States with respect to the promotion of measures rendering possible the optimum sustainable yield from the living resources of the oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 328. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on steps needed to strengthen the dollar; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Res. 462. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H. Res. 463. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 8922. A bill for the relief of Paulo R. De Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 8923. A bill for the relief of Therese H. Paget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.R. 8924. A bill for the relief of Paul R. Kaufman, captain, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 8925. A bill for the relief of Kim Hak Kyung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 8926. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. William L. Brown, USAR (Retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

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 1971:

(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.)

(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	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">QUARTER</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1st</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2d</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3d</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4th</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">(Mark one square only)</td> </tr> </table>	QUARTER				P	1st	2d	3d	4th	(Mark one square only)				
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]

A. Thaddeus A. Adams III, 1300 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 E. Superior St., Chicago, Ill.

A. American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, 115 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Industry and Labor for the SST, 1156 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward T. Anderson, 2100 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Anderson, 4111 Franconia Road, Alexandria, Va.

B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 2007 Eye St., NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Record Merchandisers, Inc., 20 Conshohocken State Road, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.

A. Association of Civilian Technicians, Inc., 916 College Parkway, Rockville, Md.

A. Association of Petroleum Re-refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va.

A. James F. Bailey, 101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters, and Joiners of America, 101 Constitution 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. John H. Beidler, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Paul Revere Corp., Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert T. Borth, 3427 South Leisure World Boulevard, Silver Spring, Md.

B. General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael D. Bromberg, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Brooks, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., Sydney, Australia.

A. Burwell, Hansen & McCandless, 700 Federal Bar Building West, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. The Carpet and Rug Institute, Dalton, Ga.

A. David C. Carter, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Mbabane, Swaziland.

A. Jacob Clayman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Interbank Card Association, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1-7 O'Connell Street, Sydney, Australia.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 122 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 17 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Jack T. Conway, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Converse Rubber Co., Malden, Mass. et al.

A. James T. Corcoran, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hubert M. Crean, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Crosier, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Cocoa, Chocolate and Confectionery Alliance of Great Britain, London, England.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Industry Export Corp., New Delhi, India.

A. Walter L. Davis, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. George P. Delaney, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's Association AFL-CIO, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1725 K St. NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Marysville Dam Committee, Marysville, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001-15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, West Sacramento, Calif.

A. Peter Edelman.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Federation of American Hospitals 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fensterwald & Ohlhausen, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 17 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Raymond J. Foley, 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gene N. Fondren, 337 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 210 North 13th Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William C. Foster, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., Bellevue, Wash.

A. William C. Foster, 1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo.

A. L. G. Freeman, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Horace D. Godfrey, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Sugar Cane League of the U.S.A., 414 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Horace D. Godfrey, Alexandria, Va.

B. Gold Kist, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Green, National Education Association, 316 West 12th Street, Austin, Tex.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Morton H. Halperin, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald K. Hanes, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Harman, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rita M. Hartz, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

- A. James P. Hensley.
B. Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, 1611 N. Kent Street, Arlington, Va.
- A. J. Thomas Higginbotham, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Consumer Bankers Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Leo Hochstetter.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Car & Foundry Co., Business Center Building, Bellevue, Wash.
- A. Martin Jensen, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
- A. Charlie W. Jones, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. H. Daniel Jones III, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnson Building, Charlotte, N.C.
- A. James N. Jullana Associates, Inc., 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consejo Estatal del Azucar, Apartados Nums. 1256 y 1258, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.
- A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 733 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Centro Azucarero Paraguayo, Independencia Nacional 541, Asuncion, Paraguay.
- A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 733 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Born Corp., 3421 N. Central Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Patricia Keefer, 801 A Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Jeremiah J. Kenney, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Philip F. King, 2312 South Nash Street, Arlington, Va.
- A. Paul A. Korody, Jr., 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. James S. Krzyminski, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Hugh C. Laughlin, 6153 Garden Road, Maumee, Ohio.
B. Owens-Illinois, Post Office Box 1035, Toledo, Ohio.
- A. Robert B. Laurents, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
- A. Charles W. Lee, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
- A. Harrison Lewis, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. William George Lunsford, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
- A. Ian R. MacGowan, 2500 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street, Washington, D.C.
- A. William H. McGee, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 Rosemont, Ill.
- A. McGinnis, Lochridge & Kilgore, Texas State Bank Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, Inc., Weslaco, Tex.
- A. Myles F. McGrall, 15th and L Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.
- A. Frank McManus, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Robert V. Mariani, Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
- A. Mayer, Brown & Platt, 231 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 425 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Mayer, Brown & Platt, 231 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Libby, McNeill & Libby, 200 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Edward L. Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sugar Distributors of Venezuela, Edif. de la Luz Electrica de Venezuela, Av. Urdaneta, Caracas, Venezuela.
- A. Paul J. Minarchenko, Jr., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Civil Airlift.
- A. John J. Motley.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, Washington Building, 15th Street & New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sugar Distributors of Venezuela, Edif. de la Luz Electrica de Venezuela, Av. Urdaneta, Caracas, Venezuela.
- A. D. Michael Murray, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. John R. Murray, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Lawrence P. Mutter, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Record Merchandisers, Inc., Arent, Fox, Kinter, Plotkin & Kahn, Trionon Building, 20 Conshohocken State Road, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
- A. National Committee for an American SST, 1156-15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Louis H. Nevins, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. John J. O'Shea, 1315 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Industry and Labor for the SST, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. John J. O'Shea, 1315 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Committee for an American SST, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Vincent J. Paterno, 916 College Parkway, Rockville, Md.
B. Association of Civilian Technicians, Inc., 916 College Parkway, Rockville, Md.
- A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Central American Sugar Council, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Kenneth Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Prather, Levenberg, Seeger, Doolittle, Farmer & Ewing, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Central de Cooperativas Agrarias del Peru, Avda. Guzman Blanco 240, Lima, Peru.
- A. Arthur L. Quinn, Arthur Lee Quinn, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Belize Sugar Industries, Belize City, British Honduras.
- A. Arthur L. Quinn, Arthur Lee Quinn, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Compania Azucarera Valdez, S.A., Sociedad Agricola e Industrial, San Carlos, Guayaquil, Ecuador.
- A. Arthur L. Quinn, Arthur Lee Quinn, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Government of Republic of Panama, Compania Azucarera La Estrella, S.A. and Azucarera Nacional S.A., Panama City, Panama.
- A. Arthur L. Quinn, Arthur Lee Quinn, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Indies Sugar Association, Bridgetown, Barbados.
- A. Earl G. Quinn, Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. William C. Foster, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Louis J. Rancourt, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. Robert S. Reese, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Delos W. Rentzel, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill.

A. Arthur J. Rothkopf, Arnold C. Johnson & Jerome N. Sonosky, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Commercial Credit Co., Baltimore, Md.

A. Rowley & Scott, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Custom Recording Co., Inc., 634 Buena Vista Avenue, East, North Augusta, S.C.

A. Raymond L. Schafer, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, Tenn.

A. A. Cleve Schneeberger, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William M. Segall, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Carpet and Rug Institute, Dalton, Ga.

A. Sharon, Pierson & Semmes, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Children's Hospital, 2125 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sharon, Pierson & Semmes, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., El Paso, Tex.

A. Sharon, Pierson and Semmes, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mauritius Chamber of Agriculture and Mauritius Sugar Syndicate, Port Louis, Mauritius.

A. A. Z. Shows, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Avionics Communication Systems, Inc., 5252 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Va.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye 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. The Wayne Smith Co., Inc., 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph J. Standa, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard H. Stock, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard H. Stock, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. Keith Stroup, 2105 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 2105 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Greene & Hill, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Private Sugar Producers of Guadeloupe and Martinique, DZone Industrielle, Pointe-Jarry, Baie-Mahault, B.P. 175, Pointe-A-Pitre, Guadeloupe.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Greene & Hill, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Private Sugar Producers of Madagascar, 282 Boulevard St. Germain, Paris, 7e France.

A. David A. Sweeney, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Peter E. Terzick, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 100 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American National Insurance Co., Anico Building, Galveston, Tex.

A. Phillip Tocker, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph P. Trainor, Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United States Sugar Industry Information Service, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. Dick Vander Woude, 10400 West Higgins Road, Des Plaines, Ill.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. F. Waldrop, Jr., 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard Warden, 1823 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1823 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryan K. Whitehead, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Pierre, So. Dak.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Gerald L. Wykoff, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Embassy of the Government of the Republic of Korea, 2320 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

*The 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 1971:

(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:

- (1) "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".)
- (2) "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:
 - (1) 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.
 - (2) 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 left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.
2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.
3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes anything of value. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of \$500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of \$500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to \$500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. \$.....Dues and assessments
2. \$.....Gifts of money or anything of value
3. \$.....Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. \$.....Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. \$.....Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. \$.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. \$.....Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. \$.....TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

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

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

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. Sothoron Kirby Able, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$125.
- A. Clarence G. Adamy.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500.
- A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$27,977.07. E. (9) \$27,977.07.
- A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Washington, D.C.
- A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 55 School St. SW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,247.03. E. (9) \$4,247.03.
- A. George Alderson, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42 Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,000.
- A. John R. Ale, American Life Convention, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$102.73. E. (9) \$50.49.
- A. Willis W. Alexander, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. Mrs. Donne Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,437.36. E. (9) \$1,437.36.
- A. Kenneth D. Allen, Assistant Washington Counsel, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$124.20. E. (9) \$26.70.
- A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$9.10.
- A. All-Industry Committee for Radio All-Channel Legislation, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,309. E. (9) \$3,375.28.
- A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$8,361.58.
- A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,370.93. E. (9) \$5,370.93.
- A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$200.
- A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,904.45. E. (9) \$2,904.45.
- A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$46,554. E. (9) \$46,554.
- A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$50,604.69.
- A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$124,944.67. E. (9) \$2,102.29.
- A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2692.30. E. (9) \$2532.50.
- 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) \$2,150. E. (9) \$2,150.
- A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$16,452.88. E. (9) \$16,452.88.
- A. American Israeli Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1738.17. E. (9) \$1086.35.
- A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) \$2. E. (9) \$2.
- A. American Labor and Industry for the SST, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$86,714.55. E. (9) \$30,973.94.
- A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$2,285.22.
- A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$31,914.09.
- A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$2,510.
- A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1540 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) \$1,320.48.
- A. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Box 605, 117 West Third Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$3,853.13. E. (9) \$3,853.13.
- A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,681.24. E. (9) \$3,307.33.
- A. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$18,165. E. (9) \$5,646.
- A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$5,660.19.
- A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,120.68. E. (9) \$3,420.10.
- A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$85.09.
- A. American Taxpayers Association, 501 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. American Textile Machinery Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$350.24.
- A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$13,267.91. E. (9) \$13,267.91.
- A. American Trucking Associations, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$19,427.99.
- A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$165.
- A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,081.40. E. (9) \$4,081.40.
- A. Edward T. Anderson, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,431.82. E. (9) \$117.25.
- A. John Anderson, 4111 Franconia Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 2007 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$452.73.
- A. William C. Anderson, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,063. E. (9) \$73.83.
- 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, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, Natl. Capt. Div. 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- 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. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insurance & Securities Inc., 100 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) \$5.65.

A. Associated Dairymen, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,050.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.

A. Association for Broadcast-Engineering Standards, Inc., 1130 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,011.74. E. (9) \$4,011.74.

A. Association of Civilian Technicians Inc., 916 College Parkway, Rockville, Md.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$2,081.31.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.

E. (9) \$792.77.

A. William S. Aud, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$51.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard W. Averill, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Wina, Minn.

D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$301.

A. Gary D. Avery, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$40. E. (9) \$7.25.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association for Broadcast-Engineering Standards, Inc., 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Bagwell, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. James F. Bailey, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,250.00. E. (9) \$534.52.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Manager, Washington Office, General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 W. Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Thomas H. Barksdale, Jr., 1435 Waggoner Circle, McLean, Va.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1500.00. E. (9) \$300.

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., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$796.25. E. (9) \$10.47.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the U.S. and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) \$3,600.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Ore.

B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Court House, Roseburg, Ore.

D. (6) \$1,200.00.

A. A. David Baumhart, Post Office Box 553, Lorain, Ohio.

B. Green Olive Trade Association, 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$350.00. E. (9) \$33.86.

A. Mrs. Dita Davis Beard, ITT Building, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., ITT Building, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$1,735.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,374.99. E. (9) \$89.62.

A. James F. Bell, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,187.50. E. (9) \$124.43.

A. Reed A. Benson, The John Birch Society, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The John Birch Society, Incorporated, 295 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. George Bursach, American Society of Bank Directors, National Press Building, Room 1307 Washington, D.C.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Austrian Trade Delegate in the United States, 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Meat Products Group, American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$5,000.00

A. Robert L. Bevan, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$98.38.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,560. E. (9) \$397.75.

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. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, c/o William A. Geoghegan, Esquire, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$722.22. E. (9) \$219.20.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman & 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.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, Bogan & Freeland, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Co. Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert T. Borth, 3427 South Leisure World Boulevard, Silver Spring, Md.

B. General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$260.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$356.25. E. (9) \$20.21.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert D. Bourland, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,008.15.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Wayne W. Bradley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,248.13. E. (9) \$664.04.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, The Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

D. (6) \$62.50. E. (9) \$4.

A. Wally Briscoe.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$135. E. (9) \$16.50.

A. David A. Brody, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 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. Michael D. Bromberg, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Public Utilities Corp., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) \$7.54.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cominco American Inc., West 818 Riverside, Spokane, Wash.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$5.08.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ebasco Industries.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Housing Producers, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman, Drew & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Franchise Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of CPA's, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Anne Bryant, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Holmes/Harmon Corp., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Anne Bryant, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Commerce Corp., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., National Cotton Council, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$10. E. (9) \$51.22.

A. Richard L. Bullock, National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Building Manufacturers.

D. (6) \$300.

A. David A. Bunn, Consultant, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hearst Corp., 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,200.

A. David A. Bunn, Parcel Post Association, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Parcel Post Association.

E. (9) \$700.

A. George J. Burger.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,250.03.

E. (9) \$1,820.57.

A. George J. Burger.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$699.60. E. (9) \$926.12.

A. George B. Burnham, 120 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$80. E. (9) \$80.

A. George Burnham IV, United States Steel Corp., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$234. E. (9) \$435.

A. Charles S. Burns, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$975. E. (9) \$196.87.

A. David Burpee, Seed Grower, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

E. (9) \$291.28.

A. Burwell, Hansen & McCandless, 700 Federal Bar Building West, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$141.68.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$120. E. (9) \$700.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1106, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Company, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Charles S. Caldwell, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,400. E. (9) \$476.76

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$1,100.

A. Donald L. Calvin, New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,000.00.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$49.22.

A. Charles Argyll Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$241.95.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Kirlin, Campbell & Keating, Room 505, The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 Saint Mary Avenue, London, E.C. 3, England et al.

D. (6) \$11,241.15. E. (9) \$828.81.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norval E. Carey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$375.

A. C. Sargent Carleton, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Audio-Visual Association.

D. (6) \$1,346.

A. Philip Carlip.

B. National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, District 2, 650 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Philip Carlip.

B. Seafarers International Union, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$2,239.13.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.

E. (9) \$1,208.28.

A. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, Raleigh Building, Raleigh, N.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,666.67. E. (9) \$177.88.

A. Albert A. Carretta, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Work Glove Manufacturers Association, 1604 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,705.92.

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. 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., The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$42.05.

A. J. M. Chambers & Co., Inc., 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Cordage Institute, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$197.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Post Office Box 445, Mbabane, Swaziland.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$1,329.78.

A. James W. Chapman, Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,250.

A. William C. Chapman, Industry-Government Relations, GMC, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$3,000.00. E. (9) \$2,421.23.

A. Leslie Cheek III, American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$250.00.

A. Mr. A. H. Chesser, United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Transportation Union, 400 First NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$250.00.

A. Lowell T. Christison, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Box 605, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$131.38. E. (9) \$63.85.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50.00. E. (9) \$3.55.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$40,157.90.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, Shipbuilders Council of America, 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) \$24.48.

A. Mr. Robert M. Clark, The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$100.00.

A. Jacob Clayman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$562.90. E. (9) \$562.90.

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. Aceitunas de Mesa, S.A., Rosario, 10, Seville, Spain.
D. (6) \$1,000.00.

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) \$900. E. (9) \$400.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1-7 O'Connell Street, Sydney, Australia.

A. William T. Cleary, 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. Walter S. Clement, 915 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 8 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$210.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Brands, Inc., 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Liggett & Myers, Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lorillard, Division of Loew's Theatres, Inc., 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris Inc., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.
E. (9) \$45.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$180. E. (9) \$39.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CNA Insurance, 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

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.
D. (6) \$15,000. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Coalition Against the SST, 235 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$800.

A. Mr. Jeffrey Cohelan, Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Colihan, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$600.00.

A. William J. Colley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,248.13. E. (9) \$759.99.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$475.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$100.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., 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 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, c/o Carpenter Technology Corp., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$525.

A. Paul G. Collins, The Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 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. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$725. E. (9) \$1,825.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, c/o P. W. K. Sweet, Jr., 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$600.

A. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,022.51. E. (9) \$5,208.97.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$116,000. E. (9) \$6,234.43.

A. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,189,886.19. E. (9) \$201,949.14.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Academy of Actuaries, 208 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$167.50.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, 1285 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$200.

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. \$87.78.

A. James T. Conner, the Madison Building, 1155-15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Associations.
D. (6) \$1,440.00. E. (9) \$163.15.

A. John A. Connor, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,250.00. E. (9) \$361.22.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Miss Eileen D. Cooke, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$95.96.

A. Harry N. Cook, 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 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,248.13. E. (9) \$714.59.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.

D. (6) \$4,500.00.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 S. Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.

B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H.

D. (6) \$3,750.00. E. (9) \$677.67.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Forest Industries, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, Canada.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$10.62.

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) \$15.

A. Darrell Coover, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$387.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lilly Endowment, Inc., 914 Merchant Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, c/o P.W.K. Sweet, 50 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James T. Corcoran, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$825. E. (9) \$75.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.

D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$31.50.

A. Council for a Livable World, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$943.56. E. (9) \$943.56.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Adhesive & Sealant Council, 1410 Higgins 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 5th 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, 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 Beach, 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. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Optical Manufacturers Association, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Raymond L. Courage.

B. International Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Makers of Explosives, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$35.10.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. MGIC Investment Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis.

D. (6) \$2,000.00.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Glaverbel Inc., 75 Plandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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 and Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Jay Creswell, Sr., Universal Exchange, 602 South Summerlie Avenue, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) \$998.86.

A. Francis D. Cronin, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

A. H. C. Crotty, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Crowell, Collier & MacMillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,999.99. E. (9) \$3,189.97.

A. John C. Datt, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,313. E. (9) \$34.01.

A. John B. Davenport, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$193.50.

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) \$178.89.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$90.31.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. Myron Stratton Home, Post Office Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo.

D. (6) \$3,329.01. E. (9) \$221.66.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$105.79.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$553.54.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$553.54.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

- B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,241.98. E. (9) \$104.79.
- A. Fred E. Davis, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$150.
- A. R. Hilton Davis, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- 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) \$3,424.67.
- A. Charles W. Day, Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) \$630. E. (9) \$39.
- A. George P. Delaney, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y.
- 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) \$5,232.50. E. (9) \$310.80.
- A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900.
- A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,000.
- A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Soybean Association, Hudson, Iowa.
D. (6) \$9,000.
- A. C. H. DeVaney, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,063. E. (9) \$17.83.
- A. R. Daniel Devlin, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$230.00. E. (9) \$230.00.
- A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,812.50. E. (9) \$1,266.89.
- A. George S. Dietrich, Association for Broadcast-Engineering Standards, Inc., 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Association for Broadcast-Engineering Standards, Inc., 1130 17th 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) \$2,383. E. (9) \$223.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Post Office 15830, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,588.57. E. (9) \$38.57.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.
D. (6) \$809. E. (9) \$9.
- A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) \$27,874.63. E. (9) \$27,874.63.
- A. Discover America Travel Organizations, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$39,746.18. E. (9) \$682.50.
- A. Joseph DiStefano, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, Allied and Technical Workers of the United States and Canada, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,884.78.
- A. James F. Doherty.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$7,875. E. (9) \$1,006.76.
- A. Robert C. Dolan, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$180. E. (9) \$165.66.
- A. C. L. Dorson, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Employees of the U.S. Government, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,443.80. E. (9) \$240.
- A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, David R. Bradley, News Press & Gazette Co., 9th and Edmond Streets, St. Joseph, Mo.
- A. F. Raymond Downs, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- A. Harry J. Doyle, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Post Office Box 605, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$264.50. E. (9) \$296.65.
- A. Franklin B. Dryden.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.00. E. (9) \$75.00.
- A. Evelyn Dubrow, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,445. E. (9) \$2,328.48.
- A. M. L. DuMars, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$60.
- A. J. D. Durand.
B. Association of Oil Pipelines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$340.
- A. Henry I. Dworshak.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$975.00.
- A. Roy W. Easley, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4.35. E. (9) \$2.
- A. Hallett D. Edson, N.A.U.S., 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$1,200.
- A. Macon T. Edwards, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$165. E. (9) \$30.19.
- 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) \$158.61.
- A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.
D. (6) \$3,824.50. E. (9) \$3,318.20.
- 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. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,100.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,200.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Towers Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,400.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,200.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) \$900.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 302 State Building, 217 West First Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Richard W. Emory, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

E. (9) \$61.07.

A. Grover W. Ensley.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$428.20. E. (9) \$43.

A. David G. Erskine, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. John D. Fagan, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,575. E. (9) \$33.

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) \$5,232.50. E. (9) \$208.50.

A. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$78,892.02. E. (9) \$21,536.09.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Fensterwald and Ohlhausen, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$69.85.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1500 Guinness Tower, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, Canada.

D. (6) \$7,749.99. E. (9) \$147.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto 12, Canada.

D. (6) \$999.99. E. (9) \$31.

A. Francis S. Filbey.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,452.10.

A. Thomas W. Fink, 1200 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$897. E. (9) \$22.

A. Firearms Lobby of America, 415 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12,476.26. E. (9) \$13,166.06.

A. William J. Flaherty, Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.

D. (6) \$5,625. E. (9) \$144.10.

A. Roger Fleming, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,725. E. (9) \$62.08.

A. Frank U. Fletcher, Fletcher, Heald, Rowell, Kenehan & Hildreth, 1225 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Law Firm of Fletcher, Heald, Rowell, Kenehan & Hildreth, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Raymond J. Foley.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$10.

A. Gene N. Fondren, Post Office Box 192, Taylor, Tex.

B. Texas Railroads.

D. (6) \$3,403. E. (9) \$682.51.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Burlington Northern, Inc., et al.

D. (6) \$500.

A. James W. Foristel, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,260. E. (9) \$244.61.

A. William C. Foster, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., Post Office Box 576, Bellevue, Wash.

D. (6) \$1,150. E. (9) \$73.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John G. Fox, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$133.32.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Cental Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

D. (6) \$74.50. E. (9) \$58.60.

A. R. Frank Frazier.

B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Robert M. Frederick, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. James O. Freeman, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$31.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$6.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$30,854. E. (9) \$11,767.

A. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$5,000.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$536.45.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$418.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Anchor Corp., et al.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Royal Crown Cola Co., Columbus, Ga.

A. James E. Gaffigan, American Hotel & Motel Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$100.

A. William B. Gardiner, Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.

D. (6) \$4,875. E. (9) \$178.20.

A. John W. Gardner, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,391.98.

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, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

A. Walter Gerson.

B. National Association of Plumbing, Heating, Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,125. E. (9) \$425.

A. William T. Gibb, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$118.04. E. (9) \$7.50.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Vance M. Gilmer, Shell Oil Co., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shell Oil Co., Shell Plaza, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Tennessee Railroad Association, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Glassie, Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson, William B. Beebe, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5. E. (9) \$3.27.

A. Henry H. Glassie, Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson, and William B. Beebe, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$51.34.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$591.75. E. (9) \$591.75.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J.

D. (6) \$77. E. (9) \$6.

A. Vance V. Goodfellow, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$5,325.48.

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) \$243.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 495 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Government Employes Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12,495.91. E. (9) \$5,949.20.

A. Donald E. Graham.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cornelius R. Gray.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Gray, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert K. Gray, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$85.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$236.25. E. (9) \$57.55.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, Union Pacific Railroad, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

E. (9) \$738.44.

A. Dale Greenwood.

B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

E. (9) \$507.93.

A. William G. Grief, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bristol-Myers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Evaporated Milk Association, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Griner.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$9,951.90. E. (9) \$2,671.47.

A. Grootemaat, Cook & Franke, 660 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

B. Marshall & Isley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$9,781.76.

A. James J. Gudinas.

B. Highway Department, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jerome R. Gulan, National Federation of Independent Business.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$300.

A. Robert J. Habenicht, 1400 South Joyce Street, Arlington, Va.

B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va.

D. (6) \$300.00. 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) \$78.12.

A. Matthew Hale, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$100.

A. Harold T. Halpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, General Motors Corp., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$1,949.75.

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, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,750. E. (9) \$106.89.

A. Morton H. Halperin, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,225. E. (9) \$26.75.

A. Thomas A. Halsted, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Council for a Livable World, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,310.46.

A. Judith A. Hamburg, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, One No. 13th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ida Cason Callaway Foundation, Pine Mountain, Ga.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor Law Study Committee, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$200.

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. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 79 W. Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$20.

A. Robert N. Hampton, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$953.75. E. (9) \$30.30.

A. Edward F. Harding, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$204. E. (9) \$354.98.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.

B. California Savings & Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,800.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$352.46.

A. Mr. Andrew E. Hare, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$7.50.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$80.50. E. (9) \$80.50.

A. Mrs. Mildred B. Harman, National Women's Christian Temperance Union, Warner Building, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$825. E. (9) \$400.15.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., American Life Convention, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$560. E. (9) \$35.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Harper, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (6) \$120. E. (9) \$439.25.

A. Dennis E. Hart, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$996. E. (9) \$19.90.

A. Rita M. Hartz, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

- B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,804.80.
- A. Clifford J. Harvison, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Lewis B. Hastings, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$500.
- A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$338.09.
- 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) \$120.
- 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) \$490.88. E. (9) \$49.45.
- A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$81.93.
- A. Hays & Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
- 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) \$57.75.
- A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,840.33. E. (9) \$4,840.33.
- A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$1,351.82.
- A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Association, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$800.
- A. Walter G. Held, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, 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.
D. (6) \$528.
- A. Leslie P. Henry, President, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$747.71.
- A. Richard I. Hersh, Box 1333, Syracuse, N.Y.
B. Agway Inc., Box 1333, Syracuse, N.Y.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$455.51.
- A. The Hertz Corp., 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$165.98.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 410 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, et al., Westfield, Mass., Redfield Gunsight, Denver, Colo., Browning Arms Co., Morgan, Utah.
D. (6) \$11,416.50. E. (9) \$68.25.
- A. Andrew I. Hickey, Jr., Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,012.50. E. (9) \$276.65.
- A. Iowa Railway Association, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Association, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) \$1,102.20.
- A. J. Thomas Higginbotham, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$353.35.
- A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$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) \$911.93.
- 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) \$400.
- A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$195.
- A. Leo Hochstetter.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
- B. Committee of European National Shipowners Association, 30/32 St. Mary Avenue, London, E.C.3, England.
D. (6) \$2,500.
- A. Mr. Lee B. Holmes, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$6,195.
- A. John W. Holton, American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,750.00.
- A. Edwin M. Hood, Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Thomas B. House.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.
- A. C. T. Hoversten, 209 West 53d Street, Western Springs, Ill.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Bedford Park, Argo, Ill.
D. (6) \$200.
- A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C.
B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.
- A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C.
B. Allstate Insurance Cos., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.
- A. Charles L. Huber, Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$1,638.25.
- A. Edward W. Hummers, Jr., Fletcher, Heald, Rowell, Kenahan & Hildreth, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Richard M. Hunt, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$120.
- A. James L. Huntley, Active Ballot Club Department, Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,176.90. E. (9) \$1,230.46.
- A. Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Bernard J. Imming, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$312.50. E. (9) \$9.52.

- A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,421.35. E. (9) \$6,631.35.
- A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$8,579.72.
- A. International Brotherhood of Painters & Allied Trades, 217 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.
D. (6) \$5,090.15. E. (9) \$4,182.
- A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$14,882.89.
- A. International Union of District 50, Allied & Technical Workers of the United States and Canada.
E. (9) \$4,884.78.
- A. Investment Co. Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$375.
- A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$15,771.09. E. (9) \$6,985.22.
- A. William E. Isaeff, American Automobile Association, 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 N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Reinsurance Association of America, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500.00. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Charles E. Jackson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert C. Jackson, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$2,750.00. E. (9) \$181.44.
- 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. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) \$200.
- A. Daniel Jaspán, National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$8,161.01. E. (9) \$74.16.
- A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) \$500.00.
- A. H. Bradley Johnson.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$825.
- A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkeley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkeley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Spencer A. Johnson, National Home Furnishings Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$150.
- A. Herbert Jolovitz.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$19.
- A. Charlie W. Jones, Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Man-Man Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. H. Daniel Jones III, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$85. E. (9) \$5.
- A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$18.12.
- A. Dr. Oliver H. Jones, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$10,916.
- A. Phillip E. Jones, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$63.75.
- A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 737 Woodward Building, 733 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Centro Azucarero Paraguayo Independencia Nacional, 541 Asuncion, Paraguay.
- A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 737 Woodward Building, 733 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Born Corp., 3421 North Central Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Gerald M. Katz, Esq., 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.
E. (9) \$61.07.
- A. Carleton R. Kear, Jr., Retired Officer Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$787.50.
- A. Capt. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grain & Feed Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$140.
- A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$300.
- A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$275.
- A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2130, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (A Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$12.06.
- A. Patricia Keefer, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,550. E. (9) \$63.50.
- A. Patricia J. Keefer, Youth Franchise Coalition, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Youth Franchise Coalition, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Harold V. Kelly.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. John T. Kelly.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. George Kelm, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Myron Stratton Home, Post Office Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo.
D. (6) \$3,329.01. E. (9) \$221.66.
- A. R. G. Kendall, Jr., Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) \$215. E. (9) \$362.40.
- A. Edward F. Kenahan, Fletcher, Heald, Rowell, Kenahan & Hildreth, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., 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.
- A. Harold L. Kennedy, Marathon Oil Co., 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Company, Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) \$190.85.
- A. Jeremiah J. Kenney, Jr., Union Carbide Corp., 77 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$112.25.
- A. Thomas F. Kerester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$875. 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) \$347.10. E. (9) \$16.11.
- A. Charles L. King, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$90.

A. Joseph T. King, 3600 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Counsel for Associated Equipment Distributors.

D. (6) Approximately \$20,000 to \$25,000 per year. E. (9) \$1,322.61.

A. John M. Kinnaird.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$858.59.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz, Masters & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$71.70.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton St., Allentown, Pa.

D. (6) \$549.90. E. (9) \$489.02.

A. James D. Kittelton, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$575.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.

B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 409 LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$82.14.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,400. E. (9) \$408.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

A. Phillip M. Knox, Jr., 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$31.25.

A. William L. Kohler, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 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) \$1,215.93.

A. Horace R. Kornegay, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$175.00

A. Kenneth S. Kovack, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$4,071.50. E. (9) \$711.32.

A. Howard R. Koven and Abe Fortas, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,500.00 E. (9) \$250.00.

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) \$170.

A. Miss Germaine Krettek, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$726.20.

A. Krooth & Altman, Attorneys, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$3,000.

A. William J. Kuhfuss, American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$938.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, Aerospace Industries Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,072. E. (9) \$932.45.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL-CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$12,064.96.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$11,419.85. E. (9) \$9,043.96.

A. John P. Lagomarcino, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$220.33.

A. A. M. Lampley, United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$150.

A. Asger F. Langlykke, 1913 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society for Microbiology, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert Lannon, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,730.73. E. (9) \$496.77.

A. William George Lunsford, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$207.

A. James J. LaPenta, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$397.63.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, Public Relations & Civic Activities District of Columbia Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 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, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Box 605, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$711.60. E. (9) \$507.60.

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. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$340. E. (9) \$528.

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, Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$10,999.98.

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) \$10,941.25. E. (9) \$224.77.

A. Morris J. Levin, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. J. Stanley Lewis, National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,606.92.

A. Herbert Liebenson, National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., 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) \$4,304.50. E. (9) \$4,304.50.

A. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.

B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, Active Ballot Club Department, Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,176.90. E. (9) \$1,618.92.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$288.75. E. (9) \$159.24.

A. Philip J. Loree, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Lovett, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$200.

A. Harold O. Lovre, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 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) \$260.75

A. Otto Lowe, 888 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$350.

A. Wilbur C. Lowrey, Shell Oil Co., 1700 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shell Oil Co., 1 Shell Plaza, Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) \$500.

A. William R. Lucas, Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.

B. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) \$210.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Menswear Retailers of America, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. James H. Lynch, American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,194.40. E. (9) \$229.57.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) \$826.77.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va.

B. Printing Industries of America, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$1,375.

A. Ian MacGowan, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$102.

A. Ian MacGowan.

B. Youth Franchise Coalition, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. MacKenzie, Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. John A. McCart.

B. Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,641.95.

A. Jack F. McCarthy, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Utilities, Inc., 2330 Johnson Drive, Shawnee Mission, Kans.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cities Service Company, 60 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Resources & Chemical Corp., 2125 Tenneco Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) \$5,000.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobil Oil Corporation, 150 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf & Western Industries, Inc., One Gulf & Western Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John L. McConnell, New York Stock Exchange, 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. E. L. McCulloch, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 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, American Hotel & Motel Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$100.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$475.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.

B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) \$243.38.

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 McLaughlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$7,080.

A. Myles F. McGrail, 408 Executive Building, 15th and L Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.

A. Marshall C. McGrath, New York, N.Y.

B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$560. E. (9) \$140.20.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 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) \$5,232.50.

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.
D. (6) \$1,313. E. (9) \$11.75.

A. Graham N. McKelvey, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$88.

A. William F. McKenna, National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50.

A. Marvin L. McLain, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,125. E. (9) \$43.20.

A. Mrs. Teresa D. McLaughlin, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$4,352.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$150.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Company, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$385.

A. C. W. McMillan, National Press Building, 14th & F Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1540 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Ralph J. McNair, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$238.82. E. (9) \$16.56.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$428.30.

- A. McNutt, Dudley & Easterwood, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Dredging Co. et al., 12 S. 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 D. (6) \$5,150. E. (9) \$908.38.
- A. James E. Mack, National Confectioners Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$1,072.76.
- A. H. E. Mahlman, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Optometric Association c/o M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Post Office Box 605, Winona, Minn.
 D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$76.55.
- A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Andre Maisonnier, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$1,340.
- A. William J. Malatesta, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$750.
- A. Mike Manatos, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 D. (6) \$86.33. E. (9) \$86.33.
- A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$3,000.
- A. John V. Maraney, National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
- A. John V. Maraney, National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
- A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
- A. Ralph J. Marlatt, 640 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$6,015.60.
- 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) \$114. E. (9) \$4.
- A. Marshall & Isley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
 D. (6) \$176. E. (9) \$26.44.
- A. J. Paull Marshall, Association of American Railroads, 300 New Jersey Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$105.49. E. (9) \$62.58.
- A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$110.
- A. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.
 E. (9) \$61.07.
- A. Mike M. Masaoka, Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 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, Japanese American Citizens League, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Japanese American Citizens 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, P.O. Box 848, Nogales, Ariz.
 D. (6) \$500.
- A. Guy B. Maseritz, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, N.Y.
- A. Paul J. Mason, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$59.46. E. (9) \$5.02.
- A. Walter J. Mason.
 B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,076.84. E. (9) \$220.
- A. P. H. Mathews, Association of American Railroads, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$379.85. E. (9) \$308.95.
- 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) \$580. E. (9) \$549.24.
- A. Charles E. Mattingly, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
 D. (6) \$3,954. E. (9) \$124.40.
- A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.
- A. Albert E. May.
 B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- D. (6) \$82.50. E. (9) \$4.20.
- A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 N. Sheridan Road., Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$5,420. E. (9) \$240.
- 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) \$3,000. E. (9) \$400.
- A. George G. Mead, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
 B. The National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$853.04.
- A. 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) \$5,232.50. E. (9) \$474.02.
- A. R. Otto Meletzke, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$60. E. (9) \$2.47.
- A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
 B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$6,871.01. E. (9) \$139.60.
- A. Mr. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$664.26.
- A. Lawrence C. Merthan, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$105.
- A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. George F. Meyer, Jr., Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$937.50.
- A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$100.
- A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE., Suite 5, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$2,200.
- A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$257.74.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) \$195.00 E. (9) \$155.40.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$262.50. E. (9) \$73.65.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) \$5,749.98. E. (9) \$748.42.

A. Hermon I. Miller, 425 13th Street, Room 1020, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

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.

B. Maytag Company, Northern Textile Association, National Parking Association.
D. (6) \$4,800. E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Falling Building, Portland, Oreg.

B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Falling Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) \$1,190.50.

A. Robert H. Miller, Tenneco Inc., 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tenneco Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$36.85.

A. Mr. Jack Mills, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc.
D. (6) \$1,000.00. E. (9) \$200.00.

A. G. Merrill Moody, Association of American Railroads, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$82.50.

A. Joseph E. Moody, Bituminous Coal Operators Association, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bituminous Coal Operators Association, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500.

A. O. William Moody, Jr., Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C.

B. Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$625.36.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ethyl Corporation, 330 South Fourth Street, Richmond, Va.

D. (6) \$187.50.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee for Civil Airlift.

A. Morison Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James M. Morris, 1660 L Street NW., Room 804, Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$952.46.

A. James G. Morton, Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) 2,500.00 E. (9) Under \$50.00.

A. Jack Moskowitz, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,600. E. (9) \$138.

A. Lynn E. Mote, Northern Natural Gas Company, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$153.

A. William G. Mullen, National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$164.28.

A. John J. Murphy, National Customs Service Association, 517 Shoreham Building, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Customs Service Association, 517 Shoreham Building, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard W. Murphy, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J.
D. (6) \$400.

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. Lawrence P. Mutter.

B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$724.05. E. (9) \$33.14.

A. Kenneth D. Naden.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,617.50. E. (9) \$27.50.

A. John J. Nangle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$586.

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) \$1,669.65. E. (9) \$1,669.65.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,257.38. E. (9) \$1,321.15.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.

D. (6) \$21,249.60. E. (9) \$6,467.88.

A. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1101 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,141.40. E. (9) \$1,141.40.

A. National Association of Credit Management, 475 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$68,739.75. E. (9) \$10,479.39.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$500.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$12,914.52.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. \$859,158.93. E. (9) \$32,178.63.

A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2511 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2511 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,477.10. E. (9) \$2,477.10.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,467.01. E. (9) \$7,467.01.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$35,000. E. (9) \$25,342.63.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) \$191,394.95. E. (9) \$1,501.27.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,694.15. E. (9) \$1,694.15.

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) \$525,211.65. E. (9) \$6,662.46.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$469,205.68. E. (9) \$9,820.43.

- A. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,437.36. E. (9) \$1,437.36.
- A. National Committee for an American SST, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$124,368.10. E. (9) \$115,559.83.
- A. National Committee for the Recording Arts, 10,000 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$22,730. E. (9) \$19,358.79.
- A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$5,083.37. E. (9) \$5,083.37.
- A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$16,203.19. E. (9) \$18,591.92.
- A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$681.25. E. (9) \$771.15.
- A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
- B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$722.23. E. (9) \$69.23.
- A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York City, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,500.00.
- A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$286,574.91. E. (9) \$15,406.56.
- A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920-922 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$21,436.20. E. (9) \$21,436.20.
- A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$979.12. E. (9) \$1,170.32.
- A. National Grain & Feed Association, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Grain & Feed Association.
E. (9) \$18,000.
- A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$122,266.19. E. (9) \$10,750.
- A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$234.48.
- A. National Independent Dairies Association, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$100.38.
- A. National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$870.
- A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$346,152.75. E. (9) \$926.
- A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,498.95. E. (9) \$1,498.95.
- A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
- D. (6) \$7,452.53. E. (9) \$7,452.53.
- A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$7,125.08. E. (9) \$265.08.
- A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$826.98.
- A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,130. E. (9) \$750.
- A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- 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) \$2,562.52.
- A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,782.87. E. (9) \$1,893.86.
- A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,189.
- A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$870.84. E. (9) \$870.84.
- A. National Turkey Federation, Mount Morris, Ill.
- A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street, NW., Suite 711, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,100. E. (9) \$8,811.46.
- 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) \$250.
- 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. Mr. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 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.
D. (6) \$1,519.
- 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) \$4,000. E. (9) \$304.72.
- A. Robert B. Neville, 1155 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,687.50. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Louis H. Nevins, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,656.25. E. (9) \$106.64.
- 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.
- A. Jonathan Newkirk, 245 Second Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,004.
- 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. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa.
- B. Northern Helex Company, 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) \$2,250.00. E. (9) \$673.54.
- A. Patrick J. Nilan.
- B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,712.30. E. \$417.74.
- A. Stanley D. Noble, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- 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) \$1,500.00. E. (9) \$160.37.
- A. Robert D. Nordstrom, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Norfolk & Western Railway Company, 8 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (9) \$1,161.00.
- A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. International Association of Ice Cream Mfrs. & 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 NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$650.
- A. Richard T. O'Connell.
- B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,112.50. E. (9) \$135.75.
- 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) \$148.
- A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Baldwin Piano Co., 1801 Gilbert Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$7,166.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$55.

A. John B. O'Day, CLU, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economic Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$40,981.40.

A. John A. O'Donnell, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 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, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3461.52. E. (9) \$1429.32.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Mr. Alvin E. Oliver, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Grain & Feed Association, 500 Folger Building, 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 & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York City.

D. (6) \$5,000.00.

A. Mr. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$14.50.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$151.

A. Jerry H. Opack, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & 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. J. Allen Overton, Jr., American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Norman Paige, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Michael L. Parker, 3300 Crocker Plaza, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, 300 Lakeside Drive, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,833.33. E. (9) \$2,168.67.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.

B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.

D. (6) \$6,000.

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) \$158.30.

A. Vincent J. Paterno, 916 College Parkway, Rockville, Md.

B. Association of Civilian Technicians, Inc., 916 College Parkway, Rockville, Md.

D. (6) \$1,147.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Boating Industry Association, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$7,500.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, Suite 700, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Central American Sugar Council, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$695. E. (9) \$1,866.91.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. George Consolidated, Inc., 3322 Richmond Avenue, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$6,602.91.

A. Mr. Lynn C. Paulson, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$129.15.

A. Elver T. Pearson, 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. John J. Pecoraro, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 217-19 North 6th Street, Lafayette, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,825.

A. John J. Pecoraro, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. (amended)

B. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 217-19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,825.

A. Pennzoll United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$2,525.64.

A. Mr. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 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., One Shell Plaza, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. A. J. Pessel, 2919 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$1,401.91.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,537. E. (9) \$59.80.

A. Michael Petresky, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$2,850.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$325.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,125.

A. John K. Pickens, 201 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.

B. American Nursing Home Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125.

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. E. (9) \$177.47.

A. James F. Pinkney, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 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) \$85.32.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$1,460.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.

D. (6) \$128,335. E. (9) \$1,350.

A. Frederick T. Poole, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$438. E. (9) \$15.02.

A. George G. Potts, 640 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,988.40.

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) \$375.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association for Broadcast-Engineering Standards, Inc., 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, Assistant General Counsel, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$5.10.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$570.

A. William C. Prather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$475. E. (9) \$85.00.

A. William H. Press, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$13,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Mrs. Pearl B. Price, 406 Mayrant Drive, Dallas, Tex.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. Jerry C. Pritchett, 1414 30th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mechanical Contractors Association of America, Inc., 5530 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Suite 750, Washington, D.C.

A. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$471.54. E. (9) \$471.54.

A. Earle W. Putman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, Annapolis, Md.

D. (6) \$556.25. E. (9) \$122.39.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 1, Box 199, Annapolis, Md.

B. Associated Retail Bakers of America, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Joseph E. Quin, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Cancer Society et al., New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$11,916.66. E. (9) \$10,323.21.

A. Thomas H. Quinn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$862.17. E. (9) \$128.58.

A. James H. Rademacher, National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,787.60.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$396.16.

A. Raymond Raedy, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$20.63. E. (9) \$7.25.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$450.

A. G. J. Rauschenbach.

B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$710.

A. William W. Rayner, 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

B. Crowell, Collier, and MacMillan, Inc., 1701 N. Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.

B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.

D. (6) \$150.

A. David J. Reedy, 1517 Virginia Street, Downers Grove, Ill.

B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Bedford Park, Argo, Ill.

D. (5) \$1,400.

A. John T. Reggitts, Jr., 95 Boonton Avenue, R.D. 2, Boonton, N.J.

B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, et al., New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$25 estimate.

A. Delos W. Rentzel, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill.

A. William M. Requa, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (4) \$422.11.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,975.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Warner Building, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$293.70. E. (9) \$10,680.42.

A. William L. Reynolds, National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$50.

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, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,379.84. E. (9) \$14.10.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

D. (6) \$32.20. E. (9) \$71.20.

A. Richard N. Rigby, Jr., 1900 L Street NW., Suite 301, Washington, D.C.

B. National Oceanography Association, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 301, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$400.

A. Miss Rebekah Rivers, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$42.75.

A. William Neale Roach.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Roberts & Holland, 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. Trustees of the Bernice P. Bishop Estate, 419 Halekauwila Street, P.O. Box 3466, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. William S. Roberts, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$75.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$185.

A. John P. Roche, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Iron and Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$210.

A. James A. Rock, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$191. E. (9) \$3.15.

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. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$656.25.

A. Mr. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 700, 1801 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, Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. William E. Rollow, Esq., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retained by The National Skeet Shooting Association.

A. Michael J. Romig, American Insurance Association, 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. Arthur J. Rothkopf, Arnold C. Johnson, and Jerome N. Sonosky, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Commercial Credit Co., Baltimore, Md.

E. (9) \$20.64.

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, American Life Convention, 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 Deltona Corp., 3250 SW 3rd Avenue, Miami, Fla.

D. (6) \$5,240. E. (9) \$125.84.

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) \$531.25. E. (9) \$14.61.

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) \$749.84.

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.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Stanley H. Ruttenberg, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Stanley H. Ruttenberg & Associates, Inc., 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$25.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,500.00. E. (9) \$896.38.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.

B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$651.09.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, et al., San Francisco.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum, Frohlich & Taylor, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson Street, Muncie, Ind.

D. (6) \$510. E. (9) \$17.28.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum, Frohlich & Taylor, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson Street, Muncie, Ind.

D. (6) \$510. E. (9) \$17.28.

A. Carl K. Sadler, American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,970.70. E. (9) \$7,320.85.

A. Raymond L. Schafer, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

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.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

E. (9) \$61.07.

A. A. Cleve Schneeberger, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill.

D. (6) \$105. E. (9) \$20.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, Washington Office, Independent Bankers Association of America, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.

D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$3,326.08.

A. John W. Scott, Master of the National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Jefferson Pilot Corp., Post Office Box 21008, Greensboro, N.C.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Realty Committee on Taxation, 299 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$13,783.30.

A. Durward Seals, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$218.75. E. (9) \$28.09.

A. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich.

B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, et al.

E. (9) \$171.46.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$121.66.

A. Leo Seybold, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$331.57.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pfizer, Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$335.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Doubleday & Company, Inc., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Sheehan, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$5,464. E. (9) \$1,818.70.

A. Dale Sherwin, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Robert H. Shields, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Max Shine, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$992.50. E. (9) \$20.

A. A. Z. Shows, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Avionics Communication Systems Inc., 5252 Fort Royal Road, Springfield, Va.

D. (6) \$2,650. E. (9) \$649.51.

A. David Silver, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Six Agency Committee, 217 West First Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$15,460. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Carstens Slack, Phillips Petroleum Company, 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, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$22.50.
- A. Smathers & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Horse Council, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$577.50.
- A. Smathers & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$15,000. E. (9) \$147.
- A. Donald E. Smiley, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$487.42.
- A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- 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) \$116.26.
- A. Milan D. Smith, National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$712.50.
- A. Robert William Smith, Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) \$70. E. (9) \$46.49.
- A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2611 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
- A. Wayne H. Smithey, Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,950. E. (9) \$782.70.
- A. Lyle O. Snader, Association of American Railroads, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$123.27. E. (9) \$99.
- A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) \$550. E. (9) \$926.12.
- 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) \$1,726.
- A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$11,855.64. E. (9) \$6,034.76.
- A. Carl A. Soderblom, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$478.49.
- A. James M. Souby, Jr., 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$150.
- A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,245.69. E. (9) \$2.98.
- A. Frank J. Specht, 1725 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 888 7th Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- 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) \$500. E. (9) \$5,068.
- 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) \$100.
- 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., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$675.
- A. Melvin L. Stark, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$350.
- A. David J. Steinberg, 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. Steinhart, Goldberg, Feigenbaum & Ladar, Crocker Plaza, 34th Floor, Montgomery at Post, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center, Calif.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$89.23.
- A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Green Olive Trade Association, Inc., 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500.
- 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) \$60. E. (9) \$2.
- A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$141.75.
- A. Travis B. Stewart, Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$300.
- A. Richard H. Stock, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
- A. Francis W. Stover, National Legislative Service, V.F.W. 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars.
D. (6) \$5,724.50. E. (9) \$601.88.
- A. William M. Stover.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$925. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Herald E. Stringer, The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$5,610. E. (9) \$693.91.
- A. John D. Stringer, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$1,230.
- A. John D. Stringer, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. (amended).
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$1,170.
- A. Norman Strunk, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$301.07.
- A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.
- A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$257.33.
- A. G. Don Sullivan, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 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.
D. (6) \$2,225. E. (9) \$650.
- A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Irving W. Swanson, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.
- A. David A. Sweeney, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,124.50.
- A. John R. Sweeney, Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., Bethlehem, Pa.
D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$213.15.
- A. Charles P. Taft, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.
- A. Rev. Charles C. Talley, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va.,
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$138.50.
- A. Roy W. Terwilliger, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Peter E. Terzick, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$975. E. (9) \$772.45.
- A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 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, Tenneco Inc., 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
- A. William D. Thompson, Industry-Government Relations, GMC, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,994.28.
- A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1055 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Mfrs. & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,519.
- 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) \$135.63.
- A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$580. E. (9) \$546.78.
- A. John P. Tracey, American Bar Association.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$50.
- A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$61.13.
- A. Matt Triggs, American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,406. E. (9) \$55.80.
- 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 and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$5,250. E. (9) \$22.90.
- A. James R. Turnbull.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$278.43.
- 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.
- A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$456. E. (9) \$146.68.
- A. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$11,076.25.
- A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 66 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$2,319.53.
- A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$794,402.97. E. (9) \$65,012.57.
- A. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,938.22. E. (9) \$1,938.22.
- A. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$23,319.20.
- A. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$36,480.49.
- A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,894.63.
- A. John A. Vance, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,152.50. E. (9) \$924.29.
- A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1224 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hertz Corp., 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$165.98.
- A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.
E. (9) \$61.07.
- A. Richard E. Vernor, American Life Convention, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,330. E. (9) \$117.
- 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) \$115.
- A. Donn L. Waage, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank, Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$120. E. (9) \$57.75.
- A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$207.69. E. (9) \$23.03.
- A. Jack A. Waller, International Association of Fire Fighters, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,375.
- A. Thomas G. Walters, National Association of Retired Federal Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Federal Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,884.80. E. (9) \$2,235.20.
- 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.
E. (9) \$350.
- A. Alan M. Warren, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$127.66.
- 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) \$450. E. (9) \$340.
- 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) \$850.

A. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1823 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$2,518.26.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr., Washington, D.C.

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) \$8,769.20.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Terrell M. Wertz, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$3,495. E. (9) \$97.40.

A. Westbay Associates, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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.

A. Clyde A. Wheeler, Jr., Federal Bar Building, West, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sun Oil Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) \$1,575.

A. John L. Wheeler, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wheeler, Van Sickle, Day & Anderson, 25 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.

B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

D. (6) \$176. E. (9) \$26.44.

A. Ed White, Western Railroad Association, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John S. White, Marathon Oil Co., 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

E. (9) \$227.24.

A. Robert L. White, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 910 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., 910 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) not in excess of \$500. E. (9) not in excess of \$150.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,499.62. E. (9) \$7,092.51.

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 Courier Corp., 2 Nevada Drive, Lake Success, N.Y.

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) \$532.06.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

E. (9) \$118.02.

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) \$52.41.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

E. (9) \$11.82.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. College Placement Council, Inc., 65 East Elizabeth Street, Bethlehem, Pa.

E. (9) \$15.70.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Computer Time Sharing Services Section of The Association of Data Processing Service Organizations, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$93.29.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

E. (9) \$306.59.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Pierre Agency, Pierre, S. Dak.

E. (9) \$4.32.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Estate of Albert W. Small, care of Mrs. Albert W. Small, 5803 Green Tree Road, Bethesda, Md.

E. (9) \$3.90.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hoopa Valley Tribe, Post Office Box 817, Hoopa, Calif.

E. (9) \$17.63.

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) \$79.11.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Law Schools, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$79.11.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinaliet Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

E. (9) \$53.81.

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) \$130.71.

A. Francis G. Williams.

B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100.

A. J. D. Williams, Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. D. Williams, Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council for Health Care Services, 363 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Williamson, Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 E. Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$167.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Express Co., 65 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$720. E. (9) \$4.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$1,836.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Jonathan Development Corporation, Post Office Box 68, Chaska, Minn.

D. (6) \$480.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. J. P. Morgan & Co. Inc., 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Oil Investment Institute, One Greenwich Plaza, Greenwich, Conn.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La.

B. Pennzoil United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$83.75.

A. R. J. Winchester, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.

B. Pennzoil United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$341.89.

A. Richard F. Witherall, Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Bldg., Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Bldg., Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$725. E. (9) \$1,825.

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.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,705.60. E. (9) \$877.02.

A. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1 North 13th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$30,425.84. E. (9) \$10,233.76.

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$150.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Signal Companies, Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Perry W. Woofler, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$309.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Asociacion, Nacional De Cultivadores 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 & Television Producers, 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$50.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. City of Palm Springs, 3200 Tahquitz-McCallum Way, Palm Springs, Calif.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Copyright Owners Negotiating Committee, c/o Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin, Krim & Ballon, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Unionamerica, Inc., 435 S. Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

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) \$200. E. (9) \$90.49.

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) \$5,412.50. E. (9) \$369.04.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Charge Account Bankers Association, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$225.

A. Albert H. Zinkand, Getty Oil Co., Manager Washington Office, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Getty Oil Co.

A. John L. Zorack, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$411.01.

A. Charles O. Zuver, The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$271.35.

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 1971 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$2,500.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,833.33. E. (9) \$6,212.16.

A. Paul W. Airey, Air Force Sergeants Association Inc., 4517 Sunset Drive, Panama City, Fla.

B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Frederick K. Alderson, 40 Fort Williams Parkway, Alexandria, Va.

B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$1,800.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$787.50. E. (9) \$110.29.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$7,325.83.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,043.99. E. (9) \$6,043.99.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,641.14. E. (9) \$2,641.14.

A. American Education Lobby, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$131.35. E. (9) \$339.17.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$27,292.06. E. (9) \$27,292.06.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$2,898.29.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

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. Robert E. Ansheles, Suite 718, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CITC Industries, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$925. E. (9) \$778.68.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Conwood Corp., 701 North Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$1,920. E. (9) \$31.24.

A. Australian Trade Council, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$7,425.

A. Gary D. Avery, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$120. E. (9) \$45.

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. Eml F. Baker, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 1st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,600.

A. Robert W. Barrie, 8012 Cindy Lane, Bethesda, Md.

B. General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$782. E. (9) \$343.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Ore.

B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Court House, Roseburg, Ore.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 4000 Massachusetts 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, Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,050.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$1,084.13. E. (9) \$251.69.

A. John H. Beldler, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$251.81.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Austrian Trade Delegate in the United States, 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$202.52.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Meat Products Group, American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,155.15.

A. Andrew J. Blumiller, 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) \$7,490. E. (9) \$262.05.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transamerica Corp., Occidental Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$21.13.

A. John L. Blake, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. C. B. Blankenship, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$5,010.94.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Cyril F. Brickfield, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$275.92.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.

D. (6) \$17,350.46. E. (9) \$17,350.46.

A. C. William Brown, National Association of Marine Services, Inc., 11501 Georgia Ave., Silver Spring, Md.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$560.

A. Charles H. Brown, National Educational Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of CPA's, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. W. Warren Buck, Jr., 1835 K Street NW., No. 705, Washington, D.C.

B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hearst Corp., 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Parcel Post Association, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. J. Burke, Jr., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.

B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

E. (9) 16.14.

A. Donald L. Calvin, New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert A. Carretta, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Work Glove Manufacturers Association, 1604 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,063.60. E. (1) \$46.90.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$4,997.46.

A. E. Michael Cassidy, Water Resources Associated, 1130 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.

B. Water Resources Associated, 1130 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.

A. J. M. Chambers & Co., Inc., Inc., 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Cordage Institute, 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,275. E. (9) \$150.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$20.

A. Frank Chelf, Suite 303, Congressional Plaza Building 220 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Conwood Corp., 701 North Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$1,800.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr., American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$47.50. E. (9) \$4.27.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,098. E. (9) \$8,115.12.

A. Joseph S. Clark, World Federalists, U.S.A. Inc., 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$766.69.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.

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) \$5,156.25. E. (9) \$239.31.

A. David Cohen, Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$593.97.

A. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$4208.33.

A. James F. Collins, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$125.

A. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,684.36. E. (9) \$965.23.

A. Committee of Foreign-Owned Banks, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,600. E. (9) \$6,438.78.

A. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Congress of Railway Unions.

D. (6) \$3665.51. E. (9) \$3248.49.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$265.

A. Conwood Corp., 701 North Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.

E. (9) \$3,751.24.

A. Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$2,305.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. William Kay Dalnes, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$89.79.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Importers Association, Textile and Apparel Group, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$597.19.

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.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Lewis B. Hastings, Automobile Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automobile Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 320 North Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$500.

A. H. W. Henderson, 908 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky.

B. Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) \$359.10.

A. George T. Higgins, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$175.

A. Teresa B. Hightower, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$120.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Car & Foundry Co., Business Center Building, Bellevue, Wash.
D. (6) \$1,600. E. (9) \$1,600.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Power Tool Institute, Inc., 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$532.40.

A. Peter W. Hughes, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$321.32.

A. Robert R. Humphreys, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$320. E. (9) \$23.90.

A. Bernard J. Imming, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$312.50. E. (9) \$13.55.

A. Ina Corp., 1066 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. International Brotherhood of Painters & Allied Trades, 217 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.

D. (6) \$15,096.59. E. (9) \$22,427.57.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$330.

A. Mr. Elmer A. Jones, consultant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$471.29.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$275.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$412.50. E. (9) \$12.60.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) \$4,411.20. E. (9) \$1,638.10.

A. Kominers, Fort, Schlefer & Boyer, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,700. E. (9) \$721.80.

A. Leonard Lee Lane, 2401 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Zero Population Growth, 330 Second, Los Altos, Calif.
E. (9) \$40.

A. Walter Lang, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$196.80. E. (9) \$247.33.

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. League for Economic Assistance and Development, Inc., 390 Plandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y.

D. (6) \$922.63. E. (9) \$922.63.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Asahi Chemical Industry Co., Ltd., Hi-biya-Mitsui Building 12, 1-Chome Yuraku-cho, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemical Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shell Chemical Co., 2401 Crow Canyon Road, San Ramon, Calif.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 100 3d Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$22,636.92. E. (9) \$16,269.78.

A. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., 4750 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

A. John M. Lumley, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,160. E. (9) \$222.39.

A. John R. MacKenzie, Automobile Manufacturer's Association Inc., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automobile Manufacturer's Association Inc., 320 North Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. John L. McConnell, New York Stock Exchange, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$325.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.

A. William G. McFadzean, Apostle Islands Residents Committee, 430 Baker Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$1,525.28. E. (9) \$942.28.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,416.57. E. (9) \$189.72.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,698.75. E. (9) \$834.45.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 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) \$5,635. E. (9) \$407.56.

A. Peter E. McGuire, Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,808. E. (9) \$1,295.10.

A. William H. McLin, National Education Association—New England Office, 20 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$529.38. E. (9) \$75.

A. Ben J. Man, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,469.60. E. (9) \$512.79.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) \$3,949.68. E. (9) \$411.18.

A. Albert E. May, American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$577.50. E. (9) \$40.02.

A. George G. Mead, Congressional Relations, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$459.

A. George G. Mead, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,202.48.

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) \$5,635.

A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$1,520.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,800. E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Lester F. Miller, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$12.

A. Clarence Mitchell, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Mohay, The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Morgan, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$519.88.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1128 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,562.51. E. (9) \$70.96.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,124.86. E. (9) \$1,542.42.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$13,911.65. E. (9) \$14,151.07

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,100. E. (9) \$1,100.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$28,944.65. E. \$28,742.26.

A. National Association of Single Taxpayers, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$718.74.

A. National Association of Social Workers, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,500.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 251 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$7,450. E. (9) \$10,000.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$12,098.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$24,596.43. E. (9) \$20,563.20.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York City.

E. (9) \$2,000.

A. Government Relations and Citizenship, National Education Association, 1201, 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$25,146.96.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York N.Y.

A. National Federation of Business & Professional Womens Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$57,122. E. (9) \$3,740.05.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,856.02. E. (9) \$13,968.10.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

(9) \$91.51.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,798.99. E. (9) \$1,968.51.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,084.61. E. (9) \$1,084.61.

A. National Rural Housing Coalition, Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$599. E. (9) \$832.98.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,106. E. (9) \$3,337.

A. National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,140. E. (9) \$7,186.19.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,001.68. E. (9) \$1,950.89.

A. National Taxpayers Union, 415 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,714.94. E. (9) \$1,701.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) \$20,193. E. (9) \$5,612.63.

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. Stanley D. Noble, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 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. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 8 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

E. (9) \$1,185.

A. Daniel J. O'Callaghan, The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$218.75.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,463.74. E. (9) \$20.06.

A. Kenneth G. Olson, Mountain Road, R.D. 1, Stowe, Vt.

B. American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$56.22.

A. Michael S. Olson, 501 Raleigh Building, Raleigh, N.C.

B. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, Inc., Post Office Box 2056, Raleigh, N.C.

A. Roy W. Olson, Organization of Professional Employees of U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of USDA, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$493.75. E. (9) \$25.

A. Claude E. Olmstead, National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$15.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4218. E. (9) \$1,199.30.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Water Resources Associated, Post Office Box 1310, Town House, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Water Resources Associated, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Judith E. Park, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,865.75. E. (9) \$303.26.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 1776 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers

A. Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Alaska Federation of Natives, Anchorage, Alaska

E. (9) \$1,342.64.

A. Mr. Lynn C. Paulson, National Independent Dairies Association, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$62.45.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Sheetz, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$2,150.85.

- A. Kenneth Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,926.25. E. (9) \$69.14.
- A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, Washington Bureau NAACP, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Carl Pope, 1340 Vermont NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Zero Population Growth, 320 Second Street, Los Altos, Calif.
 D. (6) \$540. E. (9) \$60.
- A. Power Tool Institute, Inc., 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill.
 D. (6) \$532.40. (9) \$532.40.
- A. H. P. Pressler, attorney, 1122 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
 B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,580. E. (9) \$940.98.
- A. Jerry C. Pritchett, 1414 30th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Mechanical Contractors Association of America, 5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$500.
- A. Arthur Lee Quinn, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Hambro American Bank & Trust Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
 D. (6) \$23,749.98. E. (9) \$11,697.87.
- A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Atkins, Kroll & Co., Ltd., 417 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
 D. (6) \$900.
- A. Alan T. Rains, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$52.66.
- A. Rial M. Rainwater, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$10.50.
- A. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$10,785. E. (9) \$14,752.26.
- A. John T. Reggitts, Jr., Rural Delivery 2, Boonton Avenue, Boonton, N.J.
- A. John A. Reilly, Esq., Kenyon & Kenyon, Reilly, Carr & Chapin, 59 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y.
 B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, et al.
 E. (9) \$25.
- A. W. W. Renfro, Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
 E. (9) \$492.94.
- A. Darrell G. Renstrom, National Education Association, 5200 South Quebec Street, Englewood, Colo.
 B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$529.38. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Research To Prevent Blindness, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York City.
 E. (9) \$3,000.
- A. Ronald E. Resh, 1300 Wyatt Building Washington, D.C.
 B. Wyatt and Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
- A. James J. Reynolds, American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 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) \$354.
- A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
 B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Gogalusa, La.
- A. Mark Richardson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$250.
- A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.
- A. James W. Riddell, Attorney, 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) \$41.36.
- A. John P. Roche, 150 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Iron and Steel Institute, 150 E. 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) \$1,965. E. (9) \$216.48.
- A. William E. Rollow, Esq., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Skeet Shooting Association.
- A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Deltona Corp., 3250 SW. 3d Avenue, Miami, Fla.
 D. (6) \$2,345. E. (9) \$34.48.
- A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Business Press, Inc., 205 E 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$4,375. E. (9) \$1,875.
- A. Durward Seals, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$212.50. E. (9) \$30.24.
- A. Clayton A. Seeber, National Education Association—Government Relations and Citizenship, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,176.25. E. (9) \$59.48.
- A. W. O Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$340.90. E. (9) \$12.37.
- A. Leo Seybold, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$333.18.
- A. Robert L. Shortle, Water Resources Associated, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.
- A. A. Z. Shows, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Avionics Communication Systems, Inc., 5252 Pert Royal Road, Springfield, Va.
 D. (6) \$1,530. E. (9) \$3,031.43.
- A. Smathers & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Horse Council, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$334.61.
- A. Smathers & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$12,500. E. (9) \$305.50.
- A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
 B. Citizens Committee on National Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,086.45. E. (9) \$2,119.02.
- A. Lawrence Spelser, American Civil Liberties Union, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$6,043.99. E. (9) \$6,043.99.
- A. J. Gilbert Stallings, Esq., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. Edward W. Stimpson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$300.
- A. James F. Sullivan, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$300.
- A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,225. E. (9) \$650.
- A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Retail Credit Co., Post Office Box 4081, Atlanta, Ga.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$297.45.

A. Monroe Sweetland, NEA, West Coast Office, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$566.88. E. (9) \$100.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) \$126. E. (9) \$74.83.

A. Ivan Swift, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$2,451.39.

A. Robert F. Sykes, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$79.35.

A. Taxation with Representation, 2369 North Taylor Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$664.45. E. (9) \$568.73.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,451.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$6,423.75. E. (9) \$4,431.71.

A. James R. Turnbull.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$212.50.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 66 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$2,405.93.

A. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,975.41. E. (9) \$1,975.41.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$21.23.

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) \$676.70. E. (9) \$145.85.

A. Wald, Harkrader, Nicholson, & Ross, 1320 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Jack A. Waller, International Association of Fire Fighters, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Fire Fighters, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,375.

A. Leonard Warner, Australian Trade Council, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Australian Trade Council, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. James A. Warren, 5500 Prospect Place, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. REA Express Inc., 219 E. 42d St., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$150.

A. Fred Wegner, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, The Fertilizer Institute, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Fertilizer Institute, 1015 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

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. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Courier Corp., 2 Nevada Drive, Lake Success, N.Y.
E. (9) \$25.35.

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.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Data Processing Service Organizations, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$151.48.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. College Placement Council, Inc., 65 East Elizabeth Street, Bethlehem, Pa.
E. (9) \$24.75.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Computer Time Sharing Services Section of the Association of Data Processing Service Organizations, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$68.65.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) \$84.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Estate of Albert W. Small, c/o Mrs. Albert W. Small, 5803 Green Tree Road, Bethesda, Md.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hoopa Valley Tribe, Post Office Box 817, Hoopa, Calif.
E. (9) \$18.33.

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) \$88.39.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinallet Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) \$17.60.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Taos Pueblo, Taos, N. Mex.
E. (9) \$173.23.

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) \$14.21.

A. J. D. Williams, Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council for Health Care Services, 363 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$0.40.

A. J. D. Williams, Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pinkerton Holding Corp., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$21.45.

A. J. D. Williams, Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$66.50.

A. Kenneth Williamson, American Hospital Association, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,300. E. (9) \$1,658.33.

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) \$4,500. E. (9) \$299.06.

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$150.

A. Jack Yelverton, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$5,635. E. (9) \$409.59.

A. Zero Population Growth, 330 Second Street, Los Altos, Calif.

D. (6) \$85,000. E. (9) \$1,260.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Charge Account Bankers Association, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John L. Zorack, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$298.15.

A. Nicholas H. Zumas, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Music Publishers Association, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$350.