United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, December 13, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

For God who commanded light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.—II Corinthians 4:6.

O God, without whose guidance we miss the way and with whose love we find the path to life, we commit ourselves and our Nation unto Thee. Help us to become one people united in our efforts to do Thy will and to work for the good of our fellow men.

May we strive earnestly to make worthy contributions in the high adventure of establishing on this planet an order of life permeated by justice for all, good will in all, and peace among all.

May the mind of Him whose birthday we celebrate become the mood of this day and of all days. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had reconsidered the bill (S. 2007) entitled "An act to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated.

The message further announced that the said bill did not pass, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 113. An act for the relief of certain individuals and organizations; and

S. 248. An act for the relief of William D. Pender.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11955) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes."

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

H.R. 8856. An act to authorize an additional Deputy Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2891) entitled "An act to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970," agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. ROTH to be the conferees on the Part of the Senate.

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

S. 216. An act to permit suits to adjudicate certain real property quiet title actions;

S. 1874. An act to provide for the establishment of projects for the dental health of children, to increase the number of dental auxiliaries, to increase the availability of dental care through efficient use of dental personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 2945. An act to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit the appointment by the President of certain additional persons to the service academies;

S.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of John Paul Austin as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert Francis Goheen as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution on national American Indian policy; and

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 45th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document.

DEDICATION OF PORTRAIT OF JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was my distinct honor and privilege to be present in the Speaker's lobby, at the simple, but dignified dedication on Saturday, December 11, when a portrait of Speaker emeritus John W. McCormack was unveiled by Speaker CARL ALBERT and majority leader HALE BOGGS.

In attendance were many Members of the House, including minority leader GERALD R. FORD and associates, including Parliamentarian, Mr. Lewis Deschler.

John William McCormack was born in South Boston, Mass., on December 22, 1891, one of 12 children—nine of whom died in infancy. At the age of 13, he left school to support his widowed mother. In a truly Horatio Alger story, he became a lawyer without ever attending high school, and then was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. The district which he represented for 42 years was truly the melting pot of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

John McCormack served as House majority leader from 1940 to 1961, except for the Republican 80th and 83d Congresses, when he served as minority whip.

He was unanimously nominated for Speaker of the House by the Democratic House caucus and was elected as the 45th Speaker on January 10, 1962.

He served 9 years as Speaker of the House, a tenure second only to that of Sam Rayburn, Democrat, of Texas. He was first in line of succession to the Presidency of the United States from the death of President Kennedy, from November 22, 1963, until January 30, 1965, when HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was inaugurated as Vice President.

Known to his colleagues as the fighting Irishman from Boston, he was the first Roman Catholic ever elected to the office of Speaker.

From humble origin to the office of Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives is a long way, but it is a forceful reminder that the great American dream can come true.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT DECEMBER 16

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight Thursday, December 16, to file five reports.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1202, Public Law 91–452, the Chair appoints the following Members on the part of the House to be members of the National Commission on Individual Rights, effective January 1, 1972: Mr. CELLER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MCCULLOCH, and Mr. SANDMAN.

RESIGNATION OF HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE FROM THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear of the resignation from the House Committee on the District of Columbia of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

The voteless people of the District of Columbia could be confident of fair and competent treatment when he was dealing with their problems. I have deeply appreciated the long hours and hard work that the gentleman from Missouri put into the District of Columbia affairs. I have been all the more appreciative because I know the work that he does here for the District of Columbia counts for very little for his own constituents.

I can well understand what prompted the gentleman to resign from the committee. I have been troubled by the arbitrary and often inept way in which the committee has been run. It is a sad day when a secret pressure effort by selfish interests can undermine the painstaking work of a subcommittee and its chairman based not on the merits of legislation but on influence peddling.

When I think, however, of the possible alternatives to a man of Mr. HUNGATE'S dedication and sensitivity to the problems of the District of Columbia serving as chairman of the very important Subcommittee on the Judiciary, I am compelled to urge Mr. HUNGATE to reconsider his decision to resign. If we are to have any success in reforming the District Committee and making it more responsive to the needs of the people of the District, we will need men like Mr. HUNGATE to help. I fear that matters can only grow worse with his resignation and I urge the Members of the House to join me in calling upon Mr. HUNGATE to reconsider his decision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN).

INTEREST, USURY, AND CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 12115) to amend certain provisions of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, relating to interest and usury, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 12115

A bill to amend certain provisions of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, relating to interest and usury

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the text of section 28–3301 of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided in section 28–3308, chapter 36 of this subtitle, the parties to an instrument in writing for the payment of money at a future time may contract therein for the payment of interest on the principal amount thereof at a rate not exceeding 8 percent per annum."

SEC. 2. The text of clause (2) in the first sentence of section 28–3303 of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) in writing, to pay a greater rate than is permitted under section 28–3301 or 28–3308 or under chapter 36 or 39 of this subtitle, the creditor shall forfeit the whole of the interest so contracted to be received."

SEC. 3. Chapter 33 of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding the following section:

"§ 28–3308. Finance charge on direct installment loans

"(a) On a loan in which the principal does not exceed $25,000 (other than a loan directly secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of this subtitle) to be repaid in equal or substantially equal monthly, or other periodic installments, any federally insured bank or savings and loan association doing business in the District of Columbia may contract for and receive interest at the rate permitted under this chapter or, in lieu of such interest, a finance charge, which, if expressed as an annual percentage rate, does not exceed a rate of 11½ percent per annum on the unpaid balances of principal. This section does not limit or restrict the manner of contracting for the finance charge, whether by way of discount, add-on or simple interest, so long as the annual percentage rate of the finance charge does not exceed that permitted by this section.

"(b) If such installment loan is precomputed,

"(1) the finance charge may be calculated on the assumption that all scheduled payments will be made when due, and

"(2) except as provided in subsection (c), upon prepayment in full of the unpaid balance of a precomputed direct installment loan, refinancing, or consolidation, an amount not less than the unearned portion of the finance charge calculated according to this section shall be rebated to the debtor. If the rebate otherwise required is less than $1, no rebate need be made.

"(c) Upon prepayment in full of such direct installment loan other than a refinancing or consolidation, whether or not precomputed, the lender may collect or retain a minimum charge within the limits stated in this section if the finance charge earned at the time of prepayment is less than any minimum charge contracted for. The minimum charge may not exceed the smaller of the following: (1) the amount of the finance charge contracted for, or (2) $5 in a transaction which had a principal of $75 or less, or $7.50 in a transaction which had a principal of more than $75.

"(d) The unearned portion of the finance charge is a fraction of the finance charge of which the numerator is the sum of the periodic balances scheduled to follow the computational period in which the prepayment occurs, and the denominator is the sum of all periodic balances under either the related loan agreement or, if the balance owing resulted from a refinancing or a consolidation, under the related refinancing agreement or consolidation agreement.

"(e) As used in this section, 'finance charge', and 'annual percentage rate' shall have the respective meanings under the provisions of the Truth-in-Lending Act (82 Stat. 146 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and the regulations and interpretations thereunder; and 'federally insured bank or savings and loan association' means an insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or an 'insured institution' as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act."

SEC. 4. Subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following chapters:

"Chapter 36.—DIRECT MOTOR VEHICLE INSTALLMENT LOANS

"§ 28–361. Direct motor vehicle installment loans

"The provisions of the Act approved April 22, 1960 (Public Law 86–431, 74 Stat. 69; D.C. Code, 1967 ed., chapter 9 of title 40), covering installment sales of motor vehicles, as amended, and the regulations issued thereunder, shall apply to the extent appropriate to, a direct installment loan, secured by a security interest in a motor vehicle, made by a federally insured bank or savings and loan association doing business in the District of Columbia, subject to section 28–3602.

"§ 28–3602. Finance charge

"Such a bank or savings and loan association may contract for and receive interest at the rate provided for in chapter 33 or, in lieu of such interest, a finance charge which, if expressed as an annual percentage rate, does not exceed a rate of 11½ percent per annum on the unpaid balances of principal.

"§ 28–3603. Definitions

"As used in this chapter, 'finance charge' and 'annual percentage rate' shall have the respective meanings under the provisions of the Truth-in-Lending Act (82 Stat. 146 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and the regulations and interpretations thereunder; and 'federally insured bank or savings and loan association' means an insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or an 'insured institution' as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act.

"Chapter 37.—REVOLVING CREDIT ACCOUNTS

"§ 28–3701. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) 'revolving credit account' means an arrangement between a seller or financial institution and a buyer pursuant to which (A) the seller may permit the buyer to purchase goods or services on credit either from the seller or by use of a credit card or other device, whether issued by the seller or a financial institution, (B) the unpaid balances of amounts financed arising from purchases and the credit service and other appropriate charges are debited to an account, (C) a credit service charge if made is not precomputed but is computed on an outstanding unpaid balance of the buyer's account from time to time, and (D) the buyer has the priv-

ilege of paying the balances in full or in installments.

"(2) 'credit service charge' means the sum of (A) all charges payable directly or indirectly by the buyer and imposed directly or indirectly by the seller as an incident to the extension of credit, including any of the following types of charges which are applicable: time price differential, service, carrying or other charge, however denominated, premium or other charge for any guarantee or insurance protecting the seller against the buyer's default or other credit loss; (B) charges incurred for investigating the collateral or credit-worthiness of the buyer or for commissions or brokerage for obtaining the credit, irrespective of the person to whom the charges are paid or payable, unless the seller had no notice of the charges when the credit was granted.

"(3) 'seller' means a person engaged in the District of Columbia in the business of selling goods or services to retail buyers.

"(4) 'buyer' means a person who buys goods or obtains services from a seller pursuant to a retail credit sale and not principally for the purpose of resale; and includes a person who enters into a prior agreement with a financial institution whereby the latter agrees to pay the debts of the buyer as they accrue at various retail sellers, designated by the financial institution, in consideration of the buyer paying to the financial institution the cash sales price plus the credit service charge on the purchase.

"(5) 'person' includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, trust, joint stock company, or any other group of persons however organized.

"(6) 'financial institution' means a person who enters into an agreement with a buyer whereby the former agrees to extend credit to the buyer and to apply it as directed by the buyer pursuant to a credit card issued to the buyer by the financial institution; and this term includes any federally insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act doing business in the District of Columbia.

"§ 28–3702. Amount and computation of credit service charge

"(a) The seller or financial institution may contract for the payment by the buyer of a credit service charge not exceeding that permitted by this section.

"(b) A credit service charge may be made in each billing cycle. For the purpose of computing the outstanding balance subject to the credit service charge, (1) the outstanding balance on any day shall consist of an amount which shall not exceed the sum of the total charges to the account less the amounts paid or credited to the account prior to such day, or (2) the outstanding balance may be computed by the average daily balance method. The credit service charge may also be computed for all outstanding balances within a range of not in excess of $10 on the basis of the median amount within such range if as so computed such credit service charge is applied to all outstanding balance within such range.

"(c) If the billing cycle is monthly, the charge may not exceed 1½ percent of that part of the outstanding balance which is $500 or less and 1 percent on that part of this amount which is more than $500. If the billing cycle is not monthly, the maximum charge is that percentage which bears the relation to the applicable monthly percentage as the number of days in the billing cycle bears to thirty. For the purposes of this section, a variation of not more than four days from month to month is 'the same day of the billing cycle'.

"Chapter 38.—CONSUMER PROTECTIONS

"§ 28–3801. Scope—Limitation on agreements and practices

"This chapter applied to actions to enforce rights arising from a consumer credit sale or a direct installment loan.

"§ 28–3802. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) 'revolving credit account' means a revolving credit account as defined in section 28–3701 of this subtitle.

"(2) 'consumer credit sale' means a sale of goods or services in which—

"(A) credit is granted by a person who regularly engages as a seller in credit transactions of the same kind;

"(B) the buyer is a natural person;

"(C) the goods or services are purchased primarily for a personal, family, household, or agricultural purpose;

"(D) either the debt is payable in installments or a finance charge is made; and

"(E) the amount financed does not exceed $25,000.

The term includes any contract in the form of a bailment or lease if the bailee or lessee contracts to pay as compensation for use a sum substantially equivalent to or in excess of the aggregate value of the property and services involved and it is agreed that the bailee or lessee will become, or for no other or a nominal consideration has the option to become, the owner of the property upon full compliance with his obligations under the contract.

"(3) 'direct installment loan' means a direct installment loan as that term is used in section 28–3308 of this subtitle and does not include a loan secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of this subtitle.

"(4) 'cross collateral' means an arrangement wherein a seller in a 'consumer credit sale' secures a debt arising from the sale by contracting for a security interest in other property if as a result of a prior sale the seller has an existing security interest in the other property. The seller may also contract for a security interest in the property sold in the subsequent sale as a security for the previous debt.

"§ 28–3803. Balloon payments

"With respect to a consumer credit sale or direct installment loans except for revolving credit accounts:

"(1) No creditor shall at any time enter into an agreement which contains or anticipates a schedule of payments under which any one payment is not equal or substantially equal to all other payments, excluding any final payment which is less than the average of previous payments or any down payment received by the creditor contemporaneously with or prior to the consummation of the transaction, or under which the intervals between any consecutive payments differ substantially.

"(2) Notwithstanding any provision of his section, where a consumer's livelihood is dependent upon seasonal or intermittent income, the parties may agree in a separate writing that one or more payments or the intervals between one or more payments may be reduced or expanded in accordance with the needs of the consumer if such payments are expressly related to the consumer's income. The separate writing shall contain a conscipuous notice directly above the signature line stating: 'I waive my right to have all payments to be made under this agreement in substantially equal amounts'.

"(3) In the event that the provisions of paragraph (2) apply, the consumer shall have the right at any time, without further cost or obligation, to revise the schedule of payments to conform both as to amounts and intervals to the average of all installments and intervals.

"§ 28–3804. Assignment of earnings and authorization to confess judgment prohibited

"(a) A creditor may not take an assignment of earnings of the consumer for payment or as security for payment of an obligation arising out of a consumer credit sale or direct installment loan.

"(b) A creditor may not take or accept from the consumer a warrant or power of attorney or other authorization for the creditor, or other person acting on his behalf, to confess judgment arising out of a consumer credit sale or direct installment loan.

"(c) An assignment of earnings or an authorization in violation of this section is subject to the provisions of section 28–3813 (d) (1) of this subtitle.

"§ 28–3805. Debts secured by cross-collateral

"(a) If debts arising from two or more consumer credit sales other than sales pursuant to a revolving charge account (§ 28–3701), are secured by cross-collateral, or consolidated into one debt payable on a single schedule of payments, and the debt is secured by security interests taken with respect to one or more of the sales, payments received by the seller after the taking of the cross-collateral or the consolidation are deemed, for the purpose of determining the amount of the debt secured by the various security interests, to have been first applied to the payment of the debts arising from the sales first made. To the extent debts are paid according to this section, security interests in items of property terminate as the debts originally incurred with respect to each item are paid.

"(b) Payment received by the seller upon a revolving charge are deemed, for the purpose of determining the amount of the debt secured by the various security interests, to have been applied first to the payment of credit service charges in the order of their entry to the account and then to the payment of debts in the order in which the entries to the account showing the debts were made.

"(c) If the debts consolidated arose from two or more sales made on the same day, payments received by the seller are deemed, for the purpose of determining the amount of the debt secured by the various security interests, to have been applied first to the payment of the smallest debt.

"§ 23–3806. Attorney's fees

"With respect to a consumer credit sale or direct installment loans the agreement may provide for the payment by the consumer of reasonable attorney's fees not in excess of 15 per centum of the unpaid balance of the obligation.

"§ 28–3807. Negotiable instruments prohibited

"(a) In a consumer credit sale, no seller shall take or otherwise arrange for the consumer to sign an instrument, except a check, payable 'to order' or 'to bearer' as evidence of the credit obligation of the consumer.

"(b) Any holder of an instrument prohibited by subsection (a) of this section 28–3807, if he takes it with knowledge of a violation of this section, takes it subject to all claims and defenses of the consumer up to the amount owing on the transaction total at the time of the assignment.

"§ 28–3808. Assignees subject to defenses

"(a) With respect to a consumer credit sale, an assignee of the rights of the seller or lessor is subject to all claims and defenses of the consumer or lessee arising out of the sale notwithstanding any terms or agreements to the contrary, but the assignee's liability under this section may not exceed the amount owing to the assignee at the time of the assignment.

"(b) Rights of the consumer or lessee can only be asserted as a matter of defense to or set-off against a claim by the assignee.

"§ 28–3809. Lender subject to defenses arising from sales

"(a) A lender who makes a direct installment loan for the purpose of enabling a consumer to purchase goods or services is subject to all claims and defenses of the consumer against the seller arising out of the purchase of the goods or service if such lender acts at the express request of the seller, and—

"(1) the seller participates in the preparation of the loan instruments, or

"(2) the lender is a person or organization controlled by or under common control with the seller, or

"(3) the seller receives or will receive a fee, compensation, or other consideration from the lender for arranging the loan.

"(b) The lender's ability under this section may not exceed the amount of the loan. Rights of the debtor can only be asserted affirmatively in an action to cancel and void the sale from its inception, or a matter of defense to or set-off against a claim by the lender.

"§ 28-3810. Referral sales

"With respect to a consumer credit sale, the seller of lessor may not give or offer to give a rebate or discount or otherwise pay or offer to pay value to the buyer or lessee as an inducement for a sale or lease in consideration of his giving to the seller or lessor the names of prospective purchasers or lessees, or otherwise aiding the seller or lessor in making a sale or lease to another person, if the earning of the rebate, discount, or other value is contingent upon the occurrence of an event subsequent to the time the buyer or lessee agrees to buy or lease. If a buyer or lessee is induced by a violation of this section to enter into a consumer credit sale, the agreement is unenforceable by the seller or lessor and the buyer or lessee, at his option, may rescind the agreement or retain the goods delivered and the benefit of any services performed, without any obligation to pay for them.

"§ 28-3811. Home solicitation sales

"(a) As used in this section 'home solicitation sale' means a cash sale or a consumer credit sale of goods, other than farm equipment, or services in which the seller or a person acting for him engages in a personal solicitation of the sale at or near a residence of the buyer and the buyer's agreement or offer to purchase is there given to a seller or a person acting for him. It does not include a sale made pursuant to a preexisting revolving credit account or prior negotiations between the parties at a business establishment at a fixed location where goods or services are offered or exhibited for sale.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), in addition to any right otherwise to revoke an offer, the buyer has the right to cancel a home solicitation sale until midnight of the third business day after the day on which the buyer signs an agreement or offer to purchase which complies with this section.

"(c) Cancellation occurs when the buyer gives written notice of cancellation to the seller at the address stated in the agreement or offer to purchase.

"(d) Notice of cancellation, if given by mail, is given when it is deposited in a mail box properly addressed and the postage prepaid.

"(e) Notice of cancellation given by the buyer need not take a particular form and is sufficient if it indicates by any form of written expression the intention of the buyer not to be bound by the home solicitation sale.

"(f) The buyer may not cancel a home solicitation sale if the buyer requests the seller to provide goods or services without delay because of an emergency, and

"(1) the seller in good faith makes a substantial beginning of performance of the contract before the buyer gives notice of cancellation, and

"(2) in the case of goods, the goods cannot be returned to the seller in substantially as good condition as when received by the buyer, and

"(3) the buyer has signed separately the following notice which appears under the conspicuous caption: 'WAIVER OF RIGHT TO CANCEL' and reads as follows: 'Because of an emergency I waive any right I may have to cancel this home solicitation sale'.

"(g) (1) In a home solicitation sale, unless the buyer requests the seller to provide goods or services without delay in an emergency, the seller must present to the buyer and obtain his signature to a written agreement or offer to purchase which designates as the date of the transaction the date on which the buyer actually signs and contains a statement of the buyer's rights which complies with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) The statement must—

"(A) appear under this conspicous caption: BUYERS RIGHT TO CANCEL', and

"(B) read as follows:

"'If this agreement was solicited at or near your residence and you do not want the goods or services, you may cancel this agreement by mailing a notice to the seller. The notice must say that you do not want the goods or services and must be mailed before midnight of the third business day after you signed this agreement. The notice must be mailed to: _____

_____

(insert name and military address of seller)

If you cancel, the seller may not keep any of your cash down payment.'

"(3) Until the seller has complied with this section the buyer may cancel the home solicitation sale by notifying the seller in any manner and by any means of his intention to cancel.

"(h) (1) Except as provided in this section, within ten days after a home solicitation sale has been canceled or an offer to purchase revoked the seller must tender to the buyer any payments made by the buyer and any note or other evidence of indebtedness. A provision permitting the seller to keep all or any part of any payment, note, or evidence of indebtedness is in violation of this section and unenforceable.

"(2) If the down payment includes goods traded in, the goods must be tendered in substantially as good condition as when received by the seller. If the seller fails to tender the goods as provided by this section, the buyer may elect to recover an amount equal to the trade-in allowance stated in the agreement.

"(3) The seller is not entitled to retain a cancellation fee.

"(4) Until the seller has complied with the obligations imposed by this section the buyer may retain possession of goods delivered to him by the seller and has a lien on the goods in his possession or control for any recovery to which he is entitled.

"(i) (1) Except as provided by the provisions on retention of goods by the buyer (subsection (h) (4) of this section), within a reasonable time after a home solicitation sale has been canceled or an offer to purchase revoked, the buyer upon demand must tender to the seller any goods delivered by the seller pursuant to the sale but he is not obligated to tender at any place other than his residence. If the seller fails to demand possession of goods within a reasonable time after cancellation or revocation, the goods become the property of the buyer without obligation to pay for them. For the purpose of this section, forty days is presumed to be a reasonable time.

"(2) The buyer has a duty to take reasonable care of the goods in his possession before cancellation or revocation and for a reasonable time thereafter, during which time the goods are otherwise at the seller's risk.

"(3) If the seller has performed any services pursuant to a home solicitation sale prior to its cancellation, the seller is entitled to no compensation.

"§ 28-3812. Limitation on creditors' remedies

"(a) This section applies to actions or other proceedings to enforce rights arising from consumer credit sales, consumer leases, and direct installment loans (other than a loan directly secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of title 28, District of Columbia Code); and, in addition, to extortionate extensions of credit.

"(b) (1) During the thirty-day period after a default consisting of a failure to pay money the creditor may not because of the default (A) accelerate the unpaid balance of the obligation, (B) bring action against the debtor, or (C) proceed against the collateral.

"(2) Unless the creditor has first (A) notified the debtor that he has elected to accelerate the unpaid balance of the obligation because of default, (B) brought action against the debtor, or (C) proceeded against the collateral, the debtor may cure a default consisting of a failure to pay money by tendering the amount of all unpaid sums due at the time of tender, without acceleration, plus any unpaid delinquency or deferral charges. Cure restores the debtor to his rights under the agreement as though the defaults cured had not occurred.

"(3) Posting of any notice required by law shall be deemed valid if mailed by certified mail to the debtor's last known address.

"(c) (1) The debtor may redeem the collateral from the creditor at any time—

"(A) within fifteen days of the creditor's taking possession of the collateral, or

"(B) thereafter until the creditor has either disposed of the collateral, entered into a contract for its disposition, or gained the right to retain the collateral in satisfaction of the debtor's obligation pursuant to the provisions on disposition of collateral in section 9-505 of subtitle I of title 28, District of Columbia Code.

"(2) The debtor may redeem the collatteral by tendering fulfillment of all obligations secured by the collateral including reasonable expenses incurred in realizing on the security interest.

"(d) Subject to the provisions in this part, the parties may agree that the creditor has the right to take possession of the collateral on default. In taking possession, a secured party may proceed without judicial process if this can be done without breach of the peace and with consent of the debtor. Those who take the collateral through repossession shall be deemed the agent of the creditor, and the creditor shall be civilly liable for any of the actions of its agents.

"(e) (1) This subsection applies to consumer credit sales of goods or services and to direct installment loans secured by interests in goods.

"(2) A creditor may not maintain a proceeding for a deficiency unless he has disposed of the goods in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner.

"(3) If the creditor repossesses or voluntarily accepts surrender of goods which were the subject of the sale and in which he has a security interest, the consumer is not personally liable to the creditor for the unpaid balance of debt arising from the sale of a commercial unit of goods of which the cash price was $2,000 or less. In that case the creditor is not obligated to resell the collatteral unless the consumer has paid 60 percent or more of the cash price and has not signed after default a statement renouncing his rights in the collateral.

"(4) If the creditor takes possession or voluntarily accepts surrender of goods which were not the subject of the sale but in which he has a security interest to secure a debt arising from a sale of goods or services or a combined sale of goods and services and the cash price of the sale was $2,000 or less, the debtor is not personally liable to the creditor for the unpaid balance of the debt arising from the sale and the creditor's duty to dispose of the collateral is governed by the provisions on disposition of collateral in section 9-505 of subtitle I of title 28, District of Columbia Code.

"(5) If the creditor takes possession or voluntarily accepts surrender of goods in which he has a security interest to secure a debt arising from a direct installment loan and the net proceeds of the loan paid to or for the benefit of the debtor are $2,000 or

less, the consumer is not personally liable to the lender for the unpaid balance of the debt arising from the loan and the lender's duty to dispose of the collateral is governed by the provisions on disposition of collateral in section 9–505 of subtitle I of title 28, District of Columbia Code.

"(6) The consumer shall be liable in damages to the creditor if the debtor has wrongfully damaged the collateral or if, after default and demand, the debtor has wrongfully failed to make collateral available to the creditor.

"(7) If the creditor elects to bring an action against the buyer for a debt arising from a consumer credit sale of goods or services, when under this section he would not be entitled to a deficiency judgment if he repossessed the collateral, and obtains judgment—

"(A) he may not repossess the collateral, and

"(B) the collateral is not subject to levy or sale on execution or similar proceedings pursuant to the judgment.

"(f) (1) If it is the understanding of the creditor and the debtor at the time an extension of credit is made that delay in making repayment or failure to make repayment could result in the use of violence or other criminal means to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property of any person, the repayment of the extension of credit is unenforceable through civil judicial processes against the debtor.

"(2) If it is shown that an extension of credit was made at an annual rate exceeding 45 per centum and that the creditor then had a reputation for the use or threat of use of violence or other criminal means to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property of any person to collect extensions of credit or to punish the nonrepayment thereof, there is prima facie evidence that the extension of credit was unenforceable under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(g) (1) With respect to a consumer credit sale, or direct installment loan, if the court as a matter of law finds—

"(A) the agreement to have been unconscionable at the time it was made, or to have been induced by unconscionable conduct, the court may refuse to enforce the agreement, or

"(B) any clause of the agreement to have been unconscionable at the time it was made, the court may refuse to enforce the agreement, or may enforce the remainder of the agreement without the unconscionable clause, or may so limit the application of any unconscionable clause as to avoid any unconscionable result.

"(2) If it is claimed or appears to the court that the agreement or any clause thereof may be unconscionable the parties shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to present evidence as to its setting, purpose, and effect to aid the court in making the determination.

"(3) For the purpose of this section, a charge or practice expressly permitted by this section is not in and of itself unconscionable in the absence of other practices and circumstances.

"§ 28–3813. Consumers' remedies

"(a) The remedies provided by this section shall be liberally administered to the end that the consumer as the aggrieved party shall be put in at least as good a position as if the creditor had fully complied with this chapter. Except as is otherwise specifically provided where there are willful and repeated violations of this chapter consequential and special damages may be had in lieu of the specific penalties allowed, and in addition punitive damages may be had as indicated.

"(b) Any right or obligation declared by this chapter is enforceable by action unless the provision declaring it specifies a different and limited effect.

"(c) 'Transaction total' means—

"(1) in the case of transactions pursuant to open end credit plans or consumer credit transactions, the total of the following calculated as if the amount or amounts financed were paid over the maximum period of the plan or, if there is no such period, over twelve months beginning with the next billing cycle or cycles following the transaction or transactions:

"(A) the amount financed, plus any down payment or required deposit balance, and

"(B) the total finance charge, including any prepaid finance charge;

"(2) in the case of other than open end transactions or consumer credit transactions, the total of the following:

"(A) the amount financed, plus any down payment or required deposit balance, and

"(B) the amount of all precomputed or precomputable finance charge, including any prepaid finance charge.

"(d) (1) In the discretion of the court, a consumer may recover from the person violating this chapter, in addition to the damages the law otherwise allows, 10 percent of the transaction total, if applicable, or $100, whichever is greater, for violations to which this applies.

"(2) This section also applies to all violations for which no other remedy is specifically provided.

"(e) If a consumer prevails in a suit brought under this Act, the court may assess reasonable attorney's fees in addition to any other amounts recoverable under this chapter.

"(f) Any charge, practice, term, clause, provision, security interest, or other action or conduct which can be shown to be in willful violation of the provisions of this chapter shall confer no rights or obligations enforceable by action.

"§ 28–3814. Debt collection

"(a) This section only applies to conduct and practices in connection with collection of obligations arising from consumer credit sales, consumer leases, and direct installment loans (other than a loan directly secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of title 28).

"(b) As used in this section, the term—

"(1) 'claim' means any obligation or alleged obligation, arising from a consumer credit sale, consumer lease, or direct installment loan;

"(2) 'debt collection' means any action, conduct or practice in connection with the solicitation of claims for collection or in connection with the collection of claims, that are owed or due, or alleged to be owed or due, a seller or lender by a consumer; and

"(3) 'debt collector' means any persons engaging directly or indirectly in debt collection, and includes any person who sells or offers to sell forms represented to be a collection system, device, or scheme intended or calculated to be used to collect claims.

"(c) No debt collector shall collect or attempt to collect any money alleged to be due and owing by means of any threat, coercion, or attempt to coerce in any of the following ways:

"(1) the use, or express or implicit threat of use, of violence or other criminal means, to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property of any person;

"(2) the accusation or threat to falsely accuse any person of fraud or any crime, or any conduct which, if true, would tend to disgrace such other person or in any way subject him to ridicule, or any conduct which, if true, would tend to disgrace such other person or in any way subject him to ridicule or contempt of society;

"(3) false accusations made to another person, including any credit reporting agency, that a consumer has not paid a just debt, or threat to so make such false accusations;

"(4) the threat to sell or assign to another the obligation of the consumer with an attending representation or implication that the result of such sale or assignment would be that the consumer would lose any defense to the claim or would be subjected to harsh, vindictive, or abusive collection attempts; and

"(5) the threat that nonpayment of an alleged claim will result in the arrest of any person.

"(d) No debt collector shall unreasonably oppress, harass, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of or attempt to collect any claim alleged to be due and owing by that person or another in any of the following ways:

"(1) the use of profane or obscene language or language that is intended to unreasonably abuse the hearer or reader;

"(2) the placement of telephone calls without disclosure of the caller's identity or with the intent to harass or threaten any person at the called number; and

"(3) causing expense to any person in the form of long-distance telephone tolls, telegram fees, or other charges incurred by a medium of communication, by concealment of the true purpose of the notice, letter, message, or communication.

"(e) No debt collector shall unreasonably publicize information relating to any alleged indebtedness or debtor in any of the following ways:

"(1) the false communication of any information relating to a consumer's indebtedness to any employer or his agent except where such indebtedness has been guaranteed by the employer or the employer has requested the loan giving rise to the indebtedness and except where such communication is in connection with an attachment or execution after judgments as authorized by law;

"(2) the disclosure, publication, or communication of false information relating to a consumer's indebtedness to any relative or family member of the consumer unless such person is known to the debt collector to be a member of the same household as the consumer, except through proper legal action or process or at the express and unsolicited request of the relative or family member;

"(3) the disclosure, publication, or communication of any information relating to a consumer's indebtedness by publishing or posting any list of consumers, except for the publication of "stop lists" to point-of-sale locations where credit is extended, or by advertising for sale any claim to enforce payment thereof or in any other manner other than through proper legal action, process, or proceeding; and

"(4) the use of any form of communication to the consumer, which ordinarily may be seen by any other persons, that displays or conveys any information about the alleged claim other than the name, address, and phone number of the debt collector.

"(f) No debt collector shall use any fraudulent, deceptive, or misleading representation or means to collect or attempt to collect claims or to obtain information concerning consumers in any of the following ways:

"(1) the use of any company name, while engaged in debt collection, other than the debt collector's true company name;

"(2) the failure to clearly disclose in all written communications made to collect or attempt to collect a claim or to obtain or attempt to obtain information about a consumer, that the debt collector is attempting to collect a claim and that any information obtained will be used for that purpose;

"(3) any false representation that the debt collector has in his possession information or something of value for the consumer, that is made to solicit or discover information about the consumer;

"(4) the failure to clearly disclose the name and full business address of the person

to whom the claim has been assigned for collection, or to whom the claim is owed, at the time of making any demand for money;

"(5) any false representation or implication of the character, extent, or amount of a claim against a consumer, or of its status in any legal proceeding;

"(6) any false representation or false implication that any debt collector is vouched for, bonded by, affiliated with or an instrumentality, agent, or official of the District of Columbia or any agency of the Federal or District government;

"(7) the use or distribution or sale of any written communication which stimulates or is falsely represented to be a document authorized, issued, or approved by a court, an official, or any other legally constituted or authorized authority, or which creates a false impression about its source, authorization, or approval;

"(8) any representation that an existing obligation of the consumer may be increased by the addition of attorney's fees, investigation fees, service fees, or any other fees or charges when in fact such fees or charges may not legally be added to the existing obligation; and

"(9) any false representation or false impression about the status or true nature of or the services rendered by the debt collector or his business.

"(g) No debt collector shall use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any claim in any of the following ways:

"(1) the seeking or obtaining of any written statement or acknowledgment in any form that specifies that a consumer's obligation is one incurred for necessaries of life where the original obligation was not in fact incurred for such necessaries;

"(2) the seeking or obtaining of any written statement or acknowledgment in any form containing an affirmation of any obligation by a consumer who has been declared bankrupt without clearly disclosing the nature and consequences of such affirmation and the fact that the consumer is not legally obligated to make such affirmation;

"(3) the collection or the attempt to collect from the consumer all or any part of the debt collector's fee or charge for services rendered;

"(4) the collection of or the attempt to collect any interest or other charge, fee, or expense incidental to the principal obligation unless such interest or incidental fee, charge, or expense is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the obligation and legally chargeable to the consumer or unless such interest or incidental fee, charge, or expense is expressly authorized by law; and

"(5) any communication with a consumer whenever it appears that the consumer has notified the creditor that he is represented by an attorney and the attorney's name and address are known.

"(h) No debt collector shall use, or distribute, sell, or prepare for use, any written communication that violates or fails to conform to United States postal laws and regulations.

"(i) No debt collector shall take or accept for assignment any of the following:

"(1) an assignment of any claim for attorney's fees which have not been lawfully provided for in the writing evidencing the obligation; or

"(2) an assignment for collection of any claim upon which suit has been filed or judgment obtained, without the debt collector first making a reasonable effort to contact the attorney representing the consumer.

"(j)(1) Proof, by substantial evidence, that a debt collector has willfully violated any provision of the foregoing subsections of this section shall subject such debt collector to liability to any person affected by such violation for all damages proximately caused by the violation.

"(2) Punitive damages may be awarded to any person affected by a willful violation of the foregoing subsections of this section, when and in such amount as is deemed appropriate by the court and trier of fact.

§ 28–3815. Administrative enforcement

"(a) As used in this section—

"(1) 'Commisioner' means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or his delegated agent;

"(b) Compliance with the requirements imposed under this chapter shall be enforced by the Commissioner. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to affect the authority and jurisdiction of the respective agencies designated in section 108 of the Truth-in-Lending Act (82 Stat. 146 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

"§ 28–3816. Inconsistent laws: What law governs

"If any provision of law or regulation promulgated thereunder is inconsistent with this chapter, this chapter shall govern, unless this chapter or the inconsistent provision of the other laws specifically provides otherwise."

SEC. 5. Section 571 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 16–571. Definitions

"For purposes of this subchapter—

"(1) The term 'wages' means compensation paid or payable for personal services, whether denominated as wages, salary, commission, bonus, or otherwise, and includes periodic payments pursuant to a pension or retirement program.

"(2) The term 'disposable wages' means that part of the earnings of any individual remaining after the deduction from those earnings of any amounts required by law to be withheld.

"(3) The term 'garnishment' means any legal or equitable procedure through which the wages of any individual are required to be withheld for payment of any debt."

SEC. 6. The text of clauses (1), (2), and (3), in the first paragraph of section 16–572 of subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 25 per centum of his disposable wages that week, or

"(2) the amount by which his disposable wages for that week exceed thirty times the Federal minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) in effect at the time the wages are payable,

whichever is less. In the case of wages for any pay period other than a week, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall by regulation prescribe a multiple of the Federal minimum hourly wage equivalent in effect to that set forth in paragraph (2)."

SEC. 7. Subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding the following sections:

"§ 16–583. No garnishment before judgment

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, prior to entry o judgment in an action against a debtor, the creditor may not obtain an interest in any property of the debtor by attachment, garnishment, or like proceedings.

"§ 16–584. No discharge from employment for garnishment

"No employer shall discharge an employee for the reason that a creditor of the employee has subjected or attempted to subject unpaid earnings of the employee to garnishment or like proceedings directed to the employer for the purpose of paying a judgment."

SEC. 8. (a) The analysis of chapter 33 of title 28 of subtitle II, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"28–3308. Finance charge on direct installment loans."

(b) The analysis of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"36. Motor Vehicle Installment Loans ..... 28–3601.
"37. Revolving Credit Accounts... 28–3701.
"38. Consumer Protections..... 28–3801."

(c) The analysis of subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"16–583. No garnishment before judgment.
"16–584. No discharge from employment for garnishment."

SEC. 9. (a) The Act of February 4, 1913 (relating to the regulation of the business of loaning money in the District of Columbia) (D.C. Code, secs. 26–601—26–611), is amended by adding at the end of that Act the following:

"SEC. 14. (a) No provision of this Act shall apply with respect to any loan, or to the making of any loan—

"(1) to any corporation which is unable to plead any statutes against usury in any action;

"(2) at a rate of interest which does not exceed the maximum lawful rate of interest which would be applicable to such loan but for the provisions of this Act;

"(3) secured on real estate located outside of the District of Columbia;

"(4) to a borrower residing, doing business, or incorporated outside of the District of Columbia; or

"(5) greater than $10,000.

"(b) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the section, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply with respect to any loan made, or to the making of any loan, in the District of Columbia on or after the effective date of such Act of February 4, 1913 (as specified in section 13 of such Act); except that such amendment shall not apply with respect to any loan made, or to the making of any loan, in the District of Columbia concerning which an action under such Act of February 4, 1913, has been filed in a court of competent jurisdiction on or before November 10, 1971.

SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1971".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 30, line 13, strike out "false" and immediately following "of any" insert "false".

Page 38, in the matter immediately following line 6, strike out "District" and insert in lieu thereof "Direct".

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

Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H.R. 12115, as amended, as set forth in the committee report, are—

First. To establish maximum interest ceiling rates in connection with direct installment loans and direct automobile installment loans.

Second. To establish maximum credit service charge rates for revolving credit accounts including credit cards, growing out of retail sales in the District of Columbia.

Third. To provide consumers with remedies and safeguards against fraudulent sales, credit, and collection practices.

Fourth. To revise certain elements of the law relating to the garnishment of wages.

Fifth. To restate the limited application of the "Loan Shark" Act thus relieving persons engaged in money lending at lawful interest rates from the terms of the act.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Hearings were held on November 29 and 30, 1971, at which bankers, merchants, the District of Columbia government, representatives of consumer groups and the public testified. The testimony and information received by the Committee, clearly demonstrated the need for changing the existing interest rates, setting maximum interest and service charges for credit sales, and the restatement of the law relating to small, high interest loans in the Nation's Capital.

The Nation's Capital is a 61 square-mile "island" surrounded by the States of Virginia and Maryland. The 11 largest banks of Virginia and Maryland compete for business with District banks by operating on the boundaries of the District by way of branch-banks, bank holding companies, or actual head offices. Competition between the banks of the three neighboring jurisdictions, which should be considerable for the best interests of the public, is impaired by current conditions in the consumer credit field. Significantly, Federal legislation affecting consumer lending by District of Columbia banks has not passed Congress since at least 1902. The sole exception, although banks not specifically mentioned, may be the automobile loan law enacted in 1960.

There are many good reasons why consumer money is not available in the District. Your committee believes one compelling reason is the lack of competition among neighboring banks resulting in a higher interest rate. When banks are hampered in maintaining their comparative position because of an inadequate return in granting a loan, the consumer borrower is often denied the right to make a loan.

SMALL INSTALLMENT LOANS

The record before the committee during recent hearings in late November, preponderates in favor of changing the maximum interest rate ceilings. Mr. L. A. Jennings, chairman of the board, the Riggs National Bank and on behalf of the District of Columbia Bankers Association, testified before the committee that an important phase of banking competition is the ability to make consumer loans, that is, personal unsecured installment loans and direct automobile installment loans, at interest rates which permit a fair profit. Competitive forces are strong in the field of bank lending activity and, if the factors governing the granting of such loans are approximately even, the rates charged by banks are governed by competition. If ceiling rate restrictions require that consumer installment loans be made on about a break-even basis from the standpoint of profit, or at a small operating loss for the average loan, or even at a negligible profit, the lending policy governing the granting of such loans must be unduly conservative because the latitude for a normal small percentage of loan losses does not exist. Banks faced with the dilemma are not competitive with banks able to make consumer installment loans at rates which produce a fair profit. When consumer loans can be made on the latter basis, the lending policy can safely be liberalized to serve far more people. While loan losses under the more liberal policy will increase to some extent, earnings are sufficient to absorb them and provide a reasonable profit to the bank. A better and more constructive job has been done for all concerned.

In the installment credit and small-loan fields, Virginia and Maryland are permitted a ceiling rate enabling banks in those States to make such loans to District of Columbia residents who are frequently denied such loans by District banks because of the lower interest ceilings. Such lower ceilings in the District of Columbia for these types of loans, which involve a higher degree of risk and higher reserves, have caused District of Columbia banks to refuse such loans. This requires District of Columbia residents, and many residents of Virginia and Maryland who work in Washington and also maintain banking relations here, to borrow in Virginia and Maryland at higher but fair rates. The anomalous situation thus exists that borrowers borrow where the interest rates are higher rather than where they are lower. This anomaly is created by lenders frequently refusing to lend at the lower rates which do not compensate for the average losses sustained, and provide no profit margin. Statistics show that the growth of such loans in Virginia and Maryland in 1970 over 1969 was 11.7 percent whereas in the District of Columbia there was a decline of 3.5 percent. This disparity in interest rate ceilings between the District of Columbia and the two States contained in the Washington metropolitan area has produced this inequitable result. The failure to correct it by enacting S. 1938 will further impair the health of consumer credit lending by District of Columbia and the two States contained in competitive advantage to banks across the river in Virginia or across the street in Maryland.

Increasing the maximum interest rate ceilings was also favored by several retail organizations and Benny L. Kass, District of Columbia Commissioner, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, Executive Director, District of Columbia Commission on Interest Rates and Consumer Credit and a leading advocate of consumer protections.

THE LOAN SHARK ACT

To understand the purposes of this section and its importance, it is necessary to briefly review the legislative history of the "loan shark act." Concern over the vicious practices of certain "racketeer" lending operators in the District of Columbia engaging in making small loans at interest rates running as high as 300 percent commanded the attention and condemnation of the Congress from 1911 through 1913 this legislation was actively considered, debated, and was reported from committees and finally enacted by Congress.

The entire thrust of this legislative action by the Congress was directed to the nefarious practices of the small loan sharks. Other lending practices by other financial institutions in the District of Columbia were not in question as a part of the issues involved in this legislation. There was but one purpose in this action by the Congress. When the total of all circumstances and debate and the legislative action is reviewed and understood, the purpose of Congress was to circumscribe this particular type of practice so that it would be under strict control and subject to rigid regulation calling for criminal penalties for violation. There was no purpose, thought, or intent to apply directly or indirectly any of the sanctions prescribed in the "loan shark" act against lending operations by persons or institutions engaging in the lending of money at interest rates which were lawful under the District of Columbia Code.

"LOAN SHARK" LENDING

The practical effect of the statement by the Congress was that those engaged in lending sums of money at rates of interest above the lawful rate, then 6 percent on both oral and written contracts, would be limited to lending sums not greater than $200 to any one person and at interest rates not in excess of 1 percent per month interest. Collateral provisions of the act required a penal bond, licensing and an annual fee of $500, and specified criminal penalties in addition to the loss of principal and interest of any unlawful loan.

In stating the provisions of the act, the Congress expressed in a series of sections various portions of the above mentioned provisions and at the close of the act listed the then known institutions engaged in lawful lending to indicate that no provisions of the act were to apply to such lending activity.

At the date of the enactment of the Loan Shark Act, all interest above 6 percent was usurious under law except for the rates prescribed in the "Loan Shark Act" and otherwise provided for pawnbrokers. Thus, the specifying rate of "6 percent interest" in section 1 of the act had the equivalent in intent of the Congress stating "the lawful rate of interest," which if substituted would have accomplished precisely what was intended by the act.

The first change in law of consequence happened in 1920, when the lawful interest rate was restated by Congress as being 6 percent on oral contract and 8 percent on written contract, which provisions of law exists today.

By applying the literal terms of section 1 of the Loan Shark Act rather than the intent, groups, organizations, and associations, not contemplated in 1913 as being financial institutions, who may have made loans after 1920 at the lawful rate but in excess of 6 percent could be found in violation of the Loan Shark Act. However, in that year an action was brought on a debt involving $177,500 secured by a first trust on real estate. If the debtor had prevailed, the lender would have forfeited all interest and the principal amount. The Court, however, held that the loan shark law was in-

tended to apply to small loans only. (*Von Rosen* v. *Dean* (1920, 41 F. 2d 982, 59 App. D.C. 359).)

In the intervening years since the 1920 case, court decisions have gradually altered the interpretation of the law to a point where a question began to grow in the financial community as to whether or not legitimate lending operations could be undertaken absent having the particular name of the type of lending business specifically exempted by the statute. As an offset to the reach of the court in the direction of applying the loan shark statute more widely, the Congress from time to time enacted additional provisions of law naming other types of businesses such as life insurance companies and small investment trust companies, and some nonprofit corporations as lawful businesses except for the expanded applications of the Loan Shark Act.

THE PARKWOOD CASE

The Parkwood decision of November 10 struck with the suddenness of a quake and shook the foundations of financial institutions of the District of Columbia with shock waves to other financial centers in the United States. When the court indicated that the Loan Shark Act "plainly applies to all who are in the business of lending money on a security at a rate of interest in excess of 6 percent, except those types of organizations specifically exempted from coverage" by the act, real estate investment trusts, mortgage bankers, union pension funds, fraternal orders, real estate brokers, charitable foundations, the Federal National Mortgage Association and numerous others found themselves exposed to financial strangulation. The consequence of cancellation of $1 billion of mortgage debt and interest due thereon appeared to be imminent.

In committee hearings, every type of financial institution joined in the expression of alarm and the urgency of immediate action by the Congress to restate the application of the Loan Shark Act so as to prevent the catastrophic losses.

RESTATEMENT OF INTEREST

Our committee approached these problems with the concept that if the full purpose and intent of the Loan Shark Act, as to its limited application, were made effective, the difficulties of the financial community would be erased. All loans in excess of $200 would be exempt from application of the act and only those of $200 or less, on which the interest rate was in excess of the lawful rate up to a maximum of 1 percent a month, would be covered.

The principles of equity would be obtained in that the parties to a contract would remain to the position which they held at the time of voluntarily entering into an agreement with mutual considerations, complying with the existing law as it was then understood and interpreted. No windfall and no unjust enrichment may arise from such an application of the intent which was embodied in the Loan Shark Act and effective until recent years.

The provisions of the Loan Shark Act are amended by section 9 of this bill in several respects, adding a new section 14 to the act.

The new section makes its terms inapplicable to any loan or making of any loan—

First, to corporations which may not legally plead the defense of usury;

Second, loans which carry an interest rate not in excess of the lawful rate of interest;

Third, loans secured on real estate located outside the District of Columbia;

Fourth, loans to borrowers residing, doing business, or incorporated outside the District; and

Fifth, loans greater than $10,000 in amount.

Subsection (b) of the new section, states a customary saving clause.

Subsection 9(b) of the bill provides that the terms of the amendment shall be considered as effective from the date of enactment of the act except that such amendment shall not apply with respect to any loan made or the making of a loan which is the subject of an action in the District of Columbia under the act of February 4, 1913, which was filed in court on or before November 10, 1971.

As to this latter provision, our committee is aware of the legislative approach used by the Congress to support the full intent and purpose of the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 84, 29 U.S.C. 251–62) which became necessary as a result of the decision in *Anderson* v. *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.* (238 U.S. 680). This new section restating the essence of the Loan Shark Act as a statute of very limited applicability, is a milder but equally purposeful legislative action toward assuring the application of the act within its real context and intent.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter in support of this legislation:

WILKES & ARTIS,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1971.

HON. JOHN L. MCMILLAN and
HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am special counsel for the Mortgage Bankers Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc. and am writing this letter at the request of Mr. Denzil O. Nichols, President of the Association.

We have examined the language of Section 9 of HR 12115 and believe it will give the relief which is so urgently needed as a result of the Parkwood decision. Aside from mere editorial changes, it is the language which we agreed upon with Neighborhood Legal Services and which they found satisfactory from their standpoint.

Let me again urge immediate enactment of this Bill. We know of well over one billion dollars of mortgages which have either been voided or their validity cast into grave doubt by the Parkwood case. We are entirely satisfied that there are many hundreds of millions, and perhaps billions, of dollars of other mortgages in the same situation. These mortgages are held by pension trust funds, charitable organizations, savings and loan associations, commercial banks, life insurance companies, individuals whose life savings are represented thereby and many other persons and organizations.

Unless this Bill is enacted and these mortgages validated in accordance with the original intent of the parties and unless this action is taken at the earliest possible moment, we cannot foresee exactly what will occur but we are certain that the financial repercussions will be disastrous for many, many investors, quite possibly reaching into every state in the Union.

Among the immediate local consequences which have already occurred has been the stopping, in the midst of construction, of a number of projects for low income and elderly persons. It has also dramatically curtailed sources of funds for much needed future building projects.

While Section 9 is commonly referred to as the "Mortgage Bankers" portion of the Bill, let me assure you that this is a misnomer. It is true that the failure to obtain relief would probably wipe out the entire mortgage banking industry in the District of Columbia but this would represent only a tiny fraction (estimated at not more than 2%) of the losses which would be entailed. The remaining 98% of the losses would be sustained by the recipients of the pensions from the affected pension trust funds, the beneficiaries of the charitable organizations, the policy holders of the life insurance companies and other individuals located throughout the United States.

Your assistance in preventing this financial debacle is urgently solicited. Our industry is not directly involved in any other portion of the Bill but we have found no objectionable provisions therein.

Respectfully,

LOUIS H. MANN.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, while it is somewhat doubtful, nevertheless out of precaution and the desire to facilitate matters, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us some indication what these reports might be?

Mr. COLMER. Yes, if the gentleman will permit, I will try to reply in my own rather befuddled mind about what the situation is right now—as the gentleman from Iowa is perfectly aware—there are a couple of rather controversial matters that are in conference, one of which is the foreign aid bill and the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

These conferees have been unable to come to any conclusion. They are still manipulating, or dickering, or conferring, I guess would be the word to use and the Committee on Rules had scheduled a meeting for 11:30 this morning to hear these Members, or at least one of them, but because of the matters I have just stated, the status of the meeting was called off.

Now I do not know just what is going to happen any more than the gentleman from Iowa does. But that is the status of it and that is the reason for this request.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman have breakfast this morning before the meeting at 7:30 o'clock was called off? Did the gentleman say it was 7:30 this morning?

Mr. COLMER. No, it was at 11:30 a.m.

Mr. GROSS. I understood the gentleman to say the meeting was called for 7:30 a.m.

Mr. COLMER. No, this was before lunch that the meeting was scheduled and not before breakfast.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has done it again. They have handed down a ridiculous ruling which, if we do not correct its impact by the pending legislation, will have a disastrous and devastating effect on the economic health and well-being of the Nation's Capital. The legislation we have before us at this time is designed to correct that ruling, and therefore, I feel that it is one of the most important bills that we have had before this House affecting the District of Columbia in many years. I consider it emergency legislation. This Congress must pass this bill, and we must pass it before this Congress adjourns.

Everyone who has participated in the hearings and knows anything about this bill and its background agrees that it is emergency legislation and must be passed.

The basic thrust of the bill, therefore, is actually not controversial. The only disagreement that we have ever had concerning this legislation is whether or not we should consolidate, along with this matter, other problems that we would like to resolve. In other words, the question is whether other legislation should ride piggyback by means of the passage of this legislation in this Congress, legislation that all of us agree must be passed.

There is nothing improper about that procedure, and our colleagues who want other matters considered are sincere in their desire to get this other legislation passed. We have heard what could be considered to be threats from some of our colleagues who have said that if certain matters were not included along with this legislation, they would do all they could to defeat the bill. In fact, we have heard threats from the other body that if certain matters, such as consumer legislation, were not included along with legislation on this particular problem, the other body would not pass the legislation.

This is most serious. This problem must be resolved before this Congress adjourns, and I hope my colleagues will not insist that we burn down the barn to get at the rats, and insist that the bill be perfect in all other respects before it will have their support.

We have tried to compromise this matter, and to compromise with those who wanted other matters included. We have tried to take those other matters out of the bill when we heard threats that it would not otherwise obtain the support of certain colleagues. Then we put certain matters back into the bill with various amendments. As a result, we think we now have a reasonable compromise which our colleagues can support in the bill we now have before us.

I have heard this bill labeled as a banker's bill. Actually, there is nothing wrong with this House or this Congress considering legislation affecting the banking industry just the same as any other industry. But to label this bill as a banker's bill, helping only the bankers, is not true. That is an unfair label to place upon this bill.

If the problem of mortgage loans in the District is not resolved by the passage of this legislation, thousands upon thousands of people in the Nation's Capital will be affected adversely, little people as well as big people. There will be tens of thousands of workers in the construction industry who will be laid off because of a drying up of mortgage loan funds here in the Nation's Capital. There will be many low-income people, low-income tenants who will be denied homes because construction will come to a halt. Millions of dollars in pension funds will evaporate, and millions of dollars in life savings of many individuals will be destroyed.

I would say that if this legislation fails to pass, the large-income people in the Nation's Capital will survive somehow. It is the low-income people, the little people, who will be primarily affected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. So, Mr. Speaker, to label this bill as a special interest bill, a mortgage banker's bill, or as a big money bill is demagoguery in its worst form.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, what is the cause of this problem we have before us here today?

In 1913, the Congress passed a bill which has come to be known as the District of Columbia loan shark law. At that time, the legal limit for interest rates in the District of Columbia was 6 percent, but those who were in the marginal categories, those who needed small loans and who could not qualify for loans at the normal rate of 6 percent, were being charged usurious rates up to as high as 300 percent in some instances. In an effort to correct that evil, and at the same time help the marginal and low-income people obtain some credit, the Congress passed a law that provided that for loans not exceeding $200, under a special license that would be obtained, money could be loaned at a rate as high as 12 percent per annum.

The law was not intended to apply to mortgage loans made by banks and savings and loan associations, and institutions of that sort.

In 1920, the Congress increased the interest rate on loans made on written contracts from 6 percent to 8 percent. At that time, in 1920, a suit was filed charging that a first trust in the amount of $177,000 was in violation of this loan shark law enacted in 1913. The court ruled at that time that the loan shark law was not intended to apply to first mortgage loans, but since that time there have been several suits filed and several further interpretations of the courts that have placed the question in doubt as to whether or not this 1913 law applies only to small loans up to $200.

So Congress from time to time amended the law, and brought in banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies in order to make it abundantly clear over and over again that the act of 1913 was to apply only to small loans not in excess of $200.

Now the courts in a recent ruling, in the decision on Parkwood, Inc. against Equitable Life Insurance Co., has stated that the Loan Shark Act applies to all who are in the business of lending money on a security at a rate in excess of 6 percent, except organizations specifically exempted from its provisions. This meant that mortgage loans made by banks in the District, or by life insurance companies prior to their exemption in 1963, would be null and void as to both principal and interest.

If this decision is allowed to stand, it would result in the loss of approximately $1 billion in mortgage loans made in good faith by financial institutions in the District of Columbia. And this will affect not only the mortgage bankers—in fact, I question whether mortgage bankers would suffer as much as other groups, because in most instances the mortgage bankers who made these loans have sold the loans to banks and savings and loan institutions, and these are the people who will suffer the loss if this ruling is allowed to stand. It would cut off all funds that would be payable to the Redevelopment Agencies, and the buyers of low-income housing, and all those who would benefit from low-income housing. It will also result in construction workers being laid off, so that there would be thousands of additional unemployed in the Nation's Capital, and thousands of people who would be homeless.

As I say, this problem affects practically every form of banking institution, savings and loan institution, and mortgage lending institution in this Nation's Capital. If this bill does not pass, this Parkwood case decision will result not only in the loss of $1 billion in these loans going back over a period of 58 years, but will dry up all mortgage funds in the Nation's Capital which are necessary to assure an economically healthy community.

Mr. Speaker, let me give a more detailed explanation of this vitally important bill, which seeks to amend certain provisions in present District of Columbia law relating to interest rates and usury, specifically by providing the following:

First. Maximum interest rates in connection with direct installment loans and automobile installment loans.

Second. Maximum credit service charge rates for revolving credit accounts growing out of retail sales.

Third. Revision of certain aspects of garnishment of wages.

Fourth. Remedies to safeguard consumers from fraudulent sales, credit, and collection practices.

Fifth. Exemption from the usury statute for mortgage banking and real estate investment trusts, and making retroactive the present exemption of life insurance companies and small business investment companies.

The last-named of these provisions of H.R. 12115, that to protect the makers of mortgage loans from a grossly inequitable inclusion under the usury statute, I regard as a highly important section of this proposed legislation.

The District of Columbia Loan Shark Act was enacted in 1913, and provided that it would be unlawful to engage in the business of lending money in the District of Columbia at a rate greater than 6 percent without procuring a license. Such a licensee could charge as much as 12 percent per annum, but only on loans not in excess of $200. It is quite obvious that the Congress at that time had no intent of prescribing these sanctions against lending operations by any persons or institutions who engaged in the lending of money at interest rates which are lawful under the District of Columbia code. Rather, this act was aimed at small loan sharks who at that time were engaged in the nefarious business of lending money in small loan amounts at rates up to as much as 300 percent in some instances. It should be mentioned at this point that in 1913, all interest rates higher than 6-percent were usurious under District of Columbia law except as provided under the Loan Shark Act at that time, as mentioned above, or as prescribed specifically for pawn brokers.

It was not until 1920 that it became legally possible to make loans in the District at a rate in excess of 6 percent, other than in the case of persons licensed under the Loan Shark Act or the Pawnbrokers Act. The act of April 19, 1920, provided a lawful rate of interest of 6 percent on oral contracts and 8 percent on written contracts, which provisions of law exist today.

Because it was possible, by applying the terms of section 1 of the Loan Shark Act literally and without regard to intent, for organizations not in existence in 1913, or not contemplated at that time as being financial institutions, and who may have made loans after 1920 at the then lawful rate but in excess of 6 percent, to be found in violation of the Loan Shark Act, the Congress enacted from time to time additional provisions of law exempting other type businesses, such as life insurance companies, small investment trust companies, and some nonprofit corporations from the loan shark law. These exemptions were prospective, of course, from their time of enactment, and not retroactive. Meanwhile, in the interval between 1913 and 1920, District of Columbia courts on several occasions had ruled that the Loan Shark Act applied only to small loans. Also, the licensing authorities of the District of Columbia have consistently taken the position that a real estate broker, including one who loaned his own money, was exempt from licensing under the loan shark law.

It came as a bombshell, therefore, when on November 10, 1971, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia decided, in the case of in re: Parkwood, Inc., by a 2-to-1 decision, that contrary to the long-standing interpretation of the District of Columbia Loan Shark Act by the District of Columbia officials in charge of administering it, that the Loan Shark Act "plainly applies to all who are in the business of lending money on a security at a rate in excess of 6 percent, except those types of organizations specifically exempted from coverage" by the act. By reason of this decision, real estate investment trusts, mortgage bankers, union pension funds, fraternal orders, real estate brokers, charitable foundations, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and numerous others were immediately exposed to financial disaster as more than a billion dollars in mortgage loans were placed in jeopardy as to the lenders, who stood to lose not only their interest but the principal of their loans as well. This decision also affects life insurance companies for their activities in lending prior to 1963, as well as small business investment companies in regard to loans made by them prior to 1960, because those were the years in which these organizations received their respective exemptions from the Loan Shark Act, but not on a retroactive basis.

I wish to point out that the devastating consequences of the Parkwood decision are not limited to the lenders and their customers. The funds pumped into the economy of the Metropolitan Washington area by large-scale lenders are essential to a large segment of the area's economy. For example, construction contractors will be obliged to lay off workers and to withhold paychecks as a result of the lenders being forced to cease advancing funds on existing and new construction loans. Similarly, the serious effects of this decision on the residential housing market are illustrated by the fact that 30 to 50 percent of the transfers of single family residences in this area are financed through such sources. At this time, a number of scheduled closings on such houses have been delayed by the Parkwood decision.

Under the present uncertain state of the law, many lenders will simply withdraw from the District of Columbia loan market, because they could suffer the penalty of having their loans declared void. Obviously, they will lend their money in a market where this problem does not exist. Thus, unless this problem is remedied immediately, the entire financial community in the Washington metropolitan area will be thrown into chaos, and the total extent of the repercussions cannot now even be estimated.

It is critically important, therefore, that the Congress take immediate action to head off this disaster, in the public interest, as to allow the effect of this decision to stand would destroy the District of Columbia as an area where normal commerce could be carried on. Many institutions would become bankrupt, including those providing retirement, sick pay, and other benefits to millions of persons; also, many thousands of persons would be put out of work.

In order to avert this impending disaster, section 9 of H.R. 12115 provides a new section 14 to the Loan Shark Act which will make that act inapplicable to:

First. Loans to corporations which may not legally plead the defense of usury;

Second. Loans which carry an interest rate not in excess of the lawful rate of interest;

Third. Loans secured on real estate located outside the District of Columbia;

Fourth. Loans to borrowers residing, doing business, or incorporated outside the District; and

Fifth. Loans greater than $10,000 in amount.

This section provides also that the terms of this amendment shall be effective from the date of enactment of the Loan Shark Act, or February 4, 1913, except that such amendment shall not apply with respect to any loan made which is subject to an action in the District of Columbia under the Loan Shark Act, which action was filed in court on or before November 10, 1971, the date of the Parkwood decision.

These provisions in section 9 will simply assure that the parties to a contract will be restored to the position which they held at the time they voluntarily entered into an agreement, complying with the existing law as it was understood and interpreted. No windfall or unjust enrichment may result from the enactment of these amendments to the Loan Shark Act. Hence, I consider them to be entirely equitable and constructive.

This bill also establishes new maximum interest rates on direct installment loans and direct automobile installment loans by authorizing any federally insured bank or savings and loan association financing loans up to $25,000 in the District to contract for finance charges not in excess of 11.5 percent, and also to charge that same rate of interest on the unpaid balances of principal on direct motor vehicle installment loans. Direct installment motor vehicle loans are those which are made to an owner who pledges the automobile as security.

These provisions are supported by all the banks in the District of Columbia, all local savings and loan associations, major retailers, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

While there are many reasons why consumer loan money is not available at present in the District of Columbia, it is my opinion that one of the main reasons is the current lack of competition among neighboring banks in this area. The 11 largest banks of Virginia and Maryland operate on the borders of the District by means of branch banks, banks owned by holding companies, or actual head offices. Competition between the nearby banks of these two States and those in the District of Columbia in the matter of consumer credit borrowing, which should be intense for the best interests of the public, is presently much impaired by current conditions in the consumer credit field.

This is true because the laws of Virginia and Maryland permit interest rates on installment loans by such institutions higher than the 8 percent which is the ceiling in the District. Under present con-

ditions, the cost to the banks in the District of Columbia of making installment loans is such that there is little or no profit to the lending institutions. For this reason, the banks in the District of Columbia are frequently refusing to grant such loans. As a result, District of Columbia residents as well as many residents of Virginia and Maryland who work in the District, are forced to borrow in the neighboring States, even though the interest rates there are higher.

There is no question that this provision in H.R. 12115 will serve to correct this inequitable situation, and restore a measure of health to the banks and savings and loan companies in the District of Columbia by eliminating the present unfair advantage accruing to the lending across the river in Virginia and Maryland.

Another important provision of H.R. 12115 is in section 4 of the bill, and permits a retail seller or financial institution engaged in business in the District to charge a rate not in excess of 1.5 percent—18 percent per annum—per month on that part of the outstanding balance which is $500 or less, and 1 percent—12 percent per annum—per month on that part of this amount which is more than $500.

Revolving credit accounts are an old and well-established method whereby credit is extended in connection with the sale of goods and services on time. Recently, banks have become active in this field. In bank credit card operations, the smaller merchants receive the added advantage of receiving cash turned over to the credit card companies and are relieved of all collection expenses, administrative expense, and bad debt losses of a nonfraudulent nature. A credit card company is literally a paper factory, and is expensive to operate because of the hundreds of thousands of small monthly bills involved. It would be impossible to operate such a company profitably on the basis of a service charge rate equivalent to an 8-percent contract simple interest rate per annum, as the cost of rendering the service far exceeds that amount.

The District of Columbia has only one locally based credit card company, previously referred to as Central Charge Service, Inc., now a subsidiary of the Riggs National Bank. It currently sends out monthly statements to 270,000 card holders, and serves in excess of 6,000 merchants. Competition is provided in very adequate measure by 35 Virginia and Maryland banks with 235 offices in the Metropolitan area who issue Bank Americard and Master Charge cards.

Consumer credit statutes have been enacted fixing a ceiling on finance charges equal to 1.5 percent per month on balances up to $500 and 1 percent per month on the excess in Maryland, and 1.5 percent per month on all balances in Virginia. Although the District of Columbia usury statute is not believed to have any bearing on Central Charge's finance charges, or those of major retail merchants who issue their own credit cards, the legality of these charges, which are the same as the Maryland rates, are now being attacked in the courts as usury. To avoid any need for further litigation on this subject, I submit that this provision in H.R. 12115 will resolve the uncertainty in the revolving credit area, by adopting for the District of Columbia the lesser of the Virginia and Maryland finance charge rates, the lesser—Maryland—being the same as that now in effect in the District. Without such legislation, Central Charge will have no alternative but to go out of business if its finance charges are held to be purely interest and subject to the 8 percent per annum contract simple interest ceiling rate. This would indeed be unfortunate for business in the District of Columbia.

Other provisions of this proposed legislation will serve to safeguard consumers in the District from fraudulent sales, credit, and collection practices. For example, buyers who feel they have been deceived by high-pressure, door-to-door salesmen will have a 3-day period after signing in which they may cancel a contract. Buyers may also refuse to make payments on merchandise which is defected, even if the contract has been sold to a finance company or other third party. The bill also outlaws "balloon payment" installment buying contracts calling for low payments until the last, which is ballooned into a much larger payment than the others. At present, when a buyer cannot meet such a ballooned final payment, the merchandise is repossessed.

Further, the bill will allow courts to void a sales agreement in cases where the intent was to defraud the buyer in an "unconscionable manner." There have been cases in which a person caught in such circumstances has been found by a court to owe a legitimate debt, and given 30 days in which to pay.

The bill includes certain changes in the present law relating to garnishment of wages in the District. Garnishment, of course, is the procedure by which a creditor can collect a debt by getting a portion of the debtor's wages direct from his employer. This provision will allow garnishment of as much as 25 percent of an employee's disposable wages for a given week—which means that part of his earnings remaining after the deduction of any amounts required by law to be withheld—or the amount by which the employee's disposable wages for that week exceed 30 times the Federal minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act in effect at that time—whichever is the lesser amount. This would amount, in effect, to a garnishment limit of about $80 a month from a wage earner who has a take-home pay of $325.

It is further provided that no creditor may attach any debtor's property, by attachment or garnishment, before a court decision has been made as to the validity of the debt. Also, no employee may be discharged by reason of a garnishment or like proceeding by a creditor directly to the employer for the purpose of paying a judgment.

I feel these provisions to be fair and equitable, for the wage earners and the collection agencies alike.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains provisions which are urgently needed to assure the economic well-being of the District of Columbia and its citizens. I urge its prompt enactment.

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

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe this is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will deal with in this session.

Very frankly, in the committee I made the motion to separate the consumer protection provision and the mortgage banker provision in the bill because certain groups had not testified at the hearings. But after our committee meeting December 7, we found that all business community elements could support a combined bill. So, while we did not have adequate time on December 7 to ask the questions which I believe needed to be asked and have answered, and to give necessary consideration we reported out only S. 1938 that day without consumer provisions. When one is in doubt one certainly takes the cautious course, which I did.

I later found there was some danger that we would lose the bill dealing with the mortgage situation in the District of Columbia if it did not contain consumer provisions even though the consumer provisions were in a separate reported bill. I then made extensive investigation with all the groups and found that the legislation as presently drafted was acceptable to the District of Columbia Bankers Association, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the American Collectors Association, Incorporated.

Rather than take a chance of losing these measures—in this case, in my judgment, particularly the one dealing with the mortgage loan situation that now prevails because of the Packwood decision—I then supported the bill that put them both together.

I want to say that the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HUNGATE, held the hearings on these matters and did a fine job. Really the bill that we now have before us, H.R. 12115, is pretty much the bill that Congressman HUNGATE worked on, and perfected, and I believe it is a good measure. I congratulate him for a fine job.

I should like to call to your attention that there is about a billion dollars of financing in the District of Columbia that is in jeopardy because of the fact that in the original legislation they set up revisions in the usury laws, and while the mortgage bankers specifically were not mentioned, our U.S. Circuit Court in the District of Columbia has held the 1913 loan shark law applied to mortgages. I do not believe that was the intention of Congress in 1913, but the law as interpreted states that only those who were mentioned were exempt. In this case mortgage bankers were not mentioned as exempt, as I understand it.

In my judgment, if we can permit one banker to enjoy the benefit of the laws of the land there should be no reason why the other group should not likewise be involved.

May I say further that the total development program, urban renewal in the District of Columbia, is involved, and this city would be in turmoil if some-

thing is not done on this bill. District of Columbia redevelopment land officials support it, Neighborhood Legal Services Counsel supports it, and it is desperately needed.

So we have tried to fairly approach this and put it back together in a manner which I believe is correct and proper. Some provisions of the original bill were stricken. Some amendments were put in that found acceptance.

I have asked local counsel to examine the language of section 9 of H.R. 12115 and I believe it will give the relief which is so urgently needed as a result of the Parkwood decision. Aside from mere editorial changes, it is the language which was agreed upon between the Neighborhood Legal Services which they found satisfactory from their standpoint and the Mortgage Bankers Association.

Let me again urge immediate enactment of this bill. We know of well over $1 billion of mortgages which have either been voided or their validity cast into grave doubt by the Packwood case. We in the committee are entirely satisfied that there are many hundreds of millions, and perhaps billions, of dollars of other mortgages in the same situation. These mortgages are held by pension trust funds, charitable organizations, savings and loan associations, commercial banks, life insurance companies, individuals whose life savings are represented thereby and many other persons and organizations.

Unless this bill is enacted and these mortgages validated in accordance with the original intent of the parties and unless this action is taken at the earliest possible moment, we cannot foresee exactly what will occur but we are certain that the financial repercussions will be disastrous for many, many investors, quite reaching into every State in the Union.

Among the immediate local consequences which have already occurred has been the stopping, in the midst of construction, of a number of projects for low-income and elderly persons. It has also drastically curtailed sources of funds for much needed future building projects.

While section 8 is commonly referred to as the "mortgage bankers" portion of the bill, let me assure you that this is a misnomer. It is true that the failure to obtain relief would probably wipe out the entire mortgage banking industry in the District of Columbia but this would represent only a tiny fraction—estimated at not more than 2 percent—of the losses which would be entailed. The remaining 98 percent of the losses would be sustained by the recipients of the pensions from the affected pension trust funds, the beneficiaries of the charitable organizations, the policy holders of the life insurance companies and other individuals located throughout the United States.

I believe the bill is a good bill and I hope it will be passed.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12115, the House version of the bill passed by the Senate (S. 1938) revising interest rates in the District of Columbia and providing much-needed protections for borrowers.

The most highly publicized provision of the bill, and the most difficult from a drafting point of view, was section 9, dealing with the exemption of certain kinds of loans from the operation of the loan shark law. I am pleased that the committee was able to agree on language which provides the necessary protection to large institutional lenders without jeopardizing the rights of consumers who have been victimized by loan sharks. The committee also had to deal with the difficult problem of providing retroactive protection without overstepping constitutional limits. Here too the committee did a creditable job.

Lest there be any misunderstanding of the intent of the committee regarding the retroactivity of the changes effected by section 9, it should be made clear that no such retroactivity is intended to attach to the changes in the usury rate as defined in section 28–3303 of the D.C. Code. The new interest rate ceiling is prospective only. There is no intention to affect cases which may be pending or contemplated, involving loans which were made before the passage of this bill at interest rates in excess of those permitted by the usury laws of the District of Columbia.

All in all, H.R. 12115 represents a responsible effort to alleviate the problems of lenders and borrowers alike in the District of Columbia. It enjoys the support of the financial community and of consumer interests. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 1938) to amend certain provisions of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, relating to interest and usury, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the Senate bill the same bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. No. We will strike out all after the enacting clause and place what our committee endorsed in the Senate bill. We will substitute the House language for the Senate language.

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

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It embraces the same subject. This is merely a parliamentary procedure in order to get the Senate bill before the other body as amended by the House provisions. It embraces the same subject, with the exception of a few minor amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 1938

An act to amend certain provisions of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, relating to interest and usury

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the text of section 28–3301 of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided in section 28–3308, chapter 36 and chapter 39 of this subtitle, the parties to an instrument in writing for the payment of money at a future time may contract therein for the payment of interest on the principal amount thereof at a rate not exceeding 8 percent per annum."

SEC. 2. The text of clause (2) in the first sentence of section 28–3303 of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) in writing, to pay a greater rate than is permitted under section 28–3301 or 28–3308 or under chapter 36 or 39 of this subtitle, the creditor shall forfeit the whole of the interest so contracted to be received."

SEC. 3. Chapter 33 of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding the following section:

"§ 28–3308. Finance charge on direct installment loans

"(a) On a loan in which the principal does not exceed $25,000 (other than a loan directly secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of this subtitle) to be repaid in equal or substantially equal monthly, or other periodic, installments, any federally insured bank or savings and loan association doing business in the District of Columbia may contract for and receive interest at the rate permitted under this chapter or, in lieu of such interest, a finance charge which, if expressed as an annual percentage rate, does not exceed a rate of 11½ percent per annum on the unpaid balances of principal. This section does not limit or restrict the manner of contracting for the finance charge, whether by way of discount, add-on, or simple interest, so long as the annual percentage rate of the finance charge does not exceed that permitted by this section.

"(b) If such installment loan is precomputed,

"(1) the finance charge may be calculated on the assumption that all scheduled payments will be made when due, and

"(2) except as provided in subsection (c), upon prepayment in full of the unpaid balance of a precomputed direct installment loan, refinancing, or consolidation, an amount not less than the unearned portion of the finance charge calculated according to this section shall be rebated to the debtor. If the rebate otherwise required is less than $1, no rebate need be made.

"(c) Upon prepayment in full of such direct installment loan other than a refinancing or consolidation, whether or not precomputed, the lender may collect or retain a minimum charge within the limits stated in this section if the finance charge earned at the time of prepayment is less than any minimum charge contracted for. The minimum charge may not exceed the smaller of the following: (1) the amount of the finance charge contracted for, or (2) $5 in a transaction which had a principal of $75 or less, or $7.50 in a transaction which had a principal of more than $75.

"(d) The unearned portion of the finance

charge is a fraction of the finance charge of which the numerator is the sum of the periodic balances scheduled to follow the computational period in which the prepayment occurs, and the denominator is the sum of all periodic balances under either the related loan agreement or, if the balance owing resulted from a refinancing or a consolidation, under the related refinancing agreement or consolidation agreement.

"(e) As used in this section, 'finance charge', and 'annual percentage rate' shall have the respective meanings under the provisions of the Truth-in-Lending Act (82 Stat. 146 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and the regulations and interpretations thereunder; and 'federally insured bank or savings and loan association' means an insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or an 'insured institution' as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act."

SEC. 4. Subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following chapters:

"Chapter 36.—DIRECT MOTOR VEHICLE INSTALLMENT LOANS

"§ 28–3601. Direct motor vehicle installment loans

"The provisions of the Act approved April 22, 1960 (Public Law 86–431, 74 Stat., 69; D.C. Code, 1967 ed., chapter 9 of title 40), covering installment sales of motor vehicles, as amended, and the regulations issued thereunder, shall apply, to the extent appropriate, to a direct installment loan, secured by a security interest in a motor vehicle, made by a federally insured bank or savings and loan association doing business in the District of Columbia, subject to section 28–3602.

"§ 28–3602. Finance charge

"Such a bank or savings and loan association may contract for and receive interest at the rate provided for in chapter 33 or, in lieu of such interest, a finance charge which, if expressed as an annual percentage rate, does not exceed a rate of 11½ percent per annum on the unpaid balances of principal.

"§ 28–3603. Definitions

"As used in this chapter, 'finance charge' and 'annual percentage rate' shall have the respective meanings under the provisions of the Truth-in-Lending Act (82 Stat. 146 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and the regulations and interpretations thereunder; and 'federally insured bank or savings and loan association' means an insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or an 'insured institution' as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act.

"Chapter 37.—REVOLVING CREDIT ACCOUNTS

"§ 28–3701. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) 'revolving credit account' means an arrangement between a seller or financial institution and a buyer pursuant to which (A) the seller may permit the buyer to purchase goods or services on credit either from the seller or by use of a credit card or other device, whether issued by the seller or a financial institution, (B) the unpaid balances of amounts financed arising from purchases and the credit service and other appropriate charges are debited to an account, (C) a credit service charge if made is not precomputed but is computed on an outstanding unpaid balance of the buyer's account from time to time, and (D) the buyer has the privilege of paying the balances in full or in installments.

"(2) 'credit service charge' means the sum of (A) all charges payable directly or indirectly by the buyer and imposed directly or indirectly by the seller as an incident to the extension of credit, including any of the following types of charges which are applicable; time price differential, service, carrying or other charge, however denominated, premium or other charge for any guarantee or insurance protecting the seller against the buyer's default or other credit loss; (B) charges incurred for investigating the collateral or credit-worthiness of the buyer or for commissions or brokerage for obtaining the credit, irrespective of the person to whom the charges are paid or payable, unless the seller had no notice of the charges when the credit was granted.

"(3) 'seller' means a person engaged in the District of Columbia in the business of selling goods or services to retail buyers.

"(4) 'buyer' means a person who buys goods or obtains services from a seller pursuant to a retail credit sale and not principally for the purpose of resale; and includes a person who enters into a prior agreement with a financial institution whereby the latter agrees to pay the debts of the buyer as they accrue at various retail sellers, designated by the financial institution, in consideration of the buyer paying to the financial institution the cash sales price plus the credit service charge on the purchase.

"(5) 'person' includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, trust, joint stock company, or any other group of persons however organized.

"(6) 'financial institution' means a person who enters into an agreement with a buyer whereby the former agrees to extend credit to the buyer and to apply it as directed by the buyer pursuant to a credit card issued to the buyer by the financial institution; and this term includes any federally insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act doing business in the District of Columbia.

"§ 28–3702. Amount and computation of credit service charge

"(a) The seller or financial institution may contract for the payment by the buyer of a credit service charge not exceeding that permitted by this section.

"(b) A credit service charge may be made in each billing cycle. For the purpose of computing the outstanding balance subject to the credit service charge, (1) the outstanding balance on any day shall consist of an amount which shall not exceed the sum of the total charges to the account less the amount paid or credited to the account prior to such day, or (2) the outstanding balance may be computed by the average daily balance method. The credit service charge may also be computed for all outstanding balances within a range of not in excess of $10 on the basis of the median amount within such range if as so computed such credit service charge is applied to all outstanding balance within such range.

"(c) If the billing cycle is monthly, the charge may not exceed 1½ percent of that part of the outstanding balance which is $500 or less and 1 percent on that part of this amount which is more than $500. If the billing cycle is not monthly, the maximum charge is that percentage which bears the relation to the applicable monthly percentage as the number of days in the billing cycle bears to thirty. For the purposes of this section, a variation of not more than four days from month to month is 'the same day of the billing cycle'."

"Chapter 38.—CONSUMER PROTECTIONS

"§ 28–3801. Scope—Limitation on agreements and practices

"This chapter applies to actions to enforce rights arising from a consumer credit sale or a direct installment loan.

"§ 28–3802. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) 'revolving credit account' means a revolving credit account as defined in section 28–3701 of this subtitle.

"(2) 'consumer credit sale' means a sale of goods or services in which—

"(A) credit is granted by a person who regularly engages as a seller in credit transactions of the same kind;

"(B) the buyer is a natural person;

"(C) the goods or services are purchased primarily for a personal, family, household, or agricultural purpose;

"(D) either the debt is payable in installments or a finance charge is made; and

"(E) the amount financed does not exceed $25,000.

The term includes any contract in the form of a bailment or lease if the bailee or lessee contracts to pay as compensation for use a sum substantially equivalent to or in excess of the aggregate value of the property and services involved and it is agreed that the bailee or lessee will become, or for no other or a nominal consideration has the option to become, the owner of the property upon full compliance with his obligations under the contract.

"(3) 'direct installment loan' means a direct installment loan as that term is used in section 28–3308 of this subtitle and does not include a loan secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of this subtitle.

"(4) 'cross collateral' means an arrangement wherein a seller in a 'consumer credit sale' secures a debt arising from the sale by contracting for a security interest in other property if as a result of a prior sale the seller has an existing security interest in the other property. The seller may also contract for a security interest in the property sold in the subsequent sale as a security for the previous debt.

"§ 28–3803. Balloon payments

"With respect to a consumer credit sale or direct installment loans except for revolving credit accounts:

"(1) No creditor shall at any time enter into an agreement which contains or anticipates a schedule of payments under which any one payment is not equal or substantially equal to all other payments, excluding any final payment which is less than the average of previous payments or any down payment received by the creditor contemporaneously with or prior to the consummation of the transaction, or under which the intervals between any consecutive payments differ substantially.

"(2) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, where a consumer's livelihood is dependent upon seasonal or intermittent income, the parties may agree in a separate writing that one or more payments or the intervals between one or more payments may be reduced or expanded in accordance with the needs of the consumer if such payments are expressly related to the consumer's income. The separate writing shall contain a conspicuous notice directly above the signature line stating: "I waive my right to have all payments to be made under this agreement in substantially equal amounts'.

"(3) In the event that the provisions of paragraph (2) apply, the consumer shall have the right at any time, without further cost or obligation, to revise the schedule of payments to conform both as to amounts and intervals to the average of all installments and intervals.

"§ 28–3804. Assignment of earnings and authorization to confess judgment prohibited

"(a) A creditor may not take an assignment of earnings of the consumer for payment or as security for payment of an obligation arising out of a consumer credit sale or direct installment loan.

"(b) A creditor may not take or accept from the consumer a warrant or power of attorney or other authorization for the creditor, or other person acting on his behalf, to con-

fess judgment arising out of a consumer credit sale or direct installment loan.

"(c) An assignment of earnings or an authorization in violation of this section is subject to the provisions of section 28-3813 (d) (1) of this subtitle.

"§ 28-3805. Debts secured by cross-collateral

"(a) If debts arising from two or more consumer credit sales, other than sales pursuant to a revolving charge account (§ 28-3701), are secured by cross-collateral, or consolidated into one debt payable on a single schedule of payments, and the debt is secured by security interests taken with respect to one or more of the sales, payments received by the seller after the taking of the cross-collateral or the consolidation are deemed, for the purpose of determining the amount of the debt secured by the various security interests, to have been first applied to the payment of the debts arising from the sales first made. To the extent debts are paid according to this section, security interests in items of property terminate as the debts originally incurred with respect to each item are paid.

"(b) Payment received by the seller upon a revolving charge are deemed, for the purpose of determining the amount of the debt secured by the various security interests, to have been applied first to the payment of credit service charges in the order of their entry to the account and then to the payment of debts in the order in which the entries to the account showing the debts were made.

"(c) If the debts consolidated arose from two or more sales made on the same day, payments received by the seller are deemed, for the purpose of determining the amount of the debt secured by the various security interests, to have been applied first to the payment of the smallest debt.

"§ 28-3806. Attorney's fees

"With respect to a consumer credit sale or direct installment loans the agreement may provide for the payment by the consumer of reasonable attorney's fees not in excess of 15 per centum of the unpaid balance of the obligation.

"§ 28-3807. Negotiable instruments prohibited

"(a) In a consumer credit sale, no seller shall take or otherwise arrange for the consumer to sign an instrument, except a check, payable 'to order' or 'to bearer' as evidence of the credit obligation of the consumer.

"(b) Any holder of an instrument prohibited by subsection (a) of this section 28-3807, if he takes it with knowledge of a violation of this section, takes it subject to all claims and defenses of the consumer up to the amount owing on the transaction total at the time of the assignment.

"§ 28-3808. Assignees subject to defenses

"(a) With respect to a consumer credit sale, an assignee of the rights of the seller or lessor is subject to all claims and defenses of the consumer or lessee arising out of the sale notwithstanding any terms or agreements to the contrary, but the assignee's liability under this section may not exceed the amount owing to the assignee at the time of the assignment.

"(b) Rights of the consumer or lessee can only be asserted as a matter of defense to or set-off against a claim by the assignee.

"§ 28-3809. Lender subject to defenses arising from sales

"(a) A lender who makes a direct installment loan for the purpose of enabling a consumer to purchase goods or services is subject to all claims and defenses of the consumer against the seller arising out of the purchase of the goods or service if such lender acts at the express request of the seller, and

"(1) the seller participates in the preparation of the loan instruments, or

"(2) the lender is a person or organization controlled by or under common control with the seller, or

"(3) the seller receives or will receive a fee, compensation, or other consideration from the lender for arranging the loan.

"(b) The lender's liability under this section may not exceed the amount of the loan. Rights of the debtor can only be asserted affirmatively in an action to cancel and void the sale from its inception, or as a matter of defense to or set off against a claim by the lender.

"§ 28-3810. Referral sales

"With respect to a consumer credit sale, the seller or lessor may not give or offer to give a rebate or discount or otherwise pay or offer to pay value to the buyer or lessee as an inducement for a sale or lease in consideration of his giving to the seller or lessor the names of prospective purchasers or lessees, or otherwise aiding the seller or lessor in making a sale or lease to another person, if the earning of the rebate, discount, or other value is contingent upon the occurrence of an event subsequent to the time the buyer or lessee agrees to buy or lease. If a buyer or lessee is induced by a violation of this section to enter into a consumer credit sale, the agreement is unenforceable by the seller or lessor and the buyer or lessee, at his option, may rescind the agreement or retain the goods delivered and the benefit of any services performed, without any obligation to pay for them.

"§ 28-3811. Home solicitation sales

"(a) As used in this section, 'home solicitation sale' means a cash sale or a consumer credit sale of goods, other than farm equipment, or services in which the seller or a person acting for him engages in a personal solicitation of the sale at or near a residence of the buyer and the buyer's agreement or offer to purchase is there given to a seller or a person acting for him. It does not include a sale made pursuant to a preexisting revolving credit account or prior negotiations between the parties at a business establishment at a fixed location where goods or services are offered or exhibited for sale.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), in addition to any right otherwise to revoke an offer, the buyer has the right to cancel a home solicitation sale until midnight of the third business day after the day on which the buyer signs an agreement or offer to purchase which complies with this section.

"(c) Cancellation occurs when the buyer gives written notice of cancellation to the seller at the address stated in the agreement or offer to purchase.

"(d) Notice of cancellation, if given by mail, is given when it is deposited in a mail box properly addressed and the postage prepaid.

"(e) Notice of cancellation given by the buyer need not take a particular form and is sufficient if it indicates by any form of written expression the intention of the buyer not to be bound by the home solicitation sale.

"(f) The lawyer may not cancel a home solicitation sale if the buyer requests the seller to provide goods or services without delay because of an emergency; and

"(1) the seller in good faith makes a substantial beginning of performance of the contract before the buyer gives notice of cancellation; and

"(2) in the case of goods, the goods cannot be returned to the seller in substantially as good condition as when received by the buyer; and

"(3) the buyer has signed separately the following notice which appears under the conspicuous caption: 'WAIVER OF RIGHT TO CANCEL' and reads as follows: 'Because of an emergency I waive any right I may have to cancel this home solicitation sale'.

"(g) (1) In a home solicitation sale, unless the buyer requests the seller to provide goods or services without delay in an emergency, the seller must present to the buyer and obtain his signature to a written agreement or offer to purchase which designates as the date of the transaction the date on which the buyer actually signs and contains a statement of the buyer's rights which complies with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) The statement must—

"(A) appear under this conspicuous caption: "BUYERS RIGHT TO CANCEL', and

"(B) read as follows:

"'If this agreement was solicited at or near your residence and you do not want the goods or services, you may cancel this agreement by mailing a notice to the seller. The notice must say that you do not want the goods or services and must be mailed before midnight of the third business day after you signed this agreement. The notice must be mailed to: _____

_____

(insert name and military address of seller) If you cancel, the seller may not keep any of your cash down payment.'

"(3) Until the seller has complied with this section the buyer may cancel the home solicitation sale by notifying the seller in any manner and by any means of his intention to cancel.

"(h) (1) Except as provided in this section, within ten days after a home solicitation sale has been canceled or an offer to purchase revoked the seller must tender to the buyer any payment made by the buyer and any note or other evidence of indebtedness. A provision permitting the seller to keep all or any part of any payment, note, or evidence of indebtedness is in violation of this section and unenforceable.

"(2) If the down payment includes goods traded in, the goods must be tendered in substantially as good condition as when received by the seller. If the seller fails to tender the goods as provided by this section, the buyer may elect to recover an amount equal to the trade in allowance stated in the agreement.

"(3) The seller is not entitled to retain a cancellation fee.

"(4) Until the seller has complied with the obligations imposed by this section the buyer may retain possession of goods delivered to him by the seller and has a lien on the goods in his possession or control for any recovery to which he is entitled.

"(i) (1) Except as provided by the provisions on retention of goods by the buyer (subsection (h) (4) of this section), within a reasonable time after a home solicitation sale has been canceled or an offer to purchase revoked, the buyer upon demand must tender to the seller any goods delivered by the seller pursuant to the sale but he is not obligated to tender at any place other than his residence. If the seller fails to demand possession of goods within a reasonable time after cancellation or revocation, the goods become the property of the buyer without obligation to pay for them. For the purpose of this section, forty days is presumed to be a reasonable time.

"(2) The buyer has a duty to take reasonable care of the goods in his possession before cancellation or revocation and for a reasonable time thereafter, during which time the goods are otherwise at the seller's risk.

"(3) If the seller has performed any services pursuant to a home solicitation sale prior to its cancellation, the seller is entitled to no compensation.

"§ 28-3812. Limitation on creditors' remedies.

"(a) This section applies to actions or other proceedings to enforce rights arising from consumer credit sales, consumer leases, and direct installment loans (other than a loan directly secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of title 28, District of Columbia Code); and, in addition, to extortionate extensions of credit.

"(b) (1) During the thirty-day period after a default consisting of a failure to pay money the creditor may not because of the default (A) accelerate the unpaid balance of the obligation, (B) bring action against the debtor, or (C) proceed against the collateral.

"(2) Unless the creditor has first (A) notified the debtor that he has elected to accelerate the unpaid balance of the obligation because of default, (B) brought action against the debtor, or (C) proceeded against the collateral, the debtor may cure a default consisting of a failure to pay money by tendering the amount of all unpaid sums due at the time of tender, without acceleration, plus any unpaid delinquency or deferral charges. Cure restores the debtor to his rights under the agreement as though the defaults cured had not occurred.

"(3) Posting of any notice required by law shall be deemed valid if mailed by certified mail to the debtor's last known address.

"(c) (1) The debtor may redeem the collateral from the creditor at any time—

"(A) within fifteen days of the creditor's taking possession of the collateral, or

"(B) thereafter until the creditor has either disposed of the collateral, entered into a contract for its disposition, or gained the right to retain the collateral in satisfaction of the debtor's obligation pursuant to the provisions on disposition of collateral in section 28–9–505 of subtitle I of title 28, District of Columbia Code.

"(2) The debtor may redeem the collateral by tendering fulfillment of all obligations secured by the collateral including reasonable expenses incurred in realizing on the security interest.

"(d) Subject to the provisions in this part, the parties may agree that the creditor has the right to take possession of the collateral on default. In taking possession, a secured party may proceed without judicial process if this can be done without breach of the peace and with consent of the debtor. Those who take the collateral through repossession shall be deemed the agent of the creditor, and the creditor shall be civilly liable for any of the actions of its agents.

"(e) (1) This subsection applies to consumer credit sales of goods or services and to direct installment loans secured by interests in goods.

"(2) A creditor may not maintain a proceeding for a deficiency unless he has disposed of the goods in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner.

"(3) If the creditor repossesses or voluntarily accepts surrender of goods which were the subject of the sale and in which he has a security interest, the consumer is not personally liable to the creditor for the unpaid balance of debt arising from the sale of a commercial unit of goods of which the cash price was $2,000 or less. In that case the creditor is not obligated to resell the collateral unless the consumer has paid 60 percent or more of the cash price and has not signed after default a statement renouncing his rights in the collateral.

"(4) If the creditor takes possession or voluntarily accepts surrender of goods which were not the subject of the sale but in which he has a security interest to secure a debt arising from a sale of goods or services or a combined sale of goods and services and the cash price of the sale was $2,000 or less, the debtor is not personally liable to the creditor for the unpaid balance of the debt arising from the sale and the creditor's duty to dispose of the collateral is governed by the provisions on disposition of collateral in section 28–9–505 of subtitle I of title 28, District of Columbia Code.

"(5) If the creditor takes possession or voluntarily accepts surrender of goods in which he has a security interest to secure a debt arising from a direct installment loan and the net proceeds of the loan paid to or for the benefit of the debtor are $2,000 or less, the consumer is not personally liable to the lender for the unpaid balance of the debt arising from the loan and the lender's duty to dispose of the collateral is governed by the provisions on disposition of collateral in section 28–9–505 of subtitle I of title 28, District of Columbia Code.

"(6) The consumer shall be liable in damages to the creditor if the debtor has wrongfully damaged the collateral or if, after default and demand, the debtor has wrongfully failed to make collateral available to the creditor.

"(7) If the creditor elects to bring an action against the buyer for a debt arising from a consumer credit sale of goods or services, when under this section he would not be entitled to a deficiency judgment if he repossessed the collateral, and obtains judgment—

"(A) he may not repossess the collateral, and

"(B) the collateral is not subject to levy or sale on execution or similar proceedings pursuant to the judgment.

"(f) (1) If it is the understanding of the creditor and the debtor at the time an extension of credit is made that delay in making repayment or failure to make repayment could result in the use of violence or other criminal means to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property to any person, the repayment of the extension of credit is unenforceable through civil judicial processes against the debtor.

"(2) If it is shown that an extension of credit was made at an annual rate exceeding 45 per centum and that the creditor then had a reputation for the use or threat of use of violence or other criminal means to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property of any person to collect extensions of credit or to punish the nonrepayment thereof, there is prima facie evidence that the extension of credit was unenforceable under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(g) (1) With respect to a consumer credit sale, or direct installment loan, if the court as a matter of law finds—

"(A) the agreement to have been unconscionable at the time it was made, or to have been induced by unconscionable conduct, the court may refuse to enforce the agreement, or

"(B) any clause of the agreement to have been unconscionable at the time it was made, the court may refuse to enforce the agreement, or may enforce the remainder of the agreement without the unconscionable clause, or may so limit the application of any unconscionable clause as to avoid any unconscionable result.

"(2) If it is claimed or appears to the court that the agreement or any clause thereof may be unconscionable the parties shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to present evidence as to its setting, purpose, and effect to aid the court in making the determination.

"(3) For the purpose of this section, a charge or practice expressly permitted by this section is not in and of itself unconscionable in the absence of other practices and circumstances.

"§ 28–3813. Consumers' remedies

"(a) The remedies provided by this section shall be liberally administered to the end that the consumer as the aggrieved party shall be put in at least as good a position as if the creditor had fully complied with this chapter. Except as is otherwise specifically provided where there are willful and repeated violations of this chapter consequential and special damages may be had in lieu of the specific penalties allowed, and in addition punitive damages may be had as indicated.

"(b) Any right or obligation declared by this chapter is enforceable by action unless the provision declaring it specifies a different and limited effect.

"(c) 'Transaction total' means—

"(1) in the case of transactions pursuant to open end credit plans or consumer credit transactions, the total of the following calculated as if the amount or amounts financed were paid over the maximum period of the plan or, if there is no such period, over twelve months beginning with the next billing cycle or cycles following the transaction or transactions:

"(A) the amount financed, plus any down payment or required deposit balance, and

"(B) the total finance charge, including any prepaid finance charge;

"(2) in the case of other than open end transactions or consumer credit transactions, the total of the following:

"(A) the amount financed, plus any down payment or required deposit balance, and

"(B) the amount of all precomputed or precomputable finance charge, including any prepaid finance charge.

"(d) (1) In the discretion of the court, a consumer may recover from the person violating this chapter, in addition to the damages the law otherwise allows, 10 percent of the transaction total, if applicable, or $100, whichever is greater, for violations to which this section applies.

"(2) This section also applies to all violations for which no other remedy is specifically provided

"(c) If a consumer prevails in a suit brought under this Act, the court may assess reasonable attorney's fees in addition to any other amounts recoverable under this chapter.

"(f) Any charge, practice, term, clause, provision, security interest, or other action or conduct which can be shown to be in willful violation of the provisions of this chapter shall confer no rights or obligations enforceable by action.

"§ 28–3814. Debt collection

"(a) This section only applies to conduct and practices in connection with collection of obligations arising from consumer credit sales, consumer leases, and direct installment loans (other than a loan directly secured on real estate or a direct motor vehicle installment loan covered by chapter 36 of title 28).

"(b) As used in this section, the term—

"(1) 'claim' means any obligation or alleged obligation, arising from a consumer credit sale, consumer lease, or direct installment loan;

"(2) 'debt collection' means any action, conduct, or practice in connection with the solicitation of claims for collection or in connection with the collection of claims, that are owed or due, or are alleged to be owed or due, a seller or lender by a consumer; and

"(3) 'debt collector' means any person engaging directly or indirectly in debt collection, and includes any person who sells or offers to sell forms represented to be a collection system, device, or scheme intended or calculated to be used to collect claims.

"(c) No debt collector shall collect or attempt to collect any money alleged to be due and owing by means of any threat, coercion, or attempt to coerce in any of the following ways:

"(1) the use, or express or implicit threat of use, of violence or other criminal means, to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property of any person;

"(2) the accusation or threat to falsely accuse any person of fraud or any crime, or any conduct which, if true, would tend to disgrace such other person or in any way subject him to ridicule, or any conduct which, if true, would tend to disgrace such other person or in any way subject him to ridicule or contempt of society;

"(3) false accusations made to another person, including any credit reporting agency, that a consumer has not paid a just debt, or threat to so make such false accusations;

"(4) the threat to sell or assign to another the obligation of the consumer with an at-

tending representation or implication that the result of such sale or assignment would be that the consumer would lose any defense to the claim or would be subjected to harsh, vindictive, or abusive collection attempts; and

"(5) the threat that nonpayment of an alleged claim will result in the arrest of any person.

"(d) No debt collector shall unreasonably oppress, harass, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of or attempt to collect any claim alleged to be due and owing by that person or another in any of the following ways:

"(1) the use of profane or obscene language or language that is intended to unreasonably abuse the hearer or reader;

"(2) the placement of telephone calls without disclosure of the caller's identity or with the intent to harass or threaten any person at the called number; and

"(3) causing expense to any person in the form of long distance telephone tolls, telegram fees, or other charges incurred by a medium of communication, by concealment of the true purpose of the notice, letter, message, or communication.

"(e) No debt collector shall unreasonably publicize information relating to any alleged indebtedness or debtor in any of the following ways:

"(1) the communication of any information relating to a consumer"s indebtedness to any employer or his agent except where such indebtedness has been guaranteed by the employer or the employer has requested the loan giving rise to the indebtedness and except where such communication is in connection with an attachment or execution after judgments as authorized by law;

"(2) the disclosure, publication, or communication of information relating to a consumer's indebtedness to any relative or family member of the consumer unless such person is known to the debt collector to be a member of the same household as the consumer, except through proper legal action or process or at the express and unsolicited request of the relative or family member;

"(3) the disclosure, publication, or communication of any information relating to a consumer's indebtedness by publishing or posting any list of consumers, except for the publication and distribution of "stop lists" to point of sale locations where credit is extended, or by advertising for sale any claim to enforce payment thereof or in any other manner other than through proper legal action, process, or proceeding; and

"(4) the use of any form of communication to the consumer, which ordinarily may be seen by any other persons, that displays or conveys any information about the alleged claim other than the name, address, and phone number of the debt collector.

"(f) No debt collector shall use any fraudulent, deceptive, or misleading representation or means to collect or attempt to collect claims or to obtain information concerning consumers in any of the following ways:

"(1) the use of any name, while engaged in debt collection, other than the debt collector's true name;

"(2) the failure to clearly disclose in all communications made to collect or attempt to collect a claim or to obtain or attempt to obtain information about a consumer, that the debt collector is attempting to collect a claim and that any information obtained will be used for that purpose;

"(3) any false representation that the debt collector has in his possession information or something of value for the consumer, that is made to solicit or discover information about the consumer;

"(4) the failure to clearly disclose the name and full business address of the person to whom the claim has been assigned for collection, or to whom the claim is owed, at the time of making any demand for money;

"(5) any false representation or implication of the character, extent, or amount of a claim against a consumer, or of its status in any legal proceeding;

"(6) any false representation or false implication that any debt collector is vouched for, bonded by, affiliated with or an instrumentality, agent, or official of the District of Columbia or any agency of the Federal or District government;

"(7) the use or distribution or sale of any written communication which stimulates or is falsely represented to be a document authorized, issued, or approved by a court, an official, or any other legally constituted or authorized authority, or which creates a false impression about its source, authorization, or approval;

"(8) any representation that an existing obligation of the consumer may be increased by the addition of attorney's fees, investigation fees, service fees, or any other fees or charges when in fact such fees or charges may not legally be added to the existing obligation; and

"(9) any false representation or false impression about the status or true nature of the services rendered by the debt collector or his business.

"(g) No debt collector shall use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any claim in any of the following ways:

"(1) the seeking or obtaining of any written statement or acknowledgement in any form that specifies that a consumer's obligation is one incurred for necessaries of life where the original obligation was not in fact incurred for such necessaries;

"(2) the seeking or obtaining of any written statement or acknowledgment in any form containing an affirmation of any obligation by a consumer who has been declared bankrupt without clearly disclosing the nature and consequences of such affirmation and the fact that the consumer is not legally obligated to make such affirmation;

"(3) the collection or the attempt to collect from the consumer all or any part of the debt collector's fee or charge for services rendered;

"(4) the collection of or the attempt to collect any interest or other charge, fee, or expense incidental to the principal obligation unless such interest or incidental fee, charge, or expense is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the obligation and legally chargeable to the consumer or unless such interest or incidental fee, charge, or expense is expressly authorized by law; and

"(5) any communication with a consumer whenever it appears that the consumer has notified the creditor that he is represented by an attorney and the attorney's name and address are known.

"(h) No debt collector shall use, or distribute, sell, or prepare for use, any written communication that violates or fails to conform to United States postal laws and regulations.

"(i) No debt collector shall take or accept for assignment any of the following:

"(1) an assignment of any claim for attorney's fees which have not been lawfully provided for in the writing evidencing the obligation; or

"(2) an assignment for collection of any claim upon which suit has been filed or judgment obtained, without the debt collector first making a reasonable effort to contact the attorney representing the consumer.

"(j) (1) Proof, by substantial evidence, that a debt collector has willfully violated any provision of the foregoing subsections of this section shall constitute a complete defense to any legal action undertaken by any person to enforce the claim that was being collected at the time the violation or violations occurred, and shall be deemed to constitute full satisfaction of a judgment on such claim property obtained before the occurrence of the violation or violations.

"(2) In addition to the remedy provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, a debt collector shall be liable to any person affected by a violation of the foregoing subsections of this section for all damages proximately caused by the violation.

"(3) Punitive damages may be awarded to any person affected by a willful violation of the foregoing subsections of this section, when and in such amount as is deemed appropriate by the court and trier of fact.

§ 28–3815. Administrative enforcement

"(a) As used in this section—

"(1) 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or his designated agent;

"(b) Compliance with the requirements imposed under this chapter shall be enforced by the Commissioner. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to affect the authority and jurisdiction of the respective agencies designated in section 108 of the Truth in Lending Act (82 Stat. 146 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

§ 28–3816. Inconsistent laws: What law governs

"If any provision of law or regulation promulgated thereunder is inconsistent with this chapter, this chapter shall govern, unless this chapter or the inconsistent provision of the other laws specifically provides otherwise.

"Chapter 39.—SMALL LOAN COMPANIES

"§ 28–3901. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or his designated agent.

"(2) 'Council' means the District of Columbia Council or its designated agent.

"(3) 'District' means the District of Columbia.

"(4) 'Organization' means a corporation, agency, trust, estate, partnership, cooperative, association, individual, or firm.

"(5) 'Lender' means a licensee authorized to make small loans.

"(6) 'Finance charges' means the sum of all charges, payable directly or indirectly by the person to whom the credit is extended, and imposed directly or indirectly by the creditor as an incident to the extension of credit, including any of the following types of charges which are applicable:

"(A) Interest, time price differential, and any amount payable under a point, discount, or other system or additional charges.

"(B) Service or carrying charge.

"(C) Loan fee, finder's fee, or similar charge.

"(D) Fee for an investigation or credit report.

"(E) Premium or other charge for any guarantee or insurance protecting the creditor against the obligor's default or other credit loss.

"§ 28–3902. Power to regulate and enforce

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act to the contrary, the Council is hereby authorized and empowered to make such regulations as it in its discretion deems appropriate for the governing of small loan transactions, including, without limitation, provisions:

"(1) establishing maximum finance charges;

"(2) governing the form and substance of instruments made or entered into;

"(3) requiring small loan companies to be licensed;

"(4) establishing the requirements for granting licenses;

"(5) specifying the maximum loan restrictions;

"(6) establishing the form of security and restrictions thereupon;

"(7) requiring the books and records of persons engaged in the business of financing

small loan transactions to be subject to production for examination by the Commissioner and Council; and

"(8) specifying the types and maximum amounts of insurance which may be required, at the expense of the debtor, to protect from loss the lender or his assignee or any other organization entitled to payment.

"§ 28–3903. Fixing maximum finance charge

"The Council shall from time to time investigate the economic condition and other factors relating to and affecting finance charges, and shall ascertain all pertinent facts necessary to determine what maximum charges should be permitted in such transactions. Upon the basis of such ascertained facts, the Council, notwithstanding the provisions of any other subsection, shall from time to time by regulation or order determine and fix the maximum finance charges sufficiently high to result in a fair return on investment to organizations engaged in the business of small loan transactions, but not so high as to constitute an unreasonable economic burden on small loan debtors. The Council may from time to time, upon the basis of changed conditions or facts, redetermine and refix any such maximum finance charge, but, before determining or determining any such maximum charge, the Council shall give reasonable notice of their intention to consider doing so, and provide a reasonable opportunity to persons desiring to be heard with respect to any such proposed determination or redetermination. Notice of the action proposed by the Council shall be published once a week for two consecutive weeks in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District. Any such changed maximum finance charge shall not affect any preexisting loan arrangement entered into between the lender and the debtor.

"§ 28–3904. Additional regulations

"The Council is further authorized in its discretion, to make such additional regulations as it deems necessary to insure that individuals who engage in small loan transactions are not being required, directly or indirectly, to pay finance, insurance, or other charges in excess of those authorized by the Council pursuant to the authority vested in it.

"§ 28–3905. Classification provision

"In exercising its powers and authority under sections 3902 and 3904 of this chapter, the Council is authorized, in its discretion, to make reasonable classifications (1) according to the parties to small loan transactions, or (2) according to the parties to instruments of security, or (3) according to other basis, or (4) according to two or more of the foregoing clauses (1) through (3), and to exercise such powers and authority under this section with respect to any one or more of any classifications so made or with respect to all of said classifications.

"§ 28–3906. Waiver restriction

"No provision shall be inserted in any small loan contract whereby the buyer waives or purports to waive any provision of this chapter or regulation pursuant thereto, and any such waiver or purported waiver shall be void and of no effect. The Council is authorized in its discretion, by regulation (1) to prohibit the inclusion in any small loan contract of any provision waiving or purporting to waive any provision of any regulation promulgated by the Council relating to small loan transactions, and (2) to provide that any such waiver or purported waiver, shall be void and of no effect.

"§ 28–3907. Authorization for security

"In connection with the licensing of organizations under the authority of this chapter, the Council is authorized to require either bonds or such other security as it may by regulation deem necessary, of organizations engaged in the business loan transactions. In connection with the licensing of said organizations, and the bonding of said organizations, the Council, in its discretion, may by regulation require applicants for licenses:

"(1) to furnish and keep in force a bond running to the District, or other security, to protect members of the public against financial loss by reason of the failure of the licensee or of any officer, agent, employee, or other person acting on behalf of said licensee, to observe any law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia applicable to the licensee's conduct of the licensed business;

"(2) to procure and keep in force public liability insurance or property damage insurance or both;

"(3) to appoint the Council as its true and lawful attorney upon whom all judicial and other process or legal notice directed to such person may be served.

"§ 28–3908. Right to bring suit

"Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation applicable to the licensee's conduct of the licensed activity shall have, in addition to his right of action against such licensee, a right to bring suit against the surety on a bond authorized by section 28–3907 of this chapter, either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of the bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the licensee, or of any officer, agent, employee, or other person acting on behalf of said licensee, which is in violation of law or regulation in force in the District relating to the licensed activity.

"§ 28–3909. Suspensions or revocation of license

"The Council is further authorized and empowered to make any regulations that may be necessary in furtherance of the purpose of this chapter and to suspend or revoke any license issued hereunder when, in its judgment, such is deemed desirable in the interest of public decency or the protection of lives, limbs, health, comfort, and quiet of the citizens of the District, or for any other reason it may deem sufficient.

"§ 28–3910. Penalty; prosecution

"(a) Any person who shall violate any provision of this chapter or of any regulation promulgated by the Council under the authority of this chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or both.

"(b) Prosecutions for violations of this chapter, or of the regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants. As used in this chapter the term 'Corporation Counsel' means the attorney for the District by whatever title such attorney may be known, designated by the Council to perform the functions prescribed for the Corporation Counsel in this chapter.

"§ 28–3911. Supplementary authority

"The authority and power vested in the Council by any provision of this chapter shall be deemed to be additional and supplementary to authority and power now vested in it, and not as a limitation."

SEC. 5. The text of section 16–571 of subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) As used in this subchapter, 'wages' means that part remaining after the deduction from wages of any amounts required by law to be withheld of:

"(1) wages, salary, commissions, or other remuneration for services performed by an employee for his employer, including any such remuneration measured partly or wholly by percentages or share of profits, or by other sums based upon work done or results produced, whether or not the employee is given a drawing account; and

"(2) any drawing account made available to an employee by his employer.

"(b) 'Garnishment' means any legal or equitable procedure through which the wages of any individual are required to be withheld for payment of any debt."

SEC. 6. The text of clauses (1), (2), and (3), in the first paragraph of section 16–572 of subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 16, District of Columbia, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) no attachment if wages are less than $325 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month;

"(2) 10 per centum of so much of the wages as exceeds $325 but does not exceed $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month; plus

"(3) 25 per centum of such much of the wages as exceeds $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month."

SEC. 7. Subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding the following sections:

"§ 16–583. No garnishment before judgment

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, prior to entry of judgment in an action against a debtor, the creditor may not obtain an interest in any property of the debtor by attachment, garnishment, or like proceedings.

"§ 16–584. No discharge from employment for garnishment

"No employer shall discharge an employee for the reason that a creditor of the employee has subjected or attempted to subject unpaid earnings of the employee to garnishment or like proceedings directed to the employer for the purpose of paying a judgment."

SEC. 8. (a) The analysis of chapter 33 of title 28 of subtitle II, District of Columbia Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"28–3308. Finance change on direct installment loans."

(b) The analysis of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"36. District Motor Vehicle Installment Loans ..... 28–3601.
"37. Revolving Credit Accounts ... 28–3701.
"38. Consumer Protections ..... 28–3801.
"39. Small Loan Companies ..... 28–3901."

(c) The analysis of subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"16–583. No garnishment before judgment.
"16–584. No discharge from employment for garnishment."

SEC. 9. (a) The provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia", approved February 4, 1913 (D.C. Code, sec. 26–601), shall not be construed to apply to the legitimate business of mortgage bankers and other institutional lenders engaged in making loans secured by real estate, life insurance companies (as defined in section 10 of the Act of February 4, 1913 (D.C. Code, sec. 26–610)), and small business investment companies licensed and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, conducted in the District of Columbia.

(b) The provisions of this section shall be deemed to have taken effect as of February 4, 1913.

SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1971".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'MILLAN

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1938 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12115 as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 12115) was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION ACT OF 1971

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 11992) to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 11992

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Distirct of Columbia Election Act (D.C. Code, secs. 1–1100—1–1115), is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101), is amended (A) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That", (B) by striking out in clause (3) thereof the words "at large", (C) by striking out in clause (2) thereof the final "and", (D) by redesignating clause (3) as clause (4), (E) by adding a new clause (3) as follows:

"(3) Alternates to the officials referred to in clauses (1) and (2) above, where permitted by political party rules; and".

and, (F) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Candidates for office participating in an election of the officials referred to in clauses (2), and (3) (excluding national committeemen and national committeewomen), or (4) of subsection (a) of this section may be elected at large or by precinct or ward."

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102), is amended by striking out "a school" and inserting in lieu thereof "an".

(3) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102), is amended as follows:

(A) By striking out "The term" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in paragraph (7) of this section, the term".

(B) By striking out in clause (A) "one-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety-day period" and by inserting at the end thereof immediately before the semicolon ", except in the case of an election of electors of President and Vice President of the United States the period shall be thirty days".

(C) By striking out in clause (B) "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "eighteen".

(D) By striking out clause (C), and redesignating clause (D) as clause (C).

(4) Section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102), is amended by inserting at the end of that section the following:

"(7) (A) Any person in the District of Columbia who has been convicted of a crime in the United States which is a felony in the District of Columbia, may be a qualified elector, if otherwise qualified—

"(i) at the end of the five-year period beginning on the date he completes the sentence of incarceration imposed upon him for the last such crime committed by him, or in the case of a person who is granted parole or probation with respect to such last crime, beginning on the date he begins such parole or probation, if he successfully completes such parole or probation, or

"(ii) at the end of the three-year period beginning on the date he completes such sentence of incarceration, or in the case of a person who is granted parole or probation with respect to such last crime, beginning on the date he begins such parole or probation, if the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, after application made to such court by such person, certifies to the Board that such person has demonstrated such qualities of conduct and character as to warrant the restoration of his right to vote; or

"(iii) on the date upon which he receives a pardon with respect to such crime.

"(B) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'felony' shall include any crime committed in the District of Columbia referred to in section 14 of this Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1114).

"(C) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to grant a pardon or amnesty to any person."

(5) Clause (3) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended by inserting immediately before "copy" the word "sample".

(6) Clause (4) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended by striking out "school".

(7) Section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105) is amended (A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and (B) by adding after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) (1) The Board shall, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May of each presidential election year, conduct a presidential preference primary election within the District of Columbia in which qualified electors therein may express their preference for candidates of each political party of the District of Columbia for nomination for President and may elect delegates, and alternates where permitted by the rules of a particular political party, to a particular political party national convention convened to nominate that party's candidate for President.

"(2) No person shall participate as a candidate for nomination for President in such primary unless there shall have been filed with the Board, not later than the forty-fifth day before such primary, (A) a petition on behalf of his candidacy signed by at least one thousand qualified electors of the District of Columbia who are registered under section 7 of this Act, and who are of the same political party as the prospective nominee, and (B) a written statement signed by the prospective nominee affirming that he wants his name listed on the ballot for such primary as a candidate for such nomination.

"(3) No person shall be listed on the ballot in such primary for election at large as such delegate, or alternate unless there shall have been filed with the Board, not less than the forty-fifth day before such primary, (A) a petition in support of that prospective candidate for delegate or alternate, as the case may be, signed by at least one thousand qualified electors of the District of Columbia registered under section 7 of this Act who are of the same political party as the prospective candidate, and (B) if the prospective candidate is pledged to support a particular presidential candidate, a written statement signed by such presidential candidate affirming that such prospective candidate for delegate or alternate, as the case may be, is seeking that office with the approval of such presidential candidate. If such presidential candidate fails to so indicate his approval of a candidate for delegate or alternate, such candidate shall appear on the ballot (if he files the appropriate petition) in such primary as a candidate for election as a delegate or alternate pledged to no presidential candidate.

"(4) No person shall be listed on the ballot in such primary for election from a ward as such delegate or alternate, unless there shall have been filed with the Board, not less than the forty-fifth day before such primary, (A) a petition in support of that prospective candidate for delegate or alternate, signed by at least two hundred qualified electors of the District of Columbia registered under section 7 of this Act who are of the same political party as the prospective candidate, and who reside in the ward from which he seeks election, and (B) a written statement as referred to in clause (B) of paragraph (3) of this subsection. If such presidential candidate fails to so indicate his approval of a candidate for delegate or alternate, such candidate shall appear on such ballot (if he files the appropriate petition) as a candidate for election as a delegate or alternate pledged to no presidential candidate.

"(5) The Board shall arrange the ballot for the presidential preference primary so as to enable each voter to indicate his choice for presidential nominee and for delegates, and alternates, pledged to support that prospective nominee with one mark.

"(6) The delegates and alternate delegates, of each political party within the District of Columbia to the national convention of that party convened for the nomination of the candidate of that political party for President, elected in accordance with this Act, shall be obligated, on the first and second ballots cast at that convention for nominees for President, to vote for the candidate for nomination who received at least a plurality of the votes cast in the presidential preference primary for all such candidates of that party for President held in the District of Columbia at which such delegates and alternates were elected, or until such candidate notifies each delegate in writing that he is no longer a candidate. On subsequent ballots so cast each such delegate shall be free to cast his ballots in his discretion without restriction.

"(7) The Board shall by regulation specify such additional details as may be necessary and proper to effectuate the purposes and provisions of this subsection."

(8) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1107) is amended by striking out "section 2(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2) and (7) of section 2 of this Act".

(9) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) Each candidate for election to the office of national committeeman or alternate, or national committeewoman or alternate, and for election as a member of official designated for election at large under clause (4) of the first section of this Act, shall be a qualified elector registered under section 7 of this Act who has been nominated for such office, or for election as such member or official, by a nominating petition (A) prepared in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Board, (B) signed by not less than one thousand qualified electors registered under such section 7 of this Act, who are of the same political party as the candidate, and (C) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth day before the date of the election held for such office, member, or official.

"(2) In the case of a nominating petition for a candidate for election as a member or official designated for election from a ward under clause (4) of such first section, such petition shall be prepared and filed in the same manner as a petition prepared and

filed by a candidate under paragraph (1) of this subsection and signed by two hundred qualified electors residing in such ward, registered under section 7 of this Act, who are of the same political party as the candidate."

(10) Subsection (b) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended by striking out "three-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety-day".

(11) Subsection (i) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Each candidate in a primary election for the office of Delegate shall be nominated for such office by a nominating petition (1) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth day before the date of such primary election; (2) signed by qualified electors registered under section 7 of this Act, who are of the same political party as the candidate, and equal in number to 1 per centum of the total number of such electors in the District of Columbia, as shown by the records of the Board as of the ninety-ninth day before the date of such primary election, or by two thousand of such qualified electors, whichever is less. A nominating petition for candidate in a primary election for the office of Delegate may not be circulated for signature before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions. The Board shall arrange the ballot of each political party in each such primary election so as to enable a voter of such party to vote for any one duly nominated candidate of that party for the office of Delegate."

(12) Subsection (j) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(j)(1) A duly qualified candidate for the office of Delegate may, subject to the provisions of this subsection, be nominated directly as such a candidate for election in the next succeeding general election for such office (including any such election to be held to fill a vacancy). Such person shall be nominated by a nominating petition (A) filed with the Board not less than the forty-fifth day before the date of such general election; and (B) signed by qualified electors registered under section 7 of this Act equal in number to 1½ per centum of the total number of such qualified electors in the District, as shown by the records of the Board as of the ninety-ninth day before the date of such election, or by three thousand of such qualified electors, whichever is less. No signatures on such a petition may be counted which have been made on such petition more than ninety-nine days before the date of such election.

"(2) Nominations under this subsection for candidates for election in a general election for the office of Delegate shall be of no force and effect with respect to any person whose name has appeared on the ballot of a primary election for such office held within eight months before the date of such general election."

(13) Subsection (m) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended to read as follows:

"(m) Designations with respect to the election of officials under clause (4) of the first section of this Act, shall be effected by written communications filed with the Board not later than ninety days before the date of such election."

(14) Subsection (o) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) Each candidate in a general election for member of the Board of Education shall be nomintated for such office by a nominating petition (A) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth calendar day before the date of such general election; and (B) signed by at least two hundred qualified electors who are duly registered under section 7 of this Act, who reside in the ward from which the candidate seeks election, or in the case of a candidate running at large, signed by at least one thousand of the qualified electors in the District of Columbia registered under such section 7. A nominating petition for a candidate in a general election for member of the Board of Education may not be circulated for signatures before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions. In a general election for members of the Board of Education, the Board shall arrange the ballot for each ward to enable a voter registered in that ward to vote for any one candidate duly nominated to be elected to such office from such ward, and to vote for as many candidates duly nominated for election at large to such office as there are Board of Education members to be elected at large in such election."

(15) Section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended by adding at the end of that section the following:

"(r) Any petition required to be filed under this Act by a particular date must be filed no later than 5 o'clock post meridian on such date."

(16) Subsection (1) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is repealed.

(17) Subsection (c) of section 9 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1109), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any candidate or group of candidates may, not less than two weeks prior to such election, petition the Board for credentials authorizing watchers at one or more polling places and at the place or places where the vote is to be counted for the next election during voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board shall formulate rules and regulations not inconsistent with this Act to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern the conduct of such watchers, and to limit the number of watchers so that the conduct of the election will not be unreasonably obstructed. Such rules and regulations should provide fair opportunity for watchers for all candidates or groups of candidates to challenge prospective voters whom the watchers believe to be unqualified to vote, to question the accuracy in the vote count, and otherwise to observe the conduct of the election at the polling places and the counting of votes."

(18) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The elections of the officials referred to in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first section of this Act, and of officials designated pursuant to clause (4) of such section, and the primary under section 5(b) of this Act, shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May of each presidential election year."

(19) Section 10(a)(7)(A) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking out "a majority" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least 40 per centum".

(20) Section 10(a)(7)(B) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking out "a majority" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least 40 per centum".

(21) The first sentence of paragraph (8) of subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking out "less than a majority".

(22) Subsection (a) of section 11 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1111), is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "In no case, however, shall the petitioner be required to pay the cost of any recount in any such election if the difference in the number of votes received by the petitioner in connection with any office and the number of votes received by the person certified as having been elected to that office, in the case of an election from a ward, is less than 1 per centum or fifty votes, whichever is less, or in the case of an election at large, is less than 1 per centum or five hundred votes, whichever is less."

(23) Subsection (b) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended by striking out "or delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "delegate or alternate,".

(24) Subsection (d) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended by striking out "or delegate' and inserting in lieu thereof "delegate or alternate,".

(25) Subsection (e) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) Every independent committee or party committee which receives or expends funds on behalf of any candidate or group of candidates in an election for any office referred to in the first section of this Act, or in a primary election held under section 5(b) of this Act, shall have a chairman and a treasurer and shall maintain an address in the District of Columbia where notices may be sent. Each such committee shall register with the Board of Elections as soon as its receipts or expenditures, or the sum of its receipts and expenditures total $100, or within ten days after its organization, whichever first occurs.

"(2) In any election held in the District of Columbia with respect to any office referred to in the first section of this Act, or with respect to a primary election held under section 5(b) of this Act, each candidate for election, and the treasurer of each independent or party committee, shall file with the Board of Elections on the tenth calendar day before, and also within thirty days after, the date on which such primary or general election was held, an itemized statement, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing, setting forth—

"(A) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution;

"(B) The total sum of the contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under subparagraph (A);

"(C) The total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

"(D) The name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such committee, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

"(E) The total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year and not stated under subparagraph (D);

"(F) The total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year.

"(3) The statements required to be filed by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

"(4) Every person (other than a political committee) who makes an expenditure in one or more items, other than by contribution to a political committee, aggregating $50 or more within a calendar year for the purpose of influencing any general or primary election held under this Act, shall file

with the Board an itemized detailed statement of such expenditure in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(5) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

"(1) All contributions made to or for such committee;

"(2) The name and address of every person making any such contribution, and the date thereof;

"(3) All expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

"(4) The name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

"(6) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $10 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

"(7) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received.

"(8) Any candidate, treasurer of any independent committee, or party committee, or other person who willfully violates this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 30 days, or both.".

SEC. 2. (a) Title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–1567—47–1567c) is amended by adding at the end of that title the following:

"SEC. 7. (a) CREDIT FOR CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS. For the purpose of encouraging residents of the District to participate in the election process in the District, there shall be allowed to an individual a credit against the tax (if any) imposed by this article in an amount equal to 50 per centum of any campaign contribution made to any candidate for election to any office referred to in the first section of the District of Columbia Election Act, but in no event shall such credit exceed the amount of $10.

"(b) If the amount of credit allowed an individual by subsection (a) for a taxable year exceeds the amount of tax (computed without regard to such subsection but after allowance of any other credit allowable under this article) imposed under this article on such individual for such taxable year, a refund shall be allowed such individual to the extent that such credit exceeds the amount of such tax.

"(c) (1) A husband and wife filing separate returns for a taxable year for which a joint return could have been made by them may claim between them only the total credit (or refund) to which they would have been entitled under this section had a joint return been filed.

"(2) No individual for whom a personal exemption was allowed on another individual's return shall be entitled to a credit (or refund) under this section.".

(b) The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the part of such table relating to title VI the following:

"Sec. 7. Credit for campaign contributions.".

SEC. 3. Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101 (c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Each member of the Board of Education elected from a ward shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the school election ward from which he seeks election, (B) have, for the ninety-day period immediately preceding his nomination, resided in the school election ward from which he is nominated, and (C) have, during the ninety-day period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(2) Each member of the Board of Education elected at large shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the District of Columbia, and (B) have, during the ninety-day period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(3) No individual may hold the office of member of the Board of Education and (A) hold another elective office other than delegate or alternate delegate to a convenion of a political party nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, or (B) also be an officer or employee of the District of Columbia government or of the Board of Education. A member will forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.".

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act and the amendments made thereby shall take effect as of January 1, 1972.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out line 6 and all that follows down through and including line 10 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "1–1101), is amended (A) by striking out in clause (2) thereof the final 'and', (B) by redesignating clause (3) as clause (4), (C) by adding a new clause (3) as follows:

"(3) Alternates to the officials referred to in clauses (1) and (2) above, where permitted by political party rules; and (D) by inserting in clause (4) (as redesignated by this section) 'or by ward' immediately after 'large.' "

Page 5, line 21, strike out "at large."

Page 6, line 8, insert immediately before the period the following: "and that such candidate for delegate or alternate was properly selected according to the rules of his political party relating to the nomination of candidates for delegate or alternate".

Page 6, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through and including line 4 on page 7.

Page 7, line 5, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

Page 7, line 10, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Page 7, line 25, strike out "(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

Page 11, beginning on line 12 strike out "and under subsection (b) of such first section,".

Page 18, strike out line 15 and all that follows down through and including line 20 on page 19 and strike out "'Sec. 7. Credit for campaign contributions.'" immediately following line 20 on page 19.

Page 19, line 21, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2.".

Page 21, line 8, strike out "Sec. 4." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 3.".

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

The purpose of the bill—H.R. 11992, as amended—is to amend the District of Columbia Election Act—Act of August 12, 1955; 69 Stat. 699 as amended; District of Columbia Code, see 1–1100 et seq.—and for other purposes, in several aspects so as to update and reform the election laws.

In particular, the bill would redefine qualifications for qualified electors; establish a presidential preference primary and establish procedures for electing delegates to political party national conventions; change the residency requirements for candidates for office; change the minimum age requirement for qualification to vote in the District of Columbia; provide requirements for reporting campaign contributions and expenditures, using the format of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, though when this was passed the District of Columbia was not included in the definition of the word "State".

DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED ELECTORS

Under existing law (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102) in order to be a qualified elector, that is, to be qualified to register and vote in any election in the District of Columbia, a person must have resided in the District continuously since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day of such election.

Paragraph (3) (B) of section 2 of H.R. 11992 amends this provision by reducing the period of residency to 90 days, except in the case of election of electors for President and Vice President, in which case the residency requirement is 30 days, in accordance with Public Law 91–285, 84 Stat. 314.

FEDERAL RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS

In considering the legislation which resulted in the enactment of the Voting Rights Amendments Act of 1970, the 91st Congress concluded and wrote into law (Public Law 91–285; 84 Stat. 314) additional guidelines for voting, among which were provisions relating to the residency requirements for qualifying to register and vote for President and Vice President. The Congress found that long periods of residency as a requisite to the exercise of the right to vote in Federal elections were in derogation of the exercise of a ocnstitutional right. The act established 30 days as the maximum period of residency which might be required as a qualification for registration and voting in elections for President and Vice President.

STATE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS

As a matter of fact, during recent years the minimum residency requirements for voting have been reduced in many jurisdictions throughout the country, in some cases by legislative action, and in others by court actions. The following is a listing of the State, county, and voting precinct residency requirements for voting in all 50 States, as of March 1970.

STATE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

State	State requirement	County	Voting precinct
Alabama	1 year	6 months	3 months.
Alaska	do		30 days (election district).
Arizona	do	30 days	30 days.
Arkansas	do	6 months	Do.
California	do	90 days	54 days.
Colorado	do	do	20 days.
Connecticut	Resident of town 6 months.		
Delaware	1 year	3 months	30 days.
Florida	do	6 months	
Georgia	do	do	
Hawaii	do	Representative district, 3 months.	
Idaho	6 months	30 days	30 days.
Illinois	1 year	90 days (township)	30 days (election district).
Indiana	6 months	60 days	30 days.
Iowa	do	do	10 days.
Kansas	do		30 days.
Kentucky	1 year	6 months (parish)	60 days.
Louisiana	do	6 months (municipal elec.).	3 months.
Maine	6 months	3 months (municipality)	4 months.
Maryland	1 year	6 months (city or town)	
Massachusetts	do	6 months	
Michigan	6 months		
Minnesota	do		30 days.
Mississippi	1 year	1 year	6 months (election district).
Missouri	do	60 days	60 days.
Montana	do	30 days	
Nebraska	6 months	40 days	10 days.
Nevada	do	30 days	Do.
New Hampshire			6 months.
New Jersey	6 months	40 days	
New Mexico	1 year	90 days	30 days.
New York	3 months	3 months	
North Carolina	1 year		Do.
North Dakota	do	90 days	Do.
Ohio	do	40 days	40 days.
Oklahoma	6 months	2 months	20 days.
Oregon	do		
Pennsylvania	90 days		60 days
Rhode Island	1 year	6 months[1] (town or city)	
South Carolina	do	6 months	3 months.
South Dakota	do	90 days	30 days.
Tennessee	do	3 months	
Texas	do	6 months	
Utah	do	4 months	60 days.
Vermont	do	90 days (town)	
Virginia[1]	do	6 months	30 days.
Washington	do	90 days	Do.
West Virginia	do	60 days	
Wisconsin	6 months		10 days.
Wyoming	1 year	60 days	Do.

[1] Residency requirement has been changed.

Source: Voting Information 1970, Armed Services Information Service, Department of Defense, published March 1970.

It will be noted that at that time, 22 States required 1 year of residence as a qualification to vote; 15 others required 6 months; and only two States—New York and Pennsylvania—required as little as 3 months.

These are the latest complete figures available to your committee, and some changes have occurred in some of the States' requirements since that time. As noted, for example, the requirement in Virginia has been changed, and is now 6 months of residence in the State and 30 days in the county and in the voting precinct.

VOTING AGE LOWERED

The bill also lowers the minimum age for voter qualification in the existing District of Columbia Election Act—(D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102(2)(B))—from 21 to 18 years of age. The 26th amendment to the Constitution, which was implemented by Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 92d Congress, ratified promptly by the requisite 38 States, and certified on July 5, 1971, provides that any U.S. citizen who is otherwise qualified may vote in any State or political subdivision in any election if he is at least 18 years of age. Hence, the provision referred to above in the 1955 law is no longer valid, and the changes made by this provision of H.R. 11992 is merely a matter of conforming the District of Columbia Election Act to the 26th amendment to the Constitution.

ENFRANCHISING FELONS

Further, the bill enfranchises a felon at the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date he completes the sentence of incarceration imposed upon him for the last such crime committed by him, or in the case of a person who is granted parole or probation with respect to such last crime, beginning on the date he begins such parole or probation, if he successfully completes such parole or probation; or at the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date he completes such sentence of incarceration, upon application to and certification by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia that said person has demonstrated qualities of conduct and character warranting the restoration of his right to vote; or the date upon which he receives a pardon with respect to such crime.

This bill defines "felony" as including any crime committed in the District of Columbia which is referred to in section 14—(D.C. Code, sec. 1–1114)—concerning false representation as to qualifications for voting or holding elective office; violation of sections 9, 12, or 13 of the act—voting regulations, interference with registration or voting, expenditures—bribery; voting more than once in one election; stealing ballots if employed in the counting of votes; and making false reports.

In recent years, not only has the whole issue of disenfranchisement of former felons been challenged in the courts, but also several jurisdictions have moved toward restoration of the right to vote. To enable the ex-offender to participate in meaningful community activities and to not foster his sense of estrangement, the bill moves toward this restoration.

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARY AND PARTY DELEGATES

The bill establishes a presidential preference primary election during May of each presidential election year. This primary will allow the qualified electors of the District of Columbia to indicate their preference among the candidates for nomination for President. This bill joins the election of convention delegates to the selection of presidential candidates by allowing the voter to choose both with one mark.

REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS AND RECORDS

The bill strengthens the requirements for keeping records and reporting campaign funds. Every political committee is required to maintain an address in the District of Columbia and to register with the Board of Elections. Such committee is also required to file 10 days before an election and 30 days after an election a complete accounting of contributions, expenditures, debts and obligations. Such statements are to be made part of the public records of the Board of Elections and open to public inspection. Willful violators will be subject to up to $5,000 fine or for imprisonment up to 30 days, or both.

HEARING

The Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the House Committee on the District of Columbia on September 13, 1971, held public hearings on the original bill, H.R. 10175. The Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia presented recommendations on behalf of the local government. The bill was strongly supported and some amendments were suggested to improve the measure.

Representatives of the Democratic Central Committee and the Republican Central Committee for the District of Columbia both testified in considerable detail concerning needed changes in the District of Columbia Election Act. Each group suggested amendments which received full consideration by your committee. Some of these and numerous other amendments were incorporated in the draft of the clean bill, H.R. 11992, reported to the House herewith.

The Board of Elections for the District of Columbia likewise presented detailed testimony concerning the mechanics of elections in the District of Columbia and needed improvements, which were embodied in the bill.

With reference to the provisions of the bill relating to the restoration of voting rights to former felons, favorable comment was received from the Department of Justice recommending the restoration of voting rights but subject to safeguards which were essentially adopted by your committee and written into the bill.

COMMITTEE VOTE

The pending bill, H.R. 11992, as amended, was ordered reported by a voice vote of your committee, a quorum of the committee membership being present.

COST OF LEGISLATION

It is not anticipated that any additional costs attributable to this legislation will accrue to the District of Columbia.

Any costs which might have resulted from the provisions for the allowance of tax credits against income taxes due from a contribution in an election campaign, or from refunds to him therefor, have been obviated by reason of the committee amendment deleting section 2 from the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from South Carolina this question. The provision in the bill dealing with contributions to political campaigns was stricken in committee. Has this amendment been offered and is it now included in your bill ready for final vote?

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir. The amendments have already been read.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I note that the report states there are additional views, yet I find no additional views in this report.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is a misprint, I understand.

Mr. GROSS. A misprint?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir. No one furnished any additional views.

Mr. GROSS. Some committee member did not change his mind about additional views?

Mr. McMILLAN. No.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY) for the purpose of calling up H.R. 10237, a bill from his subcommittee.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 10237) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act in order to conform to Federal law, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10237

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 2. The District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1953, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 1(b)(1) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'Employment' means:

"(A) Any service performed prior to January 1, 1972, which was employment as defined in this subsection prior to such date and, subject to the other provisions of this subsection, service performed after December 31, 1971, including service in interstate commerce, by—

"(i) any officer of a corporation; or

"(ii) any individual who, under the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an employee; or

"(iii) any individual other than an individual who is an employee under subdivision (i) or (ii) who performs services for remuneration for any person—

"(I) as any agent-driver or commission-driver engaged in distributing meat products, vegetable products, fruit products, bakery products, beverages (other than milk), or laundry or drycleaning services, for his principal;

"(II) as a traveling or city salesman, other than as an agent-driver or commission-driver, engaged upon a full-time basis in the solicitation on behalf of, and the transmission to, his principal (except for sideline sales activities on behalf of some other person) of orders from wholesalers, retailers, contractors, or operators of hotels, restaurants, or other similar establishments for merchandise for resale or supplies for use in their business operation.

"Provided, That for purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), the term 'employment shall include services described in (I) and (II) above performed after December 31, 1971, only if:

"1. The contract of service contemplates that substantially all of the services are to be performed personally by such individual;

"2. The individual does not have a substantial investment in facilities used in connection with the performance of the services (other than in facilities for transportation); and

"3. The services are not in the nature of a single transaction that is not part of a continuing relationship with the person for whom the services are performed.

"(B) Service performed after December 31, 1971, by an individual in the employ of the District or any of its instrumentalities (or or more States or their instrumentalities) for a hospital or institution of higher education located in the District: *Provided,* That such service is excluded from 'employment' as defined in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act solely by reason of section 3306(c)(7) of that Act and is not excluded from 'employment' under section 1(b)(1)(D) of this Act;

"(C) Service performed after March 30, 1962, by an individual in the employ of an educational organization, and service performed after December 31, 1971, by an individual in the employ of a religious, charitable, of other organization which is excluded from the term 'employment' as defined in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act solely by reason of section 3306(c)(8) of that Act, except as provided in section 1(b)(1)(D) of this Act;

"(D) For the purpose of subparagraphs (B) and (C) the term 'employment' does not apply to service performed after December 31, 1971—

"(i) in the employ of (I) a church or convention or association of churches, or (II) an organization which is operated primarily for religious purposes and which is operated, supervised, controlled, or principally supported by a church or convention or association of churches; or

"(ii) by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order; or

"(iii) in a facility conducted for the purpose of carrying out a program of rehabilitation for individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury or providing remunerative work for individuals who because of their impaired physical or mental capacity cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market, by an individual receiving such rehabilitation or remunerative work; or

"(iv) as part of an unemployment work-relief or work-training program assisted or financed in whole or in part by any Federal agency or an agency of a State or political subdivision thereof, by an individual receiving such work-relief or work-training; or

"(v) for a hospital in a State prison or other State correctional institution, by an inmate of the prison or correctional institution.

"(E) The term 'employment' shall include the service of an individual who is a citizen of the United States, performed outside the United States (except in Canada or the Virgin Islands), after December 31, 1971, in the employ of an American employer (other than service which is deemed 'employment' under the provisions of section 1(b)(2) of this Act or the parallel provisions of another State's law), if:

"(i) the employer's principal place of business in the United States is located in the District; or

"(ii) the employer has no place of business in the United States, but—

"(I) the employer is an individual who is a resident of the District; or

"(II) the employer is a corporation which is organized under the laws of the District or the laws of the United States; or

"(III) the employer is a partnership or a trust and the number of the partners or trustees who are residents of the District is greater than the number who are residents of any one other State; or

"(iii) none of the criteria of clauses (i) and (ii) of this subparagraph are met but the employer has elected coverage in the District or, the employer having failed to elect coverage in any State, the individual has filed a claim for benefits, based on such service, under the law of the District.

"(iv) an 'American employer', for purposes of this subparagraph, means a person who is—

"(I) an individual who is a resident of the United States; or

"(II) a partnership if two-thirds or more of the partners are residents of the United States; or

"(III) a trust, if all of the trustees are residents of the United States; or

"(IV) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

"(V) used in this subparagraph the term 'United States' includes the States, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(F) The term 'employment' shall include personal or domestic service in a private home for an employer who paid cash remuneration of $500 or more in any calendar quarter. 'Personal or domestic service' for the purpose of this subparagraph shall include all persons employed by an employer in his capacity as a householder, as distinguished from a person employed by the employer in the pursuit of a trade, occupation, profession, enterprise or vocation."

(2) Section 1(b)(2) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" after "performed within" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma;

(B) by inserting after "within and without" the following: "or entirely without";

(C) by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new paragraph:

"(C) the service is performed anywhere within the United States, the Virgin Islands or Canada: *Provided*, That (i) such service is not covered under the unemployment compensation law of any State, the Virgin Islands or Canada, and (ii) the place from which the service is directed or controlled is in the District.

(3) Section 1(b)(4) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this subsection, the term 'employment' shall also include all service performed after January 1, 1955, by an officer or member of the crew of an American vessel or American aircraft on or in connection with such vessel or aircraft: *Provided*, That the operating office from which the operations of such vessel or aircraft are ordinarily and regularly supervised, managed, directed, and controlled, is within the District."

(4) Section 1(b)(5) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(5)) is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) service performed by an individual under 18 years of age as a babysitter;";

(B) by redesignating clauses (a) and (b) of subparagraph (D) as (i) and (ii), respectively;

(C) by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (E) the following: ", except for service performed after December 31, 1971, as provided in section 1(b)(1)(B) of this Act";

(D) by striking out in subparagraph I(1)(c) "at a" and inserting in lieu thereof "at such";

E) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), and (5) of subparagraph I as (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(F) by striking out clauses (3) and (4) of subparagraph I;

(G) by redesignating (a) and (c) of clause (i) as (I) and (III), respectively;

(H) by striking out (b) of clause (i);

(I) by redesignating clauses (1) and (2) of subparagraph (K) and (i) and (ii), respectively;

(J) by inserting in subparagraph (Q), "or aircraft" after "vessel" the first and third times it appears, and by inserting "or American aircraft" after "vessel" the second time it appears;

(K) by redesignating clauses (A) and (B) of subparagraph (R) as (i) and (ii), respectively;

(L) by striking out subparagraphs (G) and (P); and

(M) by redesignating subparagraphs (H) through (T) as subparagraphs (G) through (R), respectively.

(5) Section 1(b)(6) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(6)) is amended by striking out "5(H)" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "5(G)".

(6) Section 1(b)(7) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(7) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "or which as a condition for full tax credit against the tax imposed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act is required to be covered under this Act".

(7) Section 1(b)(8) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(8)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "localized" after "Any" in subparagraph (i);

(B) by striking out "section 1(b)(5)" in such subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1(b)";

(C) by striking out "section 1(b)(8)(i)" in subparagraph (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1(b)(8)(A)";

(D) by redesignating (A) and (B) of subparagraph (i) as (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(E) by redesignating subparagraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) as (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

(8) Section 1(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(c)) is amended by striking out paragraph (3).

(9) Section 1(d) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(d)) is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence the following new sentence: "After August 29, 1946, back pay awarded under any statute of the District or of the United States shall be treated as wages."

(10) Section 1(q) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(q)) is amended to read as follows:

"(q) 'State' includes, in addition to the States of the United States of America, the District of Columbia (herein referred to as the 'District'), Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

(11) Section 1(r) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec, 46-301(r)) is amended by inserting immediately after "including" the following: "the District government and its instrumentalities (as specified in section 1(b)(1)(B)) of this Act,".

(12) Section 1(t) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(t)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and the term 'American aircraft' means an aircraft registered under the laws of the United States".

(13) Section 1 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(w) 'Institution of higher education', for the purposes of this section, means an educational institution which—

"(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

"(2) is legally authorized in the District to provide a program of education beyond high school;

"(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's or higher degree, or provides a program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, a program of postgraduate or postdoctoral studies, or a program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation; and

"(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution.

"(x) 'Hospital' means an institution which has been licensed by the Commissioner of the District as a hospital."

(14) Section 3(b) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(b)) is amended by striking out ", until the effective date of this Act,".

(15) Section 3(c)(2) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(2)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That after December 31, 1971, benefits paid to an individual for any week during which he is attending a training or retraining course under the provisions of section 10(d)(2) of this Act or extended benefits paid to an exhaustee under the provisions of section 7(g) of this Act shall not be charged against such employer accounts".

(16) Section 3(c)(3) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The standard rate of contributions shall be 2.7 per centum, except that after December 31, 1971, each employer newly subject to this Act shall pay contributions at a rate equal to the average rate on taxable wages of all employers for the preceding calendar year (rounded to the next higher one-tenth of 1 per centum), or 1 per centum, whichever is higher (not exceeding 2.7 per centum) until he has been an employer for a sufficient period to meet the requirement to qualify for a reduced rate as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection; thereaftre, his contribution rate shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of such paragraph (4)."

(17) Section 3(c)(4) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking out subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(A) No employer's rate of contribution for any calendar year or part thereof shall be reduced below the standard rate unless and until his account could have been charged with benefits paid throughout the thirty-six-consecutive-calendar-month period ending on the computation date applicable to such year or part thereof. For the calendar years 1963 to 1971, inclusive, any employer who is subject to this Act by virtue of the amendment of former section (1)(b)(5)(G) of this Act by the Act of March 30, 1962, and who has not been subject to this Act for a sufficient period to meet this requirement, may qualify for a rate less than the standard rate if his account could have been charged with benefit payments throughout a lesser period but, in no event, less than the twelve consecutive calendar months ending on the computation date (as herein defined) for that calander year.";

(B) by striking out subparagraph (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(B) If the amount of the fund as of June 30 of any years is less than 4 per centum of the total payrolls subject to contribution rate for each employer (including newly sub-month period ending on the preceding December 31, the contribution rate for each employer (including newly subject employers) shall be increased by the percentage differential between said 4 per centum of such total payrolls and said fund's percentage of such total payrolls, but in no event shall the contribution rate for any employer be more than 2.7 per centum. Said percentage differential for each employer shall be computed to the next higher one-tenth of 1 per centum.";

(C) by striking out subparagraph (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(C) If on December 20 of any year, the amount in the fund becomes less than 2 per centum of the total annual payrolls subject to contributions under the Act for the twelve-consecutive-month period ending on the preceding June 30, the Board shall make a declaration to that effect. Effective the quarter following such announcement, each employer's (including each newly subject employer's) rate of contribution shall be the standard rate.";

(D) by striking out "paragraph (iv)" in the last sentence of subparagraph (iv) and inserting in lieu thereof "subparagraph (D)"; and

(E) by redesignating subparagraph (iv) as subparagraph (D).

(18) Section 3(c)(5) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(5)) is amended—

(A) by amending the first sentence to read as follows: "The Board shall for any uncompleted portion of the calendar year beginning July 1, 1943, and for each calendar year thereafter classify employers in accordance with their actual experience in the payment of contributions and with respect to benefits charged against their accounts, except as provided in section 3(c)(3) of this Act."; and

(B) by striking out "3(c)(4)(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "3(c)(4)(A)".

(19) Section 3(c)(7) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(7)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subclauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of clause (ii) as (I), (II), (III), and (IV), respectively; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (a) through (f) as subparagraphs (A) through (F), respectively.

(20) Section 3(c)(8) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(8)) is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (i) to read as follows:

"(A) If as of the computation date the total of all contributions credited to any employer's account, with respect to employ-

ment since May 31, 1939, is in excess of the total benefits paid after June 30, 1939, then chargeable or charged to his account, such excess shall be known as the employer's reserve, and his contribution rate for the ensuing calendar year or part thereof shall be—

"(i) 2.7 per centum if such reserve is less than 0.5 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(ii) 2 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 0.5 per centum but is less than 1 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(iii) 1.5 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 1 per centum but is less than 1.5 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(iv) 1 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 1.5 per centum but is less than 2.5 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(v) 0.5 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 2.5 per centum but is less than 3 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(vi) 0.1 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 3 per centum of his average annual payroll.";

(B) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subparagraph (ii) "except as provided in subsection (c)(3) of this section."; and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (ii), (iii), and (iv) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

(21) Section 3(c)(9) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(9)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "(iv)" in subparagraph (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "(D)"; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) as (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E), respectively.

(22) Section 3(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) After December 31, 1971, the separate account established for an employer under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be discontinued effective the calendar quarter next succeeding three calendar years after the employer has been determined out of business. Thereafter no employer shall have any right to or interest in such discontinued account."

(23) Section 3(e) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) From December 31, 1939, to January 1, 1955, wages, for the purpose of section 3, shall not include any amount in excess of $3,000 paid by an employer to any person arising out of his or her employment during any calendar year. From January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1971, wages shall not include any amount in excess of $3,000 actually paid by an employer to any person during any calendar year. After December 31, 1971, wages shall not include any amount in excess of $4,200 (or in excess of the limitation on the amount of taxable wages fixed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (26 U.S.C. 3301-3308), whichever is greater) actually paid by an employer to any person during any calendar year. After December 31, 1954, the term 'employment' for the purpose of this subsection shall include services constituting employment under any employment security law of a State or of the Federal Government. After December 31, 1971, the term 'employment' for the purpose of this subsection shall include services constituting employment performed in the employ of a transfer as determined under the provisions of section 3(c)(7) of this Act."

(24) Section 3(f) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(f)) is amended by striking out the first sentence "(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A)."

(25) Section 3(g) of such act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(g)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That liability to the fund shall not exceed contributions for the three calendar years preceding the quarter in which liability was determined."

(26) Section 3 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, benefits paid to employees of nonprofit organizations shall be financed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection. For the purpose of this subsection and subsection (i), a nonprofit organization (or group of organizations) described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

"(1) Any nonprofit organization which, pursuant to section 1(b)(1)(C), is, or becomes, subject to this Act on or after January 1, 1972, shall pay contributions under the provisions of section 3(c), unless it elects, in accordance with this paragraph to pay to the Board for the District Unemployment fund an amount equal to the amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid that is attributable to service in the employ of such nonprofit organization, to individuals for weeks of unemployment which begin during the effective period of such election.

"(A) Any nonprofit organization which is, or becomes, subject to this Act on January 1, 1972, may elect to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions for a period of not less than one taxable year beginning with January 1, 1972: *Provided,* That it files with the Board a written notice of its election within the thirty-day period immediately following such date or within a like period immediately following the date of enactment of this subparagraph whichever occurs later.

"(B) Any nonprofit organization which becomes subject to this Act after January 1, 1972, may elect to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions for a period of not less than the remainder of that and the next year beginning with the date on which such liability begins by filing a written notice of its election with the Board not later than thirty days immediately following the date of the determination of such liability.

"(C) Any nonprofit organization which makes an election in accordance with subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) of this paragraph will continue to be liable for payments in lieu of contributions until it files with the Board a written notice terminating its election not later than thirty days prior to the beginning of the taxable year for which such termination shall first be effective.

"(D) Any nonprofit organization which has been paying contributions under this Act for a period subsequent to January 1, 1972, may change to a reimbursable basis by filing with the Board not later than thirty days prior to the beginning of any taxable year a written notice of election to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions. Such election shall not be terminable by the organization for that and the next year.

"(E) The Board may for good cause extend the period within which a notice of election, or a notice of termination, must be filed and may permit an election to be retroactive but not any earlier than with respect to benefits paid after December 31, 1969.

"(F) The Board, in accordance with such regulations as it may prescribe, shall notify each nonprofit organization of any determination which the Board may make of its status as an employer and of the effective date of any election which it makes and of any termination of such election. Such determinations shall be subject to reconsideration, appeal and review in accordance with the provisions of section 3(c).

"(2) Payments in lieu of contributions shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph including either subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B).

"(A) At the end of each calendar quarter, or at the end of any other period as determined by the Board, the Board shall bill each nonprofit organization (or group of such organizations) which has elected to make payments in lieu of contributions for an amount equal to the full amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid that is attributable to service in the employ of such organization.

"(B)(i) Each nonprofit organization that has elected payments in lieu of contributions may request permission to make such payments as provided in this subparagraph. Such method of payment shall become effective upon approval by the Board.

"(ii) At the end of each calendar quarter, or at the end of such other period as determined by the Board, the Board shall bill each nonprofit organization for an amount representing one of the following:

"(I) For 1972, one-fourth of 1 per centum of its total payroll for 1971.

"(II) For years after 1972, such percentage of its total payroll for the immediately preceding calendar year as the Board shall determine. Such determination shall be based each year on the average benefits costs attributable to service in the employ of nonprofit organizations during the preceding calendar year.

"(III) For any organization which did not pay wages throughout the four calendar quarters of the preceding calendar year, such percentage of its payroll during such year as the Board shall determine.

"(iii) At the end of each taxable year, the Board may modify the quarterly percentage of payroll thereafter payable by the nonprofit organization in order to minimize excess or insufficient payments.

"(iv) At the end of each taxable year, the Board shall determine whether the total of payments for such year made by a nonprofit organization is less than, or in excess of, the total amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid to individuals during such taxable year based on wages attributable to service in the employ of such organization. Each nonprofit organization whose total payments for such year are less than the amount so determined shall be liable for payment of the unpaid balance to the fund in accordance with subparagraph (C). If the total payments exceed the amount so determined for the taxable year, all or a part of the excess may, at the discretion of the Board, be refunded from the fund or retained in the fund as part of the payments which may be required for the next taxable year.

"(C) Payment of any bill rendered under subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) shall be made not later than thirty days after such bill was mailed to the last known address of the nonprofit organization or was otherwise delivered to it, unless there has been an application for review and redetermination in accordance with subparagraph (E).

"(D) Payments made by a nonprofit organization under the provisions of this subsection shall not be deducted or deductible, in whole or in part, from the remuneration of individuals in the employ of the organization.

"(E) The amount due specified in any bill from the Board shall be conclusive on the organization unless, not later than fifteen days after the bill was mailed to its last known address or otherwise delivered to it, the organization files an application for redetermination by the Board, setting forth the grounds for such application or appeal. The Board shall promptly review and reconsider the amount due specified in the bill

and shall thereafter issue a redetermination in any case in which such application for redetermination has been filed. Any such redetermination shall be conclusive on the organization unless the organization files an appeal as set forth in paragraph 3(c)(10), setting forth the grounds for the appeal.

"(F) Past due payments of amounts in lieu of contributions shall be subject to the same interest and penalties that, pursuant to section 4(c), apply to past due contributions.

"(3) In the discretion of the Director, any nonprofit organization that elects to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions shall be required within thirty days after the effective date of its election, to execute and file with the Board a surety bond approved by the Director, or it may elect instead to deposit with the Board money. The amount of such bond or deposit shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

"(A) The amount of the bond or deposit required by this paragraph shall be equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum of the organization's total wages paid for employment as defined in section 1(b)(C) for the four calendar quarters immediately preceding the effective date of the election, the renewal date in the case of a bond, or the biennial anniversary of the effective date of election in the case of a deposit of money, whichever date shall be most recent and applicable. If the nonprofit organization did not pay wages in each of such four calendar quarters, the amount of the bond or deposit shall be as determined by the Director.

"(B) Any bond deposited under this paragraph shall be in force for a period of not less than two taxable years and shall be renewed with the approval of the Director at such times as the Director may prescribe, but not less frequently than at two-year intervals as long as the organization continues to be liable for payments in lieu of contributions. The Director shall require adjustments to be made in a previously filed bond as he deems appropriate. If the bond is to be increased, the adjusted bond shall be filed by the organization within fifteen days of the date notice of the required adjustment was mailed or otherwise delivered to it. Failure by any organization covered by such bond to pay the full amount of payments in lieu of contributions when due, together with any applicable interest and penalties provided for in section 4(c) of this Act, shall render the surety liable on said bond to the extent of the bond, as though the surety was such organization.

"(C) Any deposit of money in accordance with this paragraph shall be retained by the Board in an escrow account until liability under the election is terminated, at which time it shall be returned to the organization, less any deductions as hereinafter provided. The Director may deduct from the money deposited under this paragraph by a nonprofit organization to the extent necessary to satisfy any due and unpaid payments in lieu of contributions and any applicable interest and penalties provided for in section 4(c). The Director shall require the organization within fifteen days following any deduction from a money deposit under the provisions of this subparagraph to deposit sufficient additional money to make whole the organization's deposit at the prior level. The Director may, at any time, review the adequacy of the deposit made by any organization. If, as the result of such review, he determines that an adjustment is necessary, he shall require the organization to make additional deposit within fifteen days of written notice of his determination or shall return to it such portion of the deposit as he no longer considers necessary, whichever action is appropriate.

"(D) If any nonprofit organization fails to file a bond or make a deposit, or to file a bond in an increased amount or to increase or make whole the amount of a previously made deposit, as provided under this paragraph, the Director may terminate such organization's election to make payments in lieu of contributions and such termination shall continue for not less than the four-consecutive-calendar-quarter period beginning with the quarter in which such termination becomes effective: *Provided*, That the Director may extend for good cause the applicable filing, deposit or adjustment period by not more than fifteen days.

"(4) If any nonprofit organization is delinquent in making payments in lieu of contributions as required under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Board may terminate such organization's election to make payments in lieu of contributions as of the beginning of the next taxable year and such termination shall be effective for that and the next taxable year.

"(5) Each employer that is liable for payments in lieu of contributions shall pay to the Board for the fund the amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid that are attributable to service in the employ of such employer. If benefits paid to an individual are based on wages paid by more than one employer and one or more of such employers are liable for payments in lieu of contributions, the amount payable to the fund by each employer that is liable for such payments shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B).

"(A) If benefits paid to an individual are based on wages paid by one or more employers that are liable for payments in lieu of contributions and on wages paid by one or more employers who are liable for contributions, the amount of benefits payable by each employer that is liable for payments in lieu of contributions shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total benefits paid to the individual as the total base-period wages paid to the individual by such employer bear to the total base-period wages paid to the individual by all of his base-period employers.

"(B) If benefits paid to an individual are based on wages paid by two or more employers that are liable for payments in lieu of contributions, the amount of benefits payable by each such employer shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total benefits paid to the individual as the total base-period wages paid to the individual by such employer bear to the total base-period wages paid to the individual by all of his base-period employers.

"(6) Two or more employers that have become liable for payments in lieu of contributions, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (h)(1), may file a joint application to the Board for the establishment of a group account for the purpose of sharing the cost of benefits paid that are attributable to service in the employ of such employers. Each such application shall identify and authorize a group representative to act as the group's agent for the purposes of this paragraph. Upon approval of the application, the Board shall establish a group account for such employers effective as of the beginning of the calendar quarter in which it receives the application and shall notify the group's representative of the effective date of the account. Such account shall remain in effect for not less than two years and thereafter until terminated at the discretion of the Board or upon application by the group. Upon establishment of the account, each member of the group shall be liable for payments in lieu of contributions with respect to each calendar quarter in the amount that bears the same ratio to the total benefits paid in such quarter that are attributable to service performed in the employ of all members of the group as the total wages paid for service in employment by such member in such quarter bear to the total wages paid during such quarter for service performed in the employ of all members of the group. The Board shall prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary with respect to applications for establishment, maintenance, and termination of group accounts that are authorized by this paragraph, for addition of new members to, and withdrawal of active members from, such accounts, and for the determination of the amounts that are payable under this paragraph by members of the group and the time and manner of such payments."

"(i) Notwithstanding any provisions in subsection (h) any nonprofit organization that prior to January 1, 1969, paid contributions required by subsection (c) of this section, and, pursuant to subsection (h) of this section, elects, within thirty days after the effective date of such subsection (h), to make payments in lieu of contributions, shall not be required to make any such payment on account of any benefits paid, on the basis of wages paid by such organization to individuals for weeks of unemployment which begin on or after the effective date of such election until the total amount of such benefits equals the amount of the positive balance in the experience rating account of such organization."

(27) Section 4(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(a)) is amended by inserting ", or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)," immediately after "section 3".

(28) Section 4(b) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(b)) is amended by inserting ", except as provided in section 3(h) of this Act" immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence.

(29) Section 4(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) If contributions or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h) are not paid when due, there shall be added interest at the rate of one-half of one per centum per month or fraction thereof from the date they become due until paid: *Provided*, That interest shall not run against a court appointed fiduciary when the contributions or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h) are not paid timely because of a court order.

"(2) If contributions or wage reports are not filed on or before the fifteenth day of the second month following the close of the calendar quarter for which they are due or contributions, or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h), are not paid by that time, there shall be added a penalty of 10 per centum of the contributions, or payments in lieu of the contributions under section 3(h), but such penalty shall not be less than $5 nor more than $25 and for good cause such penalty may be waived by the Board."

(30) Section 4(d) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(d)) is amended by inserting ", or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)," immediately after "contributions".

(31) Section 4(e) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(e)) is amended by striking out "or tax" in the first and fifteenth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof", or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h),".

(32) Section 4(h) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(h)) is amended by inserting "or penalty" immediately after "interest" in the second sentence.

(33) Section 4(i) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(i)) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) REFUNDS.—If not later than three years after the date on which any contributions (or payments in lieu of contributions under section (3(h)) or interest thereon were paid, an employing unit which has paid such contributions (or payments in lieu of

contributions under section 3(h)) or interest thereon shall make application for an adjustment thereof in connection with subsequent contribution payments (or payments in lieu of contributions under section (3)(h)) or for a refund thereof because such adjustment cannot be made, and the Board shall determine that such contributions (or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)) or interest on any portion thereof was erroneously collected, the Board shall allow such employing unit to make an adjustment thereof, without interest, in connection with subsequent contribution payments (or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)) by it, or if such adjustment cannot be made the Board shall refund said amount, without interest, from the clearing account or benefit account upon checks issued by the Board or its duly authorized agent. For like cause and within the same period, adjustment or refund may be so made on the Board's own initiative. Should benefits have been paid based upon work records filed by the employing unit, claiming an adjustment or refund, such benefit should be disregarded for purposes of figuring such adjustment or refund, and any such benefit payments already having been made at the time of the adjustment or refund, based upon records filed with this Board by such employing unit, shall to that extent be allowed and shall not be deemed to have been paid erroneously."

(34) Section 4(1) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–304(1)) is amended by striking out the first and second sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The Board may compromise any civil case arising under this Act. Whenever, a compromise is made by the Board in each such case, there shall be placed in the minutes of the Board the opinion of an attorney of the Board with the reasons therefor, including a statement of (1) the amount of the contributions, or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h), due, (2) the amount of interest due on the same, and (3) the amount actually paid in accordance with the terms of the compromise."

(35) Section 7(b) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–307(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out the second sentence; and

(B) by striking out in the third sentence "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "66⅔ per centum".

(36) Section 7(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–307(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To qualify for benefits an individual must have (1) been paid wages for employment of not less than $300 in one quarter in his base period, (2) been paid wages for employment of not less than $450 in not less than two quarters in such period, and (3) received during such period wages the total amount of which is equal to at least one and one-half times the amount of his wages for the quarter in such period in which his wages were the highest. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3), any otherwise qualified individual, the total amount of whose wages during such period is less than the amount required to have been received during such period under such paragraph, many qualify for benefits if the difference between the amounts so required to have been received and the total amount of his wages during such period does not exceed $70, but the amount of his weekly benefit, as computed under section 7(b), shall be reduced by $1 if such difference does not exceed $35 or by $2 if such difference is more than $35. Wages received by an individual in the period intervening between the end of his last base period and the beginning of his last benefit year shall not be available for benefit purposes in a subsequent benefit year unless he has, subsequent to the commencement of such last benefit year, performed services for which he received remuneration for personal services, whether or not such services were performed in employment as defined in this Act, in an amount equal to at least ten times the weekly benefit amount for which he qualifies in such last benefit year. Benefits payable to an individual with respect to a week shall be reduced, under regulations prescribed by the Board, by any amount received or applied for with respect to such week as a retirement pension or annuity under a public or private retirement plan or system provided, or contributed to, by any base period employer. An amount received with respect to a period other than a week shall be prorated by weeks. No reduction shall be made under the preceding two sentences for any amount received under title II of the Social Security Act."

(37) Section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–307) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(g) EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, this subsection provides a program of extended benefits on and after January 1, 1972.

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection, unless the context clearly requires otherwise—

"(A) 'Extended benefit period' means a period which—

"(i) begins with the third week after whichever of the following weeks occurs first: (I) a week for which there is a national 'on' indicater, or (II) a week for which there is a State 'on' indicator; and

"(ii) ends with either of the following weeks, whichever occurs later: (I) the third week after the first week for which there is both a national 'off' indicator and a State 'off' indicator; or (II) the thirteenth consecutive week of such period: *Provided*, That no extended benefit period may begin by reason of a State 'on' indicator before the fourteenth week following the end of a prior extended benefit period which was in effect with respect to the District.

"(B) There is a 'national' 'on' 'indicator' for a week if the Secretary of Labor determines that for each of the three most recent completed calendar months ending before such week, the rate of insured unemployment (seasonally adjusted) for all States equaled or exceeded 4.5 per centum.

"(C) There is a 'national' 'off' 'indicator' for a week if the Secretary of Labor determines that for each of the three most recent completed calendar months ending before such week, the rate of insured unemployment (seasonally adjusted) for all States was less than 4.5 per centum.

"(D) There is a 'State' 'on' 'indicator' for the District for a week if the Board determines, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Labor, that for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding twelve weeks, the rate of insured unemployment (not seasonally adjusted) under this Act—

"(i) equaled or exceeded 120 per centum of the average of such rates for the corresponding thirteen-week period ending in each of the preceeding two calendar years, and

"(i) equaled or exceeded 4 per centum.

"(E) There is a 'State' 'off' 'indicator' for the District for a week if the Board determines, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Labor, that for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding twelve weeks, the rate of insured unemployment (not seasonally adjusted) under this Act—

"(i) was less than 120 per centum of the average of such rates for the corresponding thirteen-week period ending in each of the preceding two calendar years, or

"(ii) was less than 4 per centum.

"(F) 'Rate of insured unemployment', for purposes of subparagraphs (D) and (E) of this subsection, means the percentage derived by dividing (i) the average weekly number of individuals filing claims in the District for weeks of unemployment with respect to the most recent thirteen-consecutive-week period, as determined by the Board on the basis of its reports to the Secretary of Labor, by (ii) the average monthly employment covered under this Act for the first four of the most recent six completed calendar quarters ending before the end of such thirteen-week period.

"(G) 'Regular benefits' mean benefits payable to an individual under this Act or under any State law (including benefits payable to Federal civilian employees and to ex-servicemen pursuant to chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code) other than extended benefits.

"(H) 'Extended benefits' mean benefits (including benefits payable to Federal civilian employees and to ex-servicemen pursuant to chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code) payable to an individual under the provisions of this subsection for weeks of unemployment in his eligibility period.

"(I) 'Eligibility period' of an individual means the period consisting of the weeks in his benefit year which begin in an extended benefit period and, if his benefit year ends within such extended benefit period, any week thereafter which begins in such period.

"(J) 'Exhaustee' means an individual who, with respect to any week of unemployment in his eligibilty period:

"(i) has received, prior to such week, all of the regular benefits that were available to him under this Act or any State law (including dependents' allowances and benefits payable to Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen under chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code) in his current benefit year that includes such week: *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this subparagraph, an individual shall be deemed to have received all of the regular benefits that were available to him although as a result of a pending appeal with respect to wages that were not considered in the original monetary determination in his benefit year, he may subsequently be determined to be entitled to added regular benefits;

"(ii) his benefit year having expired prior to such week, has no, or insufficient, wages on the basis of which he could establish a new benefit year that would include such week; and

"(iii) (I) has no right to unemployment benefits or allowances, as the case may be, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 and such other Federal laws as are specified in regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor; and (II) has not received and is not seeking unemployment benefits under the unemployment compensation law of the Virgin Islands or of Canada; but if he is seeking such benefits and the appropriate agency finally determines that he is not entitled to benefits under such law he is considered an exhaustee.

"(K) 'State law' means the unemployment insurance law of any State, approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(2) Except when the result would be inconsistent with the other provisions of this subsection, as provided in the regulations of the Board, the provisions of this Act which apply to claims for, or the payment of, regular benefits shall apply to claims for, and the payment of, extended benefits.

"(3) An individual shall be eligible to receive extended benefits with respect to any week of unemployment in his eligibility period only if the Board finds that with respect to such week:

"(A) he is an 'exhaustee' as defined in paragraph (1)(J) of this subsection, and

"(B) he has satisfied the requirements of this Act for the receipt of regular benefits that are applicable to individuals claiming extended benefits, including not being subject to a disqualification for the receipt of benefits.

"(4) The weekly extended benefit amount payable to an individual for a week of total unemployment in his eligibility period shall be an amount equal to the weekly basic or augmented benefit amount, whichever is appropriate, payable to him during his applicable benefit year.

"(5) The total extended benefit amount payable to any eligible individual with respect to his applicable year shall be the least of the following amounts:

"(A) 50 per centum of the total amount of regular benefits (including dependents' allowances) which were payable to him under this Act in his applicable benefit year;

"(B) thirteen times his weekly benefit amount (including dependents' allowances) which was payable to him under this Act for a week of total unemployment in the applicable benefit year; or

"(C) thirty-nine times his weekly benefit amount (including dependents' allowances) which was payable to him under this Act for a week of total unemployment in the applicable benefit year, reduced by the total amount of regular benefits which were paid (or deemed paid) to him under this Act with respect to the benefit year;

"(D) for purposes of this paragraph, the total regular benefit amount shall be that amount (including dependents' allowances) provided in the individual's monetary determination or the amount of regular benefits (including dependents' allowances) actually received, whichever is the greater.

"(6) (A) Whenever an extended benefit period is to become effective in the District (or in all States) as a result of a State or a national 'on' indicator, or an extended benefit period is to be terminated in the District as a result of State and national 'off' indicators, the Director shall make an appropriate public announcement as provided in the regulations of the Board.

"(B) Computations required by the provisions of paragraph (1)(F) of this subsection shall be made by the Board in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor."

(38) Section 9 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–309) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(g) Benefits based on service in employment defined in section 1(b)(1)(B) and (C) shall be payable in the same amount, on the same terms and subject to the same conditions as compensation payable on the basis of other service subject to this Act; except that benefits based on service in an instructional, research, or principal administrative capacity in an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1(w)) shall not be paid to an individual for any week of unemployment which begins during the period between two successive academic years, or during a similar period between two regular terms, whether or not successive, or during a period of paid sabbatical leave provided for in the individual's contract, if the individual has a contract or contracts to perform services in any such capacity for any institution or institutions of higher education for both such academic years or both such terms."

(39) Section 11 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–311) is amended—

(A) by striking out "(a)" in the penultimate sentence of subsection (a); and

(B) by inserting "or recording device" immediately after "stenographer" in the second sentence of subsection (f).

(40) Section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–313) is amended by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION.—(1) In the administration of this Act, the Board shall cooperate with the Department of Labor to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this Act, and shall take such actions, through the adoption of appropriate rules, regulations, administrative methods and standards, as may be necessary to secure to the District and its citizens all advantages available under the provisions of the Social Security Act that relate to unemployment compensation, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970.

"(2) In the administration of the provisions in section 7(g) of this Act, which are enacted to conform with the requirements of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, the Board shall take such action as may be necessary (A) to ensure that the provisions are so interpreted and applied as to meet the requirements of such Federal Act as interpreted by the Department of Labor, and (B) to secure to the District the full reimbursement of the Federal share of extended and regular benefits paid under this Act that are reimbursable under the Federal Act."

(40) Section 14 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–314) is amended—

(A) by inserting the subsection designation "(a)" immediately before "All";

(B) by striking out "$40" in such subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$65"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) There is hereby created a special deposit fund in the Treasury of the United States, separate and apart from the District Unemployment Fund, to be known as the Special Administrative Expense Fund. Notwithstanding any contrary provisions of this Act, (A) interest and penalties collected from employers, and dishonored check penalties authorized by Public Law 89–208 (79 Stat. 844), shall after January 31, 1972, be deposited into the clearing account in the District Unemployment Fund in the Treasury of the United States for clearance only and shall not, except as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, be deemed a part of the District Unemployment Fund; (B) thereafter during each calendar quarter, there shall be transferred from the clearing account to such Special Administrative Expense Fund all moneys described in subparagraph (A) of this subsection collected during the preceding quarter; and (C) refunds of such moneys paid into the Special Administrative Expense Fund shall be made from such fund.

"(2) Said moneys shall not be expended or available for expenditure in any manner which would permit their substitution for, or a corresponding reduction in, Federal funds which would, in the absence of said moneys, be available to finance expenditures for the administration of this Act. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent said moneys from being used as a revolving fund to cover expenditures, necessary and proper under the law, for which Federal funds have been duly requested but not yet received, subject to the charging of such expenditures against such funds when received. The moneys in this fund shall be used by the Board for the payment of costs of administration which are found by the Board not to be proper and valid charges payable out of Federal grants or other funds received for the administration of this Act. All such payments of expenses shall be made by checks drawn by the Board and shall be subject to audit by the District in the same manner as are payments of other expenses of the District.

"(3) No other expenditure of this fund shall be made unless and until the Board by resolution duly entered in its minutes finds that no other funds are available or can properly be used to finance such expenditures. Vouchers drawn to pay expenditures of this fund shall, among other things, include a duly certified copy of the resolution of the Board hereinbefore referred to.

"(4) The moneys in this fund shall be continuously available to the Board for expenditures and refunds in accordance with the provisions of this subsection and shall not lapse at any time or be transferred to any other fund or account except as herein provided. If, on June 30 of any calendar year, the balance of this fund exceeds $250,000 by $1,000 or more, the Board shall transfer such excess to the Unemployment Trust Fund. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of this fund in excess of $10,000 at the end of each month. Such investments shall be made in the same manner as provided in section 904 of the Social Security Act. The interest on, and the proceeds from, the sale of redemptions of any obligations held in this fund shall be credited to and form a part of this fund."

(41) Section 15 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–315) is amended by striking out "$25" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$50".

(42) Section 16 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–316) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal arrangements with appropriate and duly authorized agencies of other States or of the Federal Government, or both, whereby services performed by an individual for a single employing unit for which services are customarily performed by such individual in more than one State shall be deemed to be services performed entirely within any one of the States (1) in which any part of such individual's service is performed or (2) in which such individual has his residence or (3) in which the employing unit maintains a place of business, provided there is in effect, as to such services, an election, approved by the agency charged with the administration of such State's unemployment-compensation law, pursuant to which all the services performed by such individual for such employing unit are deemed to be performed entirely within such State.

"(b) The Board is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal arrangements with appropriate and duly authorized agencies of other States or of the Federal Government, or both, whereby potential rights to benefits accumulated under the unemployment-compensation laws of one or more States or under one or more such laws of the Federal Government, or both, may constitute the basis for the payment of benefits through a single appropriate agency under terms which the Board finds will be fair and reasonable as to all affected interests and will not result in any substantial loss to the fund.

"(c) The Board shall participate in any arrangements for the payment of compensation on the basis of combining an individual's wages and employment covered under this Act with his wages and employment covered under the unemployment-compensation laws of other States which are approved by the Secretary of Labor in consultation with the State unemployment-compensation agencies as reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of compensation in such situations and which include provisions for (1) applying the base period of a single State law to a claim involving the combining of an individual's wages and employment covered under two or more State unemployment-compensation laws, and (2) avoiding the duplicate use of wages and employment by reason of such combining.

"(d) The Board is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal arrangements with appropriate and duly authorized agencies of other States or of the Federal Government, or both, whereby contributions due under this Act with respect to wages for employment shall for the purposes of section 4 of this Act be deemed to have been paid to the fund as of the date payment was made as contributions therefor under another State or Federal un-

employment-compensation law, but no such arrangement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions for such reimbursement to the fund of such contributions and the actual earnings thereon as the Board finds will be fair and reasonable as to all affected interests.

"(e) Reimbursements paid from the fund pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be deemed to be benefits for the purpose of sections 6, 7, and 8 of this Act. The Board is authorized to make to other State or Federal agencies and to receive from such other State or Federal agencies reimbursements from or to the funds, in accordance with arrangements entered into pursuit to this section.

"(f) The administration of this Act and of State and Federal unemployment-compensation and public-employment-service laws will be promoted by cooperation between the District and such States and the appropriate Federal agencies in exchanging services and making available facilities and information. The Board is therefore authorized to make such investigations, secure and transmit such information, make available such services and facilities, and exercise such of the other power provided herein with respect to the administration of this Act as it deems necessary or appropriate to facilities the administration of any such unemployment-compensation or public-employment-service law, and in like manner to accept and utilize information, services, and facilities made available to the District by the agency charged with the administration of any such other unemployment-compensation or public-unemployment-service law.

"(g) To the extent permissible under the laws and Constitution of the United States the Board is authorized to enter into or cooperate in arrangements whereby facilities and services provided under this Act and facilities and services provided under the unemployment-compensation law of any foreign government may be utilized for the taking of claims and the payment of benefits under the employment-security law of the District or under a similar law of such government."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1972, except that the amendments made by sections 2 (35) and 2(36) of this Act shall take effect only with respect to benefit years that begin on or after January 2, 1972.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 10237, as amended, is to amend the District of Columbia Unemployed Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935—D.C. Code, title 46, section 301 et seq. It is designed to implement certain provisions of the Employment Security Amendments of 1970 (84 Stat. 695), which require that certain provisions be included in State unemployment laws and also those of the District of Columbia.

As an omnibus bill, it also contains many technical provisions recommended by the President through the Secretary of Labor to all the Governors of the various States and to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

EMPLOYMENT BROADENED

By section 2 of the bill, the District law (sec. 1(b)) will provide—as did the Employment Security Amendments of 1970 amending the Federal Unemployment Tax Act—extended coverage of individuals; it goes beyond those who were employees under the common law rules of master and servant.

Thus, under "employment", if this bill is enacted, are included (a) services of commission-drivers and salesmen; (b) services for nonprofit organizations with certain exclusions (religious institutions and rehabilitation facilities for individuals physically or mentally impaired); (c) services for District hospitals and institutions of higher education; and (d) services of American citizens employed outside the United States by American employers.

Also included in the term "employment" will be certain employees who now hire domestics in private homes, if said employers pay $500 or more in any calendar quarter. Your committee was advised that this provision alone will affect approximately 2,000 employers and about 3,000 domestic workers. Only the States of New York and Hawaii provide coverage for domestics at the present time.

According to testimony presented to your committee, it is estimated this bill will bring in some 70 organizations employing 4,200 individuals. At the same time, approximately 35 organizations employing 933 individuals, it was specified, which are now covered will be exempted.

CONTRIBUTION RATE FOR NEW EMPLOYERS

All new employers by the bill—which amends section 3(c)(3) of the 1935 act—shall have the average rate of employers in the District of Columbia for the preceding calendar year, or 1 percent, whichever is higher, but not to exceed 2.7 percent.

Further, the employers would maintain this rate until they are eligible for consideration for a reduced rate, when they would be rated as any other employer in the same category.

WAGE LIMITATION AND QUALIFYING WAGES

Section 3(e) of the present law is amended by the bill, (a) to increase the wage limitations on an individual by employers from $3,000 to $4,200—a mandatory provision under Public Law 91–373; and (b) to allow a successor employer to count any wages paid by a predecessor in deterrmining the $4,200 limitation.

Also under the bill—section 7(c) of the present law as amended—the maximum qualifying wages have been raised to $300 in one quarter and $450 in not less than 2 quarters. This is designed to increase the minimum weekly benefit amount from $8 to $14.

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM WEEKLY BENEFITS FROM 50 PERCENT TO 66⅔ PERCENT

The bill amends present law—section 7(b) of the 1935 District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act—District of Columbia Code, title 46, section 307(b)—to increase the maximum weekly benefits payable to an unemployed individual from 50 percent to 66⅔ percent of his average weekly wage during the preceding fiscal year in the District of Columbia. Such increase was recommended to the States by the President in a message to the Congress July 8, 1969; it is supported by the Secretary of Labor; and also by the District of Columbia government and representatives of labor at the hearings before your subcommittee.

On the other hand, representatives of the business community in Washington, employing over 100,000 persons, opposed the higher benefits; namely, increase from 50 percent to 66⅔ percent, for the following reasons:

First. The proposed higher benefits would reduce the incentive for seeking gainful employment.

Second. They would increase District of Columbia employer taxes substantially beyond what will be automatic increases under the mandatory changes and the nonmandatory improvements contained in the bill and supported by the business community.

Third. They would be inflationary and inconsistent with the new wage-price freeze.

Fourth. They would be significantly out of line with what nearby Maryland and Virginia employers are required to provide.

For example, the current maximum weekly benefit of $73 in the District of Columbia would be increased to $98, as compared with $59 in Virginia and $78 in Maryland.

Based on anticipated increases in the average wage for all covered workers, it was testified these maximums for the District of Columbia are expected to equal or exceed $78 and $104 respectively. Further increases in absolute dollar amounts are also expected to continue to occur, under both the current and proposed rates—as the weekly wage among nongovernment District of Columbia employees continues upward—it was stated.

Finally, it should be noted that unemployment compensation benefits are income tax free and not subject to social security withholding.

EXTENDED BENEFITS

The bill meets the extended benefits requirement of Public Law 91–373 adding a new subsection (g) to section 7 of the present law and provides individual workers with extended benefits—equal to the weekly benefit amount they received under the regular program—for half the number of weeks of their regular entitlement up to a maximum of 13 weeks, with an overall limit on regular—extended benefits of 39 weeks. The costs thereof are shared equally by the Federal Government and the District fund. The District employer will not be charged for extended benefits unless he is a self insurer. This is required by Public Law 91–373, principally based upon the concept that the self-insurer has deposited no money in the fund.

STATE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS

The following table shows for each State and the District of Columbia. First, average weekly wage; second, percent of weekly wage; third, maximum weekly benefit amount; fourth, maximum number of weeks; and fifth, maximum potential benefits. The information is extracted from Department of Labor, Manpower Administration monthly statement showing changes up to and including November 1, 1971.

The tabulation provides the following summary results:

First. Average percentage of weekly wage, 54 States and territories, 48.4 percent.

Second. Median percentage of weekly wage, 54 States and territories, 50 percent.

Third. Total number of States having maximum percentage of 66⅔, 3.

Fourth. The District of Columbia's maximum weekly benefit—$73 at present—is 16 percent higher and is available for a 26 percent longer period of time, than the national average.

State	1970 average weekly wage	Percent of weekly wage	Maximum weekly benefit amount	Maximum number of weeks	Maximum potential benefits
Alabama	$119.22	50	$60	26	$1,430
Alaska	214.11	28.40	60–85	28	1,680–2,380
Arizona	137.78	44	60	26	1,560
Arkansas	103.94	66⅔	63	26	1,638
California	154.05	42	65	26	1,690
Colorado	135.51	60	78	26	2,028
Connecticut	149.76	60–82	86–129	26	2,132–3,198
Delaware	149.73	43	65	26	1,690
District of Columbia	149.53	50	73	34	2,482
Florida	129.33	42	54	26	1,404
Georgia	122.92	41	50	26	1,300
Guam					
Hawaii	131.85	66⅔	86	[1] 26	2,236
Idaho	118.45	55	65	26	1,690
Illinois	155.94	29–56	45–88	26	1,170–2,288
Indiana	143.81	31–45	45–65	26	1,170–1,690
Iowa	129.11	55	64	26	1,664
Kansas	124.75	50	60	26	1,560
Kentucky	127.38	46¾	60	26	1,560
Louisiana	133.14	45	60	28	1,680
Maine	116.95	52	61	26	1,586
Maryland	132.37	59	78	[1] 26	2,028
Massachusetts	134.67	52½–79	74–111	30	2,070–3,120
Michigan	163.37	32–53	53–87	26	1,378–2,262
Minnesota	138.12	46	64	26	1,664
Mississippi	107.62	45	49	26	1,274
Missouri	140.57	41	57	26	1,482
Montana	$118.35	44	$52	26	$1,222
Nebraska	121.13	46	56	26	1,456
Nevada	145.05	50	73	26	1,898
New Hampshire	121.30	61	75	[1] 26	1,950
New Jersey	151.07	50	72	26	1,872
New Mexico	118.72	50	58	30	1,740
New York	159.70	47	75	[1] 26	1,950
North Carolina	112.90	50	56	[1] 26	1,456
North Dakota	116.13	50	58	26	1,508
Ohio	151.47	36–56	55–84	26	1,222–1,716
Oklahoma	226.79	47½	60	26	1,560
Oregon	134.68	46	62	26	1,612
Pennsylvania	237.79	60	81–89	30	1,800
Puerto Rico	82.74	60	50	28	1,000
Rhode Island	125.16	60	75–95	26	1,950–2,470
South Carolina	111.25	50	56	26	1,456
South Dakota	106.83	44	47	26	1,222
Tennessee	119.44	46	55	26	1,430
Texas	131.67	48	63	26	1,170
Utah	119.87	65	77	36	2,772
Vermont	128.59	50+9	74	[1] 26	1,924
Virginia	120.91	49	59	26	1,534
Virgin Islands	102.00	66⅔	68	26	1,768
Washington	149.20	50	75	30	2,250
West Virginia	140.70	50	71	[1] 26	1,846
Wisconsin	139.43	60	84	34	2,856
Wyoming	108.22	50	60	26	1,560

[1] Uniform.

ESTIMATED BENEFIT COSTS UNDER 50 PERCENT AND PROPOSED 66⅔ PERCENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT [1]

	Estimated average payment at 50 percent	Estimated average payment at 66⅔ percent	Estimated number of payments	Estimated disbursement under 50 percent	Estimated disbursement under 66⅔ percent	Increase due to 66⅔ percent
Year:						
1972	$59	$81	32,000	1,888,000	2,592,000	704,000
1973	64	88	32,000	2,048,000	2,816,000	788,000
1974	67	92	32,000	2,144,000	2,944,000	800,000
1975	73	101	32,000	2,336,000	2,232,000	896,000
1976	77	106	32,000	2,464,000	2,392,000	928,000
Total						4,096,000

[1] Based on costs experienced in 1971.

Source: District Unemployment Compensation Board, October 1971.

Cost estimates furnished your committee by representatives of the District business community, which they stated were secured from the District Unemployment Compensation Board, indicate that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the required employer contribution without the increase of 50 to 66⅔ percent will be approximately $20 million; and $22 million with the increase contained in the bill—the impact of which will only reflect a one-half year's worth of additional benefits paid January 1, 1972, through June 30, 1972.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the required employer contributions are estimated to be $22 million, without the increase of 50 percent to 66⅔ percent; estimated at $28 million if the increase is included, or a 27-percent higher cost. Under more recent estimates secured October 5, 1971, business representatives estimated the higher cost at 36 percent.

HEARING

A hearing was held on this proposed legislation by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Welfare, Housing, and Youth Affairs on October 13, 1971, at which time representatives of the District of Columbia government, District Unemployment Compensation Board, labor, and business, testified in support thereof, in the main, and except as otherwise set forth in this report. Also, various amendments were proposed but were not adopted by your committee.

No testimony was presented in opposition to the overall purposes of the bill.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, there is pending at the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2429) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act in order to conform to Federal law, and for other purposes, which is similar to the bill H.R. 10237 that we are considering at the present time, and in order to save the time of the House, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2429

An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act in order to conform to Federal law, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 2. The District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 1(b)(1) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'Employment' means:

"(A) Any service performed prior to January 1, 1972, which was employment as defined in this subsection prior to such date and, subject to the other provisions of this subsection, service performed after December 31, 1971, including service by interstate commerce, by—

"(i) any officer of a corporation; or

"(ii) any individual who, under the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an employee; or

"(iii) any individual other than an individual who is an employee under subdivision (i) or (ii) who performs services for remuneration for any person—

"(I) as an agent-driver or commission-driver engaged in distributing meat products, vegetable products, fruit products, bakery products, beverages (other than milk), or laundry or drycleaning services, for his principal;

"(II) as a traveling or city salesman, other than as an agent-driver or commission-driver, engaged upon a full-time basis in the solicitation on behalf of, and the transmis-

sion to, his principal (except for side-line sales activities on behalf of some other person) of orders from wholesalers, retailers, contractors, or operators of hotels, restaurants, or other similar establishments for merchandise for resale or supplies for use in their business operations: *Provided*, That for purposes of subparagraph (A) (iii), the term 'employment' shall include services described in (I) and (II) above performed after December 31, 1971, only if:

"1. The contract of service contemplates that substantially all of the services are to be performed personally by such individual;

"2. The individual does not have a substantial investment in facilities used in connection with the performance of the services (other than in facilities for transportation); and

"3. The services are not in the nature of a single transaction that is not part of a continuing relationship with the person for whom the services are performed.

"(B) Service performed after December 31, 1971, by an individual in the employ of the District or any of its instrumentalities (or in the employ of the District and one or more States or their instrumentalities) for a hospital or institution of higher education: *Provided*, That such service is excluded from 'employment' as defined in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act solely by reason of section 3306(c)(7) of that Act and is not excluded from 'employment' under section 1(b)(1)(D) of this Act;

"(C) Service performed after March 30, 1962, by an individual in the employ of an educational organization, and service performed after December 31, 1971, by an individual in the employ of a religious, charitable, or other organization which is excluded from the term 'employment' as defined in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act solely by reason of section 3306(c)(8) of that Act, except as provided in section 1(b)(1)(D) of this Act;

"(D) For the purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C) the term 'employment' does not apply to service performed after December 31, 1971—

"(i) in the employ of (I) a church or convention or association of churches, or (II) an organization which is operated primarily for religious purposes and which is operated, supervised, controlled, or principally supported by a church or convention or association of churches; or

"(ii) by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order; or

"(iii) in a facility conducted for the purpose of carrying out a program of rehabilitation for individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physicial or mental deficiency or injury providing remunerative work for individuals who because of their impaired physical or mental capacity cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market, by an individual receiving such rehabilitation or remunerative work; or

"(iv) as part of an unemployment work-relief or work-training program assisted or financed in whole or in part by any Federal agency or an agency of a State or political subdivision thereof, by an individual receiving such work relief or work training; or

"(v) for a hospital in a State prison or other State correctional institution, by an inmate of the prison or correctional institution.

"(E) The term 'employment' shall include the service of an individual who is a citizen of the United States, performed outside the United States (except in Canada or the Virgin Islands), after December 31, 1971, in the employ of an American employer (other than service which is deemed 'employment' under the provisions of section 1(b)(2) of this Act or the parallel provisions of another State's law), if:

"(i) the employer's principal place of business in the United States is located in the District; or

"(ii) the employer has no place of business in the United States, but

"(I) the employer is an individual who is a resident of the District; or

"(II) the employer is a corporation which is organized under the laws of the District or the laws of the United States; or

"(III) the employer is a partnership or a trust and the number of the partners or trustees who are residents of the District is greater than the number who are residents of any one other State; or

"(iii) none of the criteria of clauses (i) and (ii) of this subparagraph are met but the employer has elected coverage in the District or, the employer having failed to elect coverage in any State, the individual has filed a claim for benefits, based on such service, under the law of the District.

"(iv) an 'American employer', for purposes of this subparagraph, means a person who is—

"(I) an individual who is a resident of the United States; or

"(II) a partnership if two-thirds or more of the partners are residents of the United States; or

"(III) a trust, if all of the trustees are residents of the United States; or

"(IV) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

"(v) as used in this subparagraph the term 'United States' includes the States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(F) The term 'employment' shall include personal or domestic service in a private home for an employer who paid cash remuneration of $500 or more in any calendar quarter. 'Personal or domestic service' for the purpose of this subparagraph shall include all persons employed by an employer in his capacity as a householder, as distinguished from a person employed by the employer in the pursuit of a trade, occupation, profession, enterprise, or vocation."

(2) Section 1(b)(2) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" after "performed within" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma;

(B) by inserting after "within and without" the following: "or entirely without";

(C) by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new paragraph:

"(C) the service is performed anywhere within the United States, the Virgin Islands, or Canada: *Provided*, That (i) such service is not covered under the unemployment compensation law of any State, the Virgin Islands, or Canada, and (ii) the place from which the service is directed or controlled is in the District."

(3) Section 1(b)(4) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this subsection, the term 'employment' shall also include all service performed after January 1, 1955, by an officer or member of the crew of an American vessel or American aircraft on or in connection with such vessel or aircraft: *Provided*, That the operating officer from which the operations of such vessel or aircraft are ordinarily and regularly supervised, managed, directed, and controlled, is within the District."

(4) Section 1(b)(5) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(5)) is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) service performed by an individual under 18 years of age as a babysitter;";

(B) by redesignating clauses (a) and (b) of subparagraph (D) as (i) and (ii), respectively;

(C) by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (E) the following: ", except for service performed after December 31, 1971, as provided in section 1(b)(1)(B) of this Act";

(D) by striking out in subparagraph (I)(1)(c) "at a" and inserting in lieu thereof "at such";

(E) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), and (5) of subparagraph (I) as (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(F) by striking out clauses (3) and (4) of subparagraph (I);

(G) by redesignating (a) and (c) of clause (i) as (I) and (II) respectively;

(H) by striking out (b) of caluse (i);

(I) by redesignating clauses (1) and (2) of subparagraph (K) as (i) and (ii), respectively;

(J) by inserting in subparagraph (Q), "or aircraft" after "vessel" the first and third times it appears, and by inserting "or American aircraft" after "vessel" the second time it appears;

(K) by redesignating clauses (A) and (B) of subparagraph (R) as (i) and (ii), respectively;

(L) by striking out subparagraphs (G) and (P); and

(M) by redesignating subparagraphs (H) through (T) as subparagraphs (G) through (R), respectively.

(5) Section 1(b)(6) of such Act (D.C. Code sec. 46–301(b)(6)) is amended by striking out "5(H)" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "5(G)".

(6) Section 1(b)(7) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(7)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "or which as a condition for full tax credit against the tax imposed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act is required to be covered under this Act".

(7) Section 1(b)(8) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(8)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "localized" after "Any" in subparagraph (i);

(B) by striking out "section 1(b)(5)" in such subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1(b)";

(C) by striking out "section 1(b)(8)(i)" in subparagraph (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1(b)(8)(A)";

(D) by redesignating clauses (A) and (B) of subparagraph (i) as (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(E) by redesignating subparagraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) as (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

(8) Section 1(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "; or" at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(B) by striking out paragraph (3).

(9) Section 1(d) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(d)) is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence the following new sentence: "After August 29, 1946, back pay awarded under any statute of the District or of the United States shall be treated as earnings."

(10) Section 1(q) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(q)) is amended to read as follows:

"(q) 'State' includes, in addition to the States of the United States of America, the District of Columbia (herein referred to as the 'District'), Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

(11) Section 1(r) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(r)) is amended by inserting immediately after "including" the following: "the District government and its instrumentalities (as specified in section 1(b)(1)(B)) of this Act,".

(12) Section 1(t) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(t)) is amended by inserting im-

mediately before the period at the end thereof the folowing "; and the term 'American aircraft' means an aircraft registered under the laws of the United States".

(13) Section 1 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(w) 'Institution of higher education', for the purposes of this section, means an educational institution which—

"(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

"(2) is legally authorized in the District to provide a program of education beyond high school;

"(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's or higher degree, or provides a program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, a program of postgraduate or postdoctoral studies, or a program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation; and all colleges and universities in the District are institutions of higher education for purposes of this section.

"(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution.

"(x) 'Hospital' means an institution which has been licensed by the Commissioner of the District as a hospital."

(14) Section 3(b) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(b)) is amended by striking out ", until the effective date of this Act,".

(15) Section 3(c)(2) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(2) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That after December 31, 1971, benefits paid to an individual for any week during which he is attending a training or retraining course under the provisions of section 10(d)(2) of this Act or extended benefits paid to an exhaustee under the provisions of section 7(g) of this Act shall not be charged against such employer accounts".

(16) Section 3(c)(3) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The standard rate of contributions shall be 2.7 per centum, except that after December 31, 1971, each employer newly subject to this Act shall pay contributions at a rate equal to the average rate on taxable wages of all employers for the preceding calendar year (rounded to the next higher one-tenth of 1 per centum), or 1 per centum, whichever is higher (not exceeding 2.7 per centum) until he has been an employer for a sufficient period to meet the requirement to qualify for a reduced rate as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection; thereafter, his contribution rate shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of such paragraph (4)."

(17) Section 3(c)(4) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking out subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(A) No employer's rate of contribution for any calendar year or part thereof shall be reduced below the standard rate unless and until his account could have been charged with benefits paid throughout the thirty-six-consecutive-calendar-month period ending on the computation date applicable to such year or part thereof. For the calendar years 1963 to 1971, inclusive, any employer who is subject to this Act by virtue of the amendment of former section (1)(b)(5)(G) of this Act by the Act of March 30, 1962, and who has not been subject to this Act for a sufficient period to meet this requirement, may qualify for a rate less than the standard rate if his account could have been charged with benefit payments throughout a lesser period but, in no event, less than the twelve consecutive calendar months ending on the computation date (as herein defined) for that calendar year.";

(B) by striking out subparagraph (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(B) If the amount of the fund as of June 30 of any year is less than 4 per centum of the total payrolls subject to contributions under this Act for the twelve-consecutive-month period ending on the preceding December 31, the contribution rate for each employer (including newly subject employers) shall be increased by the percentage differential between said 4 per centum of such total payrolls and said funds' percentage of such total payrolls, but in no event shall the contribution rate for any employer be more than 2.7 per centum. Said percentage differential for each employer shall be computed to the next higher one-tenth of 1 per centum.";

(C) by striking out subparagraph (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(C) If on December 20 of any year, the amount in the fund becomes less than 2 per centum of the total annual payrolls subject to contributions under the Act for the twelve-consecutive-month period ending on the preceding June 30, the Board shall make a declaration to that effect. Effective the quarter following such announcement, each employer's (including each new subject employer's) rate of contribution shall be the standard rate.";

(D) by striking out "paragraph (iv)" in the last sentence of subparagraph (iv) and inserting in lieu thereof "subparagraph (D)"; and

(E) by redesignating subparagraph (iv) as subparagraph (D).

(18) Section 3(c)(5) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(5)) is amended—

(A) by amending the first sentence to read as follows: "The Board shall for any uncompleted portion of the calendar year beginning July 1, 1943, and for each calendar year thereafter classify employers in accordance with their actual experience in the payment of contributions and with respect to benefits charged against their accounts, except as provided in section 3(c)(3) of this Act."; and

(B) by striking out "3(c)(4)(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "3(c)(4)(A)".

(19) Section 3(c)(7) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(7)) is amended—

(A) by designating subclauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of clause (ii) as (I), (II), (III), and (IV), respectively; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (a) through (f) as subparagraphs (A) through (F), respectively.

(20) Section(c)(8) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(8)) is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (i) to read as follows:

"(A) If as of the computation date the total of all contributions credited to any employer's account, with respect to employment since May 31, 1939, is in excess of the total benefits paid after June 30, 1939, then chargeable or charged to his account, such excess shall be known as the employer's reserve, and his contribution rate for the ensuing calendar year or part thereof shall be—

"(i) 2.7 per centum if such reserve is less than 0.5 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(ii) 2 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 0.5 per centum but is less than 1 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(iii) 1.5 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 1 per centum but is less than 1.5 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(iv) 1 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 1.5 per centum but is less than 2.5 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(v) 0.5 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 2.5 per centum but is less than 3 per centum of his average annual payroll;

"(v) 0.1 per centum if such reserve equals or exceeds 3 per centum of his average annual payroll.";

(B) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subparagraph (ii) "except as provided in subsection (c)(3) of this section"; and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (ii), (iii), and (iv) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

(21) Section 3(c)(9) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)(9)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "(iv)" in subparagraph (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "(D)"; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) as (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E), respectively.

(22) Section 3(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) After December 31, 1971, the separate account established for an employer under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be discontinued effective the calendar quarter next succeeding three calendar years after the employer has been determined out of business. Thereafter no employer shall have any right to or interest in such discontinued account."

(23) Section 3(e) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) From December 31, 1939, to January 1, 1955, wages, for the purpose of section 3, shall not include any amount in excess of $3,000 paid by an employer to any person arising out of his or her employment during any calendar year. From January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1971, wages shall not include any amount in excess of $3,000 actually paid by an employer to any person during any calendar year. After December 31, 1971, wages shall not include any amount in excess of $4,200 (or in excess of the limitation on the amount of taxable wages fixed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (26 U.S.C. 3301-3311), whichever is greater) actually paid by an employer to any person during any calendar year. After December 31, 1954, the term 'employment' for the purpose of this subsection shall include services constituting employment under any employment security law of a State or the Federal Government. After December 31, 1971, the term 'employment' for the purpose of this subsection shall include services constituting employment performed in the employ of a transferor as determined under the provisions of section 3(c)(7) of this Act."

(24) Section 3(f) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303)(f)) is amended—

"(A) by striking out in the first sentence "(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A), or in the event any of its instrumentalities are required to be covered under this Act,"; and

"(B) by adding at the end of the second paragraph thereof the following: "The District of Columbia shall be liable only for 50 per centum of any extended benefits paid."

(25) Section 3(g) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303(g)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That liability to the funds shall not exceed contributions for the three calendar years next preceding the quarter in which liability was determined."

(26) Section 3 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-303) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, benefits paid to employees of nonprofit organizations shall be financed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection. For the purpose of this subsection and subsection (i), a nonprofit organization is an organization (or group of organizations) described in section 501(c)

(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

"(1) Any nonprofit organization which, pursuant to section 1(b)(1)(C), is, or becomes, subject to this Act on or after January 1, 1972, shall pay contributions under the provisions of section 3(c), unless it elects, in accordance with this paragraph to pay to the Board for the District Unemployment Fund an amount equal to the amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid that is attributable to service in the employ of such nonprofit organization, to individuals for weeks of unemployment which begin during the effective period of such election.

"(A) Any nonprofit organization which is, or becomes, subject to this Act on January 1, 1972, may elect to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions for a period of not less than one taxable year beginning with January 1, 1972: *Provided*, That it files with the Board a written notice of its election within the thirty-day period immediately following such date or within a like period immediately following the date of enactment of this subparagraph whichever occurs later.

"(B) Any nonprofit organization which becomes subject to this Act after January 1, 1972, may elect to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions for a period of not less than the remainder of that and the next year beginning with the date on which such liability begins by filing a written notice of its election with the Board not later than thirty days immediately following the date of the determination of such liability.

"(C) Any nonprofit organization which makes an election in accordance with subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) of this paragraph will continue to be liable for payments in lieu of contributions until it files with the Board a written notice terminating its election not later than thirty days prior to the beginning of the taxable year for which such termination shall first be effective.

"(D) Any nonprofit organization which has been paying contributions under this Act for a period subsequent to January 1, 1972 may change to a reimbursable basis by filing with the Board not later than thirty days prior to the beginning of any taxable year a written notice of election to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions. Such election shall not be terminable by the organization for that and the next year.

"(E) The Board may for good cause extend the period within which a notice of election, or a notice of termination, must be filed and may permit an election to be retroactive but not any earlier than with respect to benefits paid after December 31, 1969.

"(F) The Board, in accordance with such regulations as it may prescribe, shall notify each nonprofit organization of any determination which the Board may make of its status as an employer and of the effective date of any election which it makes and of any termination of such election. Such determinations shall be subject to reconsideration, appeal and review in accordance with the provisions of sections 3(c).

"(2) Payments in lieu of contributions shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph including either subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B).

"(A) At the end of each calendar quarter, or at the end of any other period as determined by the Board, the Board shall bill each nonprofit organization (or group of such organizations) which has elected to make payments in lieu of contributions for an amount equal to the full amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid that is attributable to service in the employ of such organization.

"(B) (i) Each nonprofit organization that has elected payments in lieu of contributions may request permission to make such payments as provided in this subparagraph. Such method of payment shall become effective upon approval by the Board.

"(ii) At the end of each calendar quarter, or at the end of such other period as determined by the Board, the Board shall bill each nonprofit organization for an amount representing one of the following:

"(I) For 1972, one-fourth of 1 percent of its total payroll for 1971.

"(II) For years after 1972, such percentage of its total payroll for the immediately preceding calendar year as the Board shall determine. Such determination shall be based each year on the average benefit costs attributable to service in the employ of nonprofit organizations during the preceding calendar year.

"(III) For any organization which did not pay wages throughout the four calendar quarters of the preceding calendar year, such percentage of its payroll during such year as the Board shall determine.

"(iii) At the end of each taxable year, the Board may modify the quarterly percentage of payroll thereafter payable by the nonprofit organization in order to minimize excess or insufficient payments.

"(iv) At the end of each taxable year, the Board shall determine whether the total of payments for such year made by a nonprofit organization is less than, or in excess of, the total amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid to individuals during such taxable year based on wages attributable to service in the employ of such organization. Each nonprofit organization whose total payments for such year are less than the amount so determined shall be liable for payment of the unpaid balance to the fund in accordance with subparagraph (C). If the total payments exceed the amount so determined for the taxable year, all or a part of the excess may, at the discretion of the Board, be refunded from the fund or retained in the fund as part of the payments which may be required for the next taxable year.

"(C) Payment of any bill rendered under subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) shall be made not later than thirty days after such bill was mailed to the last known address of the nonprofit organization or was otherwise delivered to it, unless there has been an application for review and redetermination in accordance with subparagraph (E).

"(D) Payments made by a nonprofit organization under the provisions of this subsection shall not be deducted or deductible, in whole or in part, from the remuneration of individuals in the employ of the organization.

"(E) The amount due specified in any bill from the Board shall be conclusive on the organization unless, not later than fifteen days after the bill was mailed to its last known address or otherwise delivered to it, the organization files an application for redetermination by the Board, setting forth the grounds for such application or appeal. The Board shall promptly review and reconsider the amount due specified in the bill and shall thereafter issue a redetermination in any case in which such application for redetermination has been filed. Any such redetermination shall be conclusive on the organization unless the organization files an appeal as set forth in section 3(c)(10), setting forth the grounds for the appeal.

"(F) Past due payments of amounts in lieu of contributions shall be subject to the same interest and penalties that, pursuant to section 4(c), apply to past due contributions.

"(3) In the discretion of the Director, any nonprofit organization that elects to become liable for payments in lieu of contributions shall be required within thirty days after the effective date of its election, to execute and file with the Board a surety bond approved by the Director, or it may elect instead to deposit with the Board money. The amount of such bond or deposit shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

"(A) The amount of the bond or deposit required by this paragraph shall be equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum of the organization's total wages paid for employment as defined in section 1(b)(1)(C) for the four calendar quarters immediately preceding the effective date of the election, the renewal date in the case of a bond, or the biennial anniversary of the effective date of election in the case of a deposit of money, whichever date shall be most recent and applicable. If the nonprofit organization did not pay wages in each of such four calendar quarters, the amount of the bond or deposit shall be as determined by the Director.

"(B) Any bond deposited under this paragraph shall be in force for a period of not less than two taxable years and shall be renewed with the approval of the Director at such times as the Director may prescribe, but not less frequently than at two-year intervals as long as the organization continues to be liable for payments in lieu of contributions. The Director shall require adjustments to be made in a previously filed bond as he deems appropriate. If the bond is to be increased, the adjusted bond shall be filed by the organization within fifteen days of the date notice of the required adjustment was mailed or otherwise delivered to it. Failure by any organization covered by such bond to pay the full amount of payments in lieu of contributions when due, together with any applicable interest and penalties provided for in section 4(c) of this Act, shall render the surety liable on said bond to the extent of the bond, as though the surety was such organization.

"(C) Any deposit of money in accordance with this paragraph shall be retained by the Board in an escrow account until liability under the election is terminated, at which time it shall be returned to the organization, less any deductions as hereinafter provided. The Director may deduct from the money deposited under this paragraph by a nonprofit organization to the extent necessary to satisfy any due and unpaid payments in lieu of contributions and any applicable interest and penalties provided for in section 4(c). The Director shall require the organization within fifteen days following any deduction from a money deposit under the provisions of this subparagraph to deposit sufficient additional money to make whole the organization's deposit at the prior level. The Director may, at any time, review the adequacy of the deposit made by any organization. If, as the result of such review, he determines that an adjustment is necessary, he shall require the organization to make additional deposit within fifteen days of written notice of his determination or shall return to it such portion of the deposit as he no longer considers necessary, whichever action is appropriate.

"(D) If any nonprofit organization fails to file a bond or make a deposit, or to file a bond in an increased amount or to increase or make whole the amount of a previously made deposit, as provided under this paragraph, the Director may terminate such organization's election to make payments in lieu of contributions and such termination shall continue for not less than the four-consecutive-calendar-quarter period beginning with the quarter in which such termination becomes effective: *Provided*, That the Director may extend for good cause the applicable filing, deposit or adjustment period by not more than fifteen days.

"(4) If any nonprofit organization is delinquent in making payments in lieu of contributions as required under paragraph (2)

of this subsection, the Board may terminate such organization's election to make payments in lieu of contributions as of the beginning of the next taxable year, and such termination shall be effective for that and the next taxable year.

"(5) Each employer that is liable for payments in lieu of contributions shall pay to the Board for the fund the amount of regular benefits plus one-half of the amount of extended benefits paid that are attributable to service in the employ of such employer. If benefits paid to an individual are based on wages paid by more than one employer and one or more of such employers are liable for payments in lieu of contributions, the amount payable to the fund by each employer that is liable for such payments shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B).

"(A) If benefits paid to an individual are based on wages paid by one or more employers that are liable for payments in lieu of contributions and on wages paid by one or more employers who are liable for contributions, the amount of benefits payable by each employer that is liable for payments in lieu of contributions shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total benefits paid to the individual as the total base-period wages paid to the individual by such employer bear to the total base-period wages paid to the individual by all of his base-period employers.

"(B) If benefits paid to an individual are based on wages paid by two or more employers that are liable for payments in lieu of contributions, the amount of benefits payable by each such employer shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total benefits paid to the individual as the total base-period wages paid to the individual by such employer bear to the total base-period wages paid to the individual by all of his base-period employers.

"(6) Two or more employers that have become liable for payments in lieu of contributions, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (h)(1), may file a joint application to the Board for the establishment of a group account for the purpose of sharing the cost of benefits paid that are attributable to service in the employ of such employers. Each such application shall identify and authorize a group representative to act as the group's agent for the purposes of this paragraph. Upon approval of the application, the Board shall establish a group account for such employers effective as of the beginning of the calendar quarter in which it receives the application and shall notify the group's representative of the effective date of the account. Such account shall remain in effect for not less than two years and thereafter until terminated at the discretion of the Board or upon application by the group. Upon establishment of the account, each member of the group shall be liable for payments in lieu of contributions with respect to each calendar quarter in the amount that bears the same ratio to the total benefits paid in such quarter that are attributable to service performed in the employ of all members of the group as the total wages paid for service in employment by such member in such quarter bear to the total wages paid during such quarter for service performed in the employ of all members of the group. The Board shall prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary with respect to applications for establishment, maintenance, and termination of group accounts that are authorized by this paragraph, for addition of new members to, and withdrawal of active members from such accounts, and for the determination of the amounts that are payable under this paragraph by members of the group and the time and manner of such payments.

"(i) Notwithstanding any provisions in subsection (h) any nonprofit organization that prior to January 1, 1969, paid contributions required by subsection (c) of this section and, pursuant to subsection (h) of this section, elects, within thirty days after the effective date of such subsection (h), to make payments in lieu of contributions, shall not be required to make any such payment on account of any benefits paid, on the basis of wages paid by such organization to individuals for weeks of unemployment which began on or after the effective date of such election until the total amount of such benefits equals the amount of the positive balance in the experience rating account of such organization."

(27) Section 4(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(a)) is amended by inserting ", or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)," immediately after "section 3".

(28) Section 4(b) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(b)) is amended by inserting ", except as provided in section 3(h) of this Act" immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence.

(29) Section 4(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) If contributions or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h) are not paid when due, there shall be added interest at the rate of one-half of 1 per centum per month or fraction thereof from the date they become due until paid: *Provided*, That interest shall not run against a court-appointed fiduciary when the contributions or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h) are not paid timely because of a court order.

"(2) If contributions or wage reports are not filed on or before the fifteenth day of the second month following the close of the calendar quarter for which they are due or contributions, or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h), are not paid by that time, there shall be added a penalty of 10 per centum of the contributions, or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h), but such penalty shall not be less than $5 nor more than $25 and for good cause such penalty may be waived by the Board."

(30) Section 4(d) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(d)) is amended by inserting ", or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)," immediately after "contributions".

(31) Section 4(e) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(e)) is amended by striking out "or tax" in the first and fifteenth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof ", or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h),".

(32) Section 4(h) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(h)) is amended by inserting "or penalty" immediately after "interest" in the second sentence.

(33) Section 4(i) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(i)) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) REFUNDS.—If not later than three years after the date on which any contributions (or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)) or interest thereon were paid, an employing unit which has paid such contributions (or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)) or interest thereon shall make application for an adjustment thereof in connection with subsequent contribution payments (or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)) or for a refund thereof because such adjustment cannot be made, and the Board shall determine that such contributions (or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)) or interest on any portion thereof was erroneously collected, the Board shall allow such employing unit to make an adjustment thereof, without interest, in connection with subsequent contribution payments (or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h)) by it, or if such adjustment cannot be made the Board shall refund said amount, without interest, from the clearing account or benefit account upon checks issued by the Board or its duly authorized agent. For like cause and within the same period, adjustment or refund may be so made on the Board's own initiative. Should benefits have been paid based upon work records filed by the employing unit, claiming an adjustment or refund, such benefit should be disregarded for purposes of figuring such adjustment or refund, and any such benefit payments already having been made at the time of the adjustment or refund, based upon records filed with this Board by such employing unit, shall to that extent be allowed and shall not be deemed to have been paid erroneously."

(34) Section 4(1) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-304(1)) is amended by striking out the first and second sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The Board may compromise any civil case arising under this Act. Whenever a compromise is made by the Board in each such case, there shall be placed in the minutes of the Board the opinion of an attorney of the Board with the reasons therefor, including a statement of (1) the amount of the contributions, or payments in lieu of contributions under section 3(h), due, (2) the amount of interest due on the same, and (3) the amount actually paid in accordance with the terms of the compromise."

(35) Section 7(b) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-307(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out the second sentence; and

(B) by striking out in the third sentence "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "66⅔ per centum".

(36) Section 7(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-307(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To qualify for benefits an individual must have (1) been paid wages for employment of not less than $300 in one quarter in his base period, (2) been paid wages for employment of not less than $450 in not less than two quarters in such period, and (3) received during such period wages the total amount of which is equal to at least one and one-half times the amount of his wages actually received in the quarter in such period in which his wages were the highest. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3), any otherwise qualified individual, the total amount of whose wages during such period is less than the amount required to have been received during such period under such paragraph, may qualify for benefits if the difference between the amounts so required to have been received and the total amount of his wages during such period does not exceed $70, but the amount of his weekly benefit, as computed under section 7(b), shall be reduced by $1 if such difference does not exceed $35 or by $2 if such difference is more than $35. Wages received by an individual in the period intervening between the end of his last base period and the beginning of his last benefit year shall not be available for benefit purposes in a subsequent benefit year unless he has, subsequent to the commencement of such last benefit year, performed services for which he received remuneration for personal services, whether or not such services were performed in employment as defined in this Act, in an amount equal to at least ten times the weekly benefit amount for which he qualifies in such last benefit year. Benefits payable to an individual with respect to a week shall be reduced, under regulations prescribed by the Board, by any amount received or applied for with respect to such week as a retirement pension or annuity under a public or private retirement plan or system provided, or contributed to, by any base period employer. An amount received with respect to a period other than a week shall be prorated by weeks.

No reduction shall be made under the preceding two sentences for any amount received under title II of the Social Security Act."

(37) Section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–307) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

(g) EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, this subsection provides a program of extended benefits on and after January 1, 1972.

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection, unless the context clearly requires otherwise—

"(A) 'Extended benefit period' means a period which—

"(i) begins with the third week after whichever of the following weeks occurs first: (I) a week for which there is a national 'on' indicator, or (II) a week for which there is a State 'on' indicator; and

"(ii) ends with either of the following weeks, whichever occurs later: (I) the third week after the first week for which there is both a national 'off' indicator and a State 'off' indicator; or (II) the thirteenth consecutive week of such period: *Provided*, That no extended benefit period may begin by reason of a State 'on' indicator before the fourteenth week following the end of a prior extended benefit period which was in effect with respect to the District.

"(B) There is a national 'on' indicator for a week if the Secretary of Labor determines that for each of the three most recent completed calendar months ending before such week, the rate of insured unemployment (seasonally adjusted) for all States was equaled or exceeded 4.5 per centum.

"(C) There is a national 'off' indicator for a week if the Secretary of Labor determines that for each of the three most recent completed calendar months ending before such week, the rate of insured unemployment (seasonally adjusted) for all States was less than 4.5 per centum.

"(D) There is a State 'on' indicator for the District for a week if the Board determines, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Labor, that for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding twelve weeks, the rate of insured unemployment (not seasonally adjusted) under this Act—

"(i) equaled or exceeded 120 per centum of the average of such rates for the corresponding thirteen-week period ending in each of the preceding two calendar years, and

"(ii) equaled or exceeded 4 per centum.

"(E) There is a State 'off' indicator for the District for a week if the Board determines in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Labor, that for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding twelve weeks, the rate of insured unemployment (not seasonally adjusted) under this Act—

"(i) was less than 120 per centum of the average of such rates for the corresponding thirteen-week period ending in each of the preceding two calendar years, or

"(ii) was less than 4 per centum.

"(F) 'Rate of insured unemployment', for purposes of subparagraphs (D) and (E) of this subsection, means the percentage derived by dividing (i) the average weekly number of individuals filing claims in the District for weeks of unemployment with respect to the most recent thirteen-consecutive-week period, as determined by the Board on the basis of its reports to the Secretary of Labor, by (ii) the average monthly employment covered under this Act for the first four of the most recent six completed calendar quarters ending before the end of such thirteen-week period.

"(G) 'Regular benefits' means benefits payable to an individual under this Act or under any State law (including benefits payable to Federal civilian employees and to ex-servicemen pursuant to chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code) other than extended benefits.

"(H) 'Extended benefits' mean benefits (including benefits payable to Federal civilian employees and to ex-servicemen pursuant to chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code) payable to an individual under the provisions of this subsection for weeks of unemployment in his eligibility period.

"(I) 'Eligibility period' of an individual means the period consisting of the weeks in his benefit year which begin in an extended benefit period and, if his benefit year ends within such extended benefit period, any weeks thereafter which begins in such period.

"(J) 'Exhaustee' means an individual who, with respect to any week of unemployment in his eligibility period:

"(i) has received, prior to such week, all of the regular benefits that were available to him under this Act or any State law (including dependents' allowances and benefits payable to Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen under chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code) in his current benefit year that includes such week: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this subparagraph, an individual shall be deemed to have received all of the regular benefits that were available to him although as a result of a pending appeal with respect to wages that were not considered in the original monetary determination in his benefit year, he may subsequently be determined to be entitled to added regular benefits; or

"(ii) his benefit year having expired prior to such week, has no, or insufficient, wages on the basis of which he could establish a new benefit year that would include such week; and

"(iii) (I) has no right to unemployment benefits or allowances, as the case may be, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965, and such other Federal laws as are specified in regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor; and (II) has not received and is not seeking unemployment benefits under the unemployment compensation law of the Virgin Islands or of Canada; but if he is seeking such benefits and the appropriate agency finally determines that he is not entitled to benefits under such law he is considered an exhaustee.

"(K) 'State law' means the unemployment insurance law of any State, approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(2) Except when the result would be inconsistent with the other provisions of this subsection, as provided in the regulations of the Board, the provisions of this Act which apply to claims for, or the payment of, regular benefits shall apply to claims for, and the payment of, extended benefits.

"(3) An individual shall be eligible to receive extended benefits with respect to any week of unemployment in his eligibility period only if the Board finds that with respect to such week:

"(A) he is an 'exhaustee' as defined in paragraph (1) (J) of this subsection, and

"(B) he has satisfied the requirements of this Act for the receipt of regular benefits that are applicable to individuals claiming extended benefits, including not being subject to a disqualification for the receipt of benefits.

"(4) The weekly extended benefit amount payable to an individual for a week of total unemployment in his eligibility period shall be an amount equal to the weekly basic or augmented benefit amount, whichever is appropriate, payable to him during his applicable benefit year.

"(5) The total extended benefit amount payable to any eligible individual with respect to his applicable year shall be the least of the following amounts:

"(A) 50 percent of the total amount of regular benefits (including dependents' allowances) which were payable to him under this Act in his applicable benefit year;

"(B) thirteen times his weekly benefit amount (including dependent's allowances) which was payable to him under this Act for a week of total unemployment in the applicable benefit year; or

"(C) thirty-nine times his weekly benefit amount (including dependents' allowances) which was payable to him under this Act for a week of total unemployment in the applicable benefit year, reduced by the total amount of regular benefits which were paid (or deemed paid) to him under this Act with respect to the benefit year.

"(D) For purposes of this paragraph, the total regular benefit amount shall be that amount (including dependents' allowance) provided in the individual's monetary determination or the amount of regular benefits (including dependents' allowances) actually received, whichever is the greater.

"(6) (A) Whenever an extended benefit period is to become effective in the District (or in all States) as a result of a State or a National 'on' indicator, or an extended benefit period is to be determined in the District as a result of State and National 'off' indicators, the Director shall make an appropriate public announcement as provided in the regulations of the Board.

"(B) Computations required by the provisions of paragraph (1) (F) of this subsection shall be made by the Board in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor."

(38) Section 9 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–309) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(g) Benefits based on service in employment defined in section 1(b) (1) (B) and (C) shall be payable in the same amount, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as compensation payable on the basis of other service subject to this Act; except that benefits based on service in an instructional, research, or principal administrative capacity in an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1(w)) shall not be paid to an individual for any week of unemployment which begins during the period between two successive academic years, or during a similar period between two regular terms, whether or not successive, or during a period of paid sabbatical leave provided for in the individual's contract, if the individual has a contract or contracts to perform services in any such capacity for any institution or institutions of higher education for both such academic years or both such terms."

(39) Section 10(d) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–310(d)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, compensation shall not be denied or reduced to an individual solely because he files a claim in another State (or a contiguous country with which the United States has an agreement with respect to unemployment compensation) or because he resides in another State (or such a contiguous country) at the time he files a claim for unemployment compensation."

(40) Section 11 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–311) is amended—

(A) by striking out the fifth sentence in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "The Board shall promptly notify the claimant and any party to the proceeding of its determination, and such determination shall be final within 10 days after the mailing of notice thereof to the party's last known address or in the absence of such mailing, within 10 days of actual delivery of such notice."

(B) by striking out the sixth sentence in subsection (b); by striking out the seventh

sentence through the words "*Provided*, That" in subsection (b) and capitalize the word "if" immediately thereafter.

(C) by striking out "after the date of notification or" in the fourth sentence of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "of".

(D) by striking out "(a)" in the penultimate sentence of subsection (e); and

(E) by inserting "or recording device" immediately after "stenographer" in the second sentence of subsection (f).

(41) Section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–313) is amended (A) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION.—(1) In the administration of this Act, the Board shall cooperate with the Department of Labor to the fullest exent consistent with the provisions of this Act, and shall take such action, through the adoption of appropriate rules, regulations, administrative methods, and standards, as may be necessary to secure to the District and its citizens all advantages available under the provisions of the Social Security Act that relate to unemployment compensation, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, or other Manpower Acts.

"(2) In the administration of the provisions in section 7(g) of this Act, which are enacted to conform with the requirements of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, the Board shall take such action as may be necessary (A) to ensure that the provisions are so interpreted and applied as to meet the requirements of such Federal Act as interpreted by the Department of Labor, and (B) to secure to the District the full reimbursement of the Federal share of extended and regular benefits paid under this Act that are reimbursable under the Federal Act." and (B) by striking out "the District of Columbia" in the third sentence of subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "any State".

(42) Section 14 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–314) is amended—

(A) by inserting the subsection designation "(a)" immediately before "All";

(B) by striking out "$40" in such subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$65"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) There is hereby created a special deposit fund in the Treasury of the United States, separate and apart from the District Unemployment Fund, to be known as the Special Administrative Expense Fund. Notwithstanding any contrary provisions of this Act, (A) interest and penalties collected from employers, and dishonored check penalties authorized by Public Law 89–208 (79 Stat. 844), shall after January 31, 1972, be deposited into the clearing account in the District Unemployment Fund in the Treasury of the United States for clearance only and shall not, except as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, be deemed a part of the District Unemployment Fund; (B) thereafter, during each calendar quarter, there shall be transferred from the clearing account to such Special Administrative Expense Fund all moneys described in subparagraph (A) of this subsection collected during the preceding quarter; and (C) refunds of such moneys paid into the Special Administrative Expense Fund shall be made from such fund.

"(2) Said moneys shall not be expended or available for expenditure in any manner which would permit their substitution for, or a corresponding reduction in, Federal funds which would, in the absence of said moneys, be available to finance expenditures for the administration of this Act. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent said moneys from being used as a revolving fund to cover expenditures, necessary and proper under the law, for which Federal funds have been duly requested but not yet received, subject to the charging of such expenditures against such funds when received. The moneys in this fund shall be used by the Board for the payment of costs of administration which are found by the Board not to be proper and valid charges payable out of Federal grants or other funds received for the administration of this Act. All such payments of expenses shall be made by checks drawn by the Board and shall be subject to audit by the District in the same manner as are payments of other expenses of the District.

"(3) No expenditure of this fund shall be made unless and until the Board by resolution duly entered in its minutes finds that no other funds are available or can properly be used to finance such expenditures. Vouchers drawn to pay expenditures of this fund shall, among other things, include a duly certified copy of the resolution of the Board hereinbefore referred to.

"(4) The moneys in this fund shall be continuously available to the Board for expenditures and refunds in accordance with the provisions of this subsection and shall not lapse at any time or be transferred to any other fund or account except as herein provided. If, on June 30 of any calendar year, the balance in this fund exceeds $250,000 by $1,000 or more, the Board shall transfer such excess to the Unemployment Trust Fund. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of this fund in excess of $10,000 at the end of each month. Such investments shall be made in the same manner as provided in section 904 of the Social Security Act. The interest on, and the proceeds from, the sale of redemptions or any obligations held in this fund shall be credited to and form a part of this fund."

(43) Section 15 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–315) is amended by striking out "$25" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$50".

(44) Section 16 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–316) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal arrangements with appropriate and duly authorized agencies of other States or of the Federal Government, or both, whereby services performed by an individual for a single employing unit for which services are customarily performed by such individual in more than one State shall be deemed to be services performed entirely within any one of the States (1) in which any part of such individual's service is performed or (2) in which such individual has his residence or (3) in which the employing unit maintains a place of business, provided there is in effect, as to such services, an election, approved by the agency charged with the administration of such State's unemployment-compensation law, pursuant to which all the services performed by such individual for such employing unit are deemed to be performed entirely within such State.

"(b) The Board is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal arrangements with appropriate and duly authorized agencies of other States or of the Federal Government, or both, whereby potential rights to benefits accumulated under the unemployment-compensation laws of one or more States or under one or more such laws of the Federal Government, or both, may constitute the basis for the payment of benefits through a single appropriate agency under terms which the Board finds will be fair and reasonable as to all affected interests and will not result in any substantial loss to the fund.

"(c) The Board shall participate in any arrangements for the payment of compensation on the basis of combining an individual's wages and employment covered under this Act with his wages and employment covered under the unemployment-compensation laws of other States which are approved by the Secretary of Labor in consultation with the State unemployment-compensation agencies as reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of compensation in such situations and which include provisions for (1) applying the base period of a single State law to a claim involving the combining of an individual's wages and employment covered under two or more State unemployment-compensation laws, and (2) avoiding the duplicate use of wages and employment by reason of such combining.

"(d) The Board is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal arrangements with appropriate and duly authorized agencies of other States or of the Federal Government, or both, whereby contributions due under this Act with respect to wages for employment shall for the purposes of section 4 of this Act be deemed to have been paid to the fund as of the date payment was made as contributions therefor under another State or Federal unemployment-compensation law, but no such arrangement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions for such reimbursement to the fund of such contributions and the actual earnings thereon as the Board finds will be fair and reasonable as to all affected interests.

"(e) Reimbursements paid from the fund pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be deemed to be benefits for the purpose of sections 6, 7, and 8 of this Act. The Board is authorized to make to other State or Federal agencies and to receive such other State or Federal agencies reimbursements from or to the fund in accordance with arrangements entered into pursuant to this section.

"(f) The administration of this Act and of State and Federal unemployment-compensation and public-employment-service laws will be promoted by cooperation between the District and such States and the appropriate Federal agencies in exchanging services and making available facilities and information. The Board is therefore authorized to make such investigations, secure and transmit such information, make available such services and facilities, and exercise such of the other powers provided herein with respect to the administration of this Act as it deems necessary or appropriate to facilitate the administration of any such unemployment-compensation or public-employment-service law, and in like manner to accept and utilize information, services, and facilities made available to the District by the agency charged with the administration of any such other unemployment-compensation or public-employment-service law.

"(g) To the extent permissible under the laws and Constitution of the United States, the Board is authorized to enter into or cooperate in arrangements whereby facilities and services provided under this Act and facilities and services provided under the unemployment-compensation law of any foreign government may be utilized for the taking of claims and the payment of benefits under the employment-security law of the District or under a similar law of such government."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1972, except that the amendments made by sections 2(35) and 2(36) of this Act shall take effect only with respect to benefit years that begin on or after January 2, 1972.

Passed the Senate December 9, 1971.

Attest:

———— ————.

Secretary.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 10237) was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1972

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY) for the purpose of calling up the bill H.R. 11268, a bill which was reported from the gentleman's subcommittee.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 11628) to authorize grants and loan guarantees for construction or modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 460]

Andrews, Ala.	Flynt	Moorhead
Ashley	Fulton, Tenn.	Moss
Badillo	Fuqua	O'Hara
Baker	Gallagher	O'Neill
Baring	Gaydos	Pelly
Belcher	Goldwater	Pepper
Bell	Grasso	Pirnie
Blanton	Gray	Poage
Blatnik	Griffiths	Pucinski
Bolling	Hall	Rees
Carey	Halpern	Reid, N.Y.
Celler	Hansen, Idaho	Rosenthal
Chamberlain	Hawkins	Rousselot
Chisholm	Hébert	Scheuer
Clark	Hicks, Wash.	Seiberling
Clay	Horton	Smith, Calif.
Conte	Karth	Spence
Conyers	Kuykendall	Springer
Dellums	Landrum	Staggers
Dent	Lujan	Steed
Derwinski	McClure	Sullivan
Diggs	McEwen	Symington
Dingell	McKevitt	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	Macdonald, Mass.	Veysey
Dowdy	Martin	Wilson, Bob
Dwyer	Mink	Wright
Edwards, La.	Minshall	Wydler
Erlenborn	Mollohan	
Evins, Tenn.		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9961, FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), who yielded to me for this purpose, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9961) to provide Federal credit unions with 2 additional years to meet the requirements for insurance, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this mean we are interrupting the legislation before the House to take up a conference report now?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman worked this out with the District Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. We are trying to get through the economic stabilization bill, and the conference was suspended while I was over here to get this done. We hope to get through with this this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. If we never got the conference report on that bill, I believe it would be soon enough.

Mr. PATMAN. We started to work at 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Dec. 8, 1971.)

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the legislation was enacted during the 91st Congress providing share insurance for credit unions, I made the statement that the legislation was designed as a beginning rather than an end to the problem of insuring credit unions. Because of the lateness of the session, the House was forced to accept the Senate bill—but with the understanding that if changes were needed to perfect the legislation they would be submitted in legislative form as quickly as possible.

The legislation, which is the subject of the conference report today, H.R. 9961, is a bill designed to improve the original share-insurance legislation.

It probably would not have been necessary to have this conference if H.R. 9961 could have been brought to the floor other than through a suspension of the rules. When the bill was considered on the Suspension Calendar in its original form, it achieved 197 votes, but failed by 16 votes to receive the necessary two-thirds majority. Subsequently, the bill was modified and passed unanimously on the Suspension Calendar. The legislation that passed the House provided that any Federal credit union whose application for share insurance had been rejected would receive 2 additional years to obtain the insurance. During that period, the credit union would not be insured. The House bill further provided that State-chartered credit unions that, under State law, are allowed to accept demand deposits, cannot be denied insurance on this basis alone. Of course, these credit unions would have to meet all of the statutory requirements for the insurance. The insurance would not cover the demand-deposit accounts in the credit union. In addition, in the event of a liquidation of such a credit union, the claims on demand deposits would be subordinated to the claims of other member accounts. And, finally, the bill provided that, in the event of a troubled or liquidating credit union, the Administrator may extend a guarantee to a credit union, individual, partnership, corporation, trust, estate, cooperative, association, Government or governmental subdivision or agency or other entity if such entity assumes the liabilities or responsibilities of a troubled or liquidating credit union.

The Senate unanimously passed its version of H.R. 9961 in a form that was identical to the House-passed version except for the insurance provision. Under the Senate-passed bill, Federal credit unions which complied with the reserve requirements of section 116(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act would be given insurance for a period of 2 years. During that period they would have to comply with administrative reserve requirements or be liquidated. Basically, this was the bill that was reported to the House Banking and Currency Committee, but failed by 16 votes on the Suspension Calendar.

In view of the majority vote achieved in the House for a bill almost identical to the Senate bill, the House conferees accepted the Senate bill with an amendment. The House conferees voted unanimously for this action.

The legislation, as agreed to by the conference committee, provides for the 2-year period of insurance for rejected credit unions who comply with the reserve requirements of section 116(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act. However, the bill contains language designed to make certain that the thrust of this provision is not blunted, because of another provision of the Federal Credit Union Act.

Shortly before the conferees met to discuss H.R. 9961, National Credit Union Administrator Herman Nickerson wrote to the conferees to point out that if the Senate bill was accepted that he would have to take action to liquidate a number of credit unions under section 207(a)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act.

That section provides:

> Upon his finding that a Federal credit union insured under this title is bankrupt or insolvent, the Administrator shall close such credit union by liquidation and appoint himself liquidating agent therefore.

According to General Nickerson, there is a possibility that 399 credit unions out of possibly some 1,400 Federal credit unions that have been denied insurance are bankrupt or insolvent. Since these credit unions are not insured at the present time, he is not required to liquidate them. However, it is his belief that when they are insured he will be required to liquidate these credit unions.

The conferees were concerned that the statement by Administrator Nickerson would do away with the assistance that was to be provided credit unions through the act; namely, the insurance. Therefore, the House conferees offered an amendment directing the Administrator to make reasonable efforts to prevent the

closing of any credit union which is insured under H.R. 9961 if he determines that with technical assistance, management training, and counseling that the credit union can be saved. In short, it is not the intention of the conferees to have the credit unions insured one day and liquidated the next.

To this end, I would like to point out that under section 207(a)(1) the Administrator is required to liquidate credit unions that are bankrupt or insolvent. However, the law does not provide any guidelines for the terms "bankrupt" or "insolvent" and the conference committee expects the Administrator not to adopt severe definitions of those terms when dealing with credit unions insured under this subsection that are sincerely making an attempt to improve their conditions.

According to the Administrator, there are 59 credit unions whose present financial condition indicates that if they are required to liquidate they would be able to pay only 90 cents on the dollar. There are another 102 credit unions that could pay from 90 to 95 cents on the dollar and 238 credit unions that could pay from 96 to 99 cents on the dollar. Thus, while these credit unions may be insolvent or bankrupt according to the definitions laid down by the Administrator, all of them have assets equal to at least 90 cents for each share dollar. It is my hope that the Administrator will forgo the liquidation of these credit unions and assist them in their rejuvenation, for I do not feel that they are bankrupt or insolvent in the classical sense of the word. It is further felt that the Administrator has enough latitude under section 207(a)(1) to keep these credit unions open and operating so that they may provide much needed financial service to their members.

In closing, let me say that it is not the intention of the conferees to pass legislation to help credit unions if the effect of that legislation is to hurt them. The conferees have stated their intention is to help the credit unions—not to put them out of business—and it is expected that the Administrator will take all necessary action to see that the credit unions are assisted.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 176, EXTENSION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING, BANKING, AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 176) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages, to extend and modify certain provisions of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is going pretty fast and I want to know if we are about to adopt a conference report wherein all of the amendments are germane to the bill?

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, they have been, and it has been cleared by the minority leader and by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WINDALL), who is on the committee. Every conferee signed the report. It was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. That could be true. The gentleman says, "They have been." Are all of the amendments germane to this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I consider them all to be germane.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman recognizes that this is a fine time to slip through nongermane provisions, and I certainly want to know whether all of the amendments are germane.

Mr. PATMAN. I compliment the gentleman upon his diligence.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Dec. 9, 1971.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 176 was considered by the House last Monday, December 6, and passed by a teller with clerks vote of 357 "ayes" to 4 "noes." This resolution was relatively noncontroversial, and the two provisions that raised the most objections on the floor were carefully considered in conference and worked out to everyone's agreement.

FLOOD INSURANCE

The House provision to extend for an additional 2 years—to December 31, 1973—the period in which States and localities could adopt adequate land-use and control measures to qualify for the Federal flood insurance program, was dropped in conference. A number of communities around the country raised serious questions with the Banking and Currency Committee about their ability to meet this land-use and control provision in such a short time. But, the Federal Insurance Administrator will work with these communities in assisting them in meeting this requirement. This cooperation has caused these communities to withdraw their objections to the land-use and control requirements. The conferees also adopted the House provision which included church properties within the definition of those properties eligible to be covered under the national flood insurance program.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Both House and Senate versions of Senate Joint Resolution 176 contained a provision to lift the existing mortgage ceilings on mortgages eligible for purchase under the Government National Mortgage Association tandem plan. The Senate provision waived the ceiling completely for 6 months till June 30, 1972. The House provision lifted the ceiling on the purchase by GNMA of eligible mortgages up to 150 percent of the mortgage ceiling where the HUD Secretary determines that cost levels so require or that such action is necessary to avoid excessive discounts on federally insured and guaranteed mortgages. The conferees accepted the House version with an amendment which authorizes an increase in mortgage limits simply upon a determination by the HUD Secretary that such action is necessary to avoid excessive discounts.

STATE TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

The Senate version of Senate Joint Resolution 176 delayed for 1 year to January 1, 1973, the termination of interim provisions governing State authority to tax national banks. The House had no such provision. The conferees agreed to accept the Senate provision with an amendment directing the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to make a study of the estimated fiscal impact on State and local governments due to the loss of revenue resulting from the extension of interim provisions governing State authority to tax the intangible personal property of commercial banks. The Board of Governors shall report the results of this study no later than 6 months after date of enactment.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The House amendment extended to June 30, 1972, the period within which communities must meet full comprehensive planning requirements in order to be eligible for basic water and sewer grants. The Senate had no such provision, and the conferees agreed to accept this House provision.

The Senate resolution permitted any entities eligible for a basic categorical grant to be also eligible for a supplemental grant to assist construction of public facilities in new communities. The House conferees agreed to accept this provision.

The Senate resolution increased the authorization for the comprehensive planning by $50 million and for the open space program by $100 million. The conferees agreed to accept this provision, since many State and public planning bodies need additional funds to continue much needed planning programs and since the additional funds for the open space land program was specifically requested by the President for his legacy of parks program.

A provision of the Senate resolution prohibited the reduction of welfare assistance payments to public housing residents who benefit from reductions in rents required by law under the HUD Act of 1969, which provided that the rent of a public housing tenant may not exceed

25 percent of the family's income. The conferees accepted this Senate provision.

The House version of Senate Joint Resolution 176 clarified the authority of the Small Business Administration to guarantee debentures issued by small business investment companies. The conferees adopted this House provision.

Mr. Speaker, most of the provisions of this resolution were similar in both House and Senate versions. I have reviewed the changes made in conference and I now move the adoption of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 176.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 176. I feel this conference report embodies the best possible compromise between the Senate and House versions of the joint resolution.

The conference report does not contain an objectionable provision that was in the House amendments concerning the extension of a waiver for land use and control measures in connection with the Federal flood insurance program. On the other hand, the conference report does contain a necessary extension of the exemption of national banks from the liability of certain State taxes. The other items in the conference report are identical to those which passed the House by an overwhelming majority of 357 to 4 on the Suspension Calendar which was considered on December 6. These are necessary extensions of basic Federal programs including the FHA and VA mortgage insurance programs.

I, therefore, urge their adoption.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I join in support of adoption of the conference report and, in doing so, wish to refer back to comments I made here in the House at the time we acted on this subject matter of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, you and my colleagues may recall I was most critical at that time of the action of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, concerning his failure to include House Joint Resolution 838, dealing with State taxation of national banks, on the Suspension Calendar. Although I am still somewhat dumfounded by his action at that time, I am pleased to report to the House now that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) was most cooperative during the deliberations of the conference committee and did not interpose any objections to inclusion in this conference report of the substance of House Joint Resolution 838, which had already been passed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) for his cooperation in this regard and for, in this way, correcting and remedying the previous action of which I complained.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 176, to extend certain laws relating to housing, banking, and urban development.

There were few major differences in the two versions of Senate Joint Resolution 176. The most controversial items were: First, a provision which would extend for an additional 2 years the period in which State and localities could adopt adequate land use and control measures to qualify for Federal flood insurance; and second, a provision which would delay for 1 year to January 1, 1973, the termination of interim provisions governing State and local authority to tax national banks.

The conferees agreed to drop the provision to extend for an additional 2 years the time in which States and localities could adopt adequate land use and control measures. The conferees felt that one of the most important parts of the flood insurance program was the establishment of adequate land use and control measures. Since the Federal flood insurance program is almost totally subsidized by the Federal Government, it was felt that the States should make some attempt to limit development in flood prone areas.

The conferees agreed to adopt the provision to extend for 1 additional year to January 1, 1973, the termination of interim provisions governing State and local authority to tax national banks. Since many States have complained to the Congress that such an extension would have a serious effect on their budget for the coming fiscal year, the conferees directed the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board to make a study to determine the fiscal impact on the local governments of the extension of these interim provisions and to report back to the Congress within 6 months on this study.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the two conference reports just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER. At the time the point of order was made that a quorum was not present the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY) had asked unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 11628) be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 11628

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1972".

CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION GRANTS

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") may make grants to nonprofit private entities to assist in meeting the cost of projects for the modernization of nonprofit private hospitals in the District of Columbia and in meeting the cost of projects for the construction or modernization of long-term care facilities (including extended care facilities), diagnostic or treatment centers, outpatient facilities, rehabilitation facilities, facilities for the mentally retarded, and community mental health centers in the District of Columbia.

(b) To carry out this section there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each of the next three fiscal years; except that the total amount appropriated under this subsection may not exceed $70,000,000.

LOAN GUARANTEES AND INTEREST SUBSIDIES FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION PROJECTS

SEC. 3. (a) To assist nonprofit private entities to carry out approved projects in the District of Columbia for the modernization or construction of nonprofit private hospitals or other facilities referred to in section 2 of this Act, the Secretary, during the period July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1976, may in accordance with the provisions of this Act guarantee to any non-Federal lender which makes a loan to any such entity for such a project payment when due of the principal of or any interest on such loan if such entity is eligible (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) for a grant under section 2 of such project.

(b) In the case of any loan guaranteed under subsection (a), the Secretary shall pay to the holder of the loan guaranteed (and for and on behalf of the entity which received such loan) amounts sufficient to reduce by not to exceed 3 per centum per annum the net effective interest rate otherwise payable on such loan.

(c)(1) The United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant for a loan guarantee under this section the amount of any payment made pursuant to such guarantee, unless the Secretary for good cause waives such right of recovery; and, upon making any such payment, the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the recipient of the payments with respect to which the guarantee was made.

(2) Guarantees of loans under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this section will be achieved; and, to the extent permitted by paragraph (3), any terms and conditions applicable to a loan guarantee under this section may be modified by the Secretary to the extent he determines it to be consistent with the financial interest of the United States.

(3) Any loan guarantee made by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be incontestable in the hands of an applicant on whose behalf such guarantee is made, and as to any person who makes or contracts to make a loan to such applicant in reliance thereon, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such applicant or such other person.

(d) There is established in the Treasury a loan guarantee and interest subsidy fund (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "fund") which shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, (1) to enable him to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under this section,

and (2) for interest subsidy payments authorized by this section. For each fiscal year there are authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for interest subsidy payments and such sums as may be necessary to discharge his responsibilities under loan guarantees. If at any time the sums in the fund are insufficient to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under this section or to make interest subsidy payments authorized by this section, he is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but only in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which the securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include any purchase of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Secretary from the fund.

(e) The Secretary, with the consent of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, may obtain from the Department of Housing and Urban Development such assistance with respect to the administration of this section as will promote efficiency and economy thereof.

APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) An application for a grant or loan guarantee with respect to any project may be approved by the Secretary under this Act only if an application for a grant with respect to such project has been filed under a Medical Facilities Act (which for purposes of this Act means title VI of the Public Health Service Act or, where appropriate, title II or part C of title I of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963) and—

(1) has been approved under the Medical Facilities Act and the application filed under this Act is for additional funds in connection therewith, or

(2) has been denied under the Medical Facilities Act because insufficient funds are available from the allotments of the District of Columbia under the Medical Facilities Act to permit approval of the application. In determining whether to approve an application for a grant under a Medical Facilities Act for any project in the District of Columbia, the availability of additional funds for such project under this Act shall be taken into consideration. Approval of such application may be made contingent upon the approval of an application or applications with respect to such project under this Act and upon such additional funds being made so available.

(b) The Secretary shall establish criteria for determining the order in which to approve, under this Act, applications for grants and loan guarantees with respect to projects. Such criteria with respect to construction or modernization projects for the same type of facility shall be consistent with the criteria developed by the State agency or the District of Columbia pursuant to the State plan approved under the applicable Medical Facilities Act.

(c) In the case of any project with respect to which an application for a grant or loan guarantee is filed under this Act and with respect to which an application for a grant has been denied under a Medical Facilities Act, such application under this Act may be approved only if there is compliance with the same terms and conditions (including determination, in accordance with the applicable State plan, that the project is needed) as are applicable to applications for grants under the Medical Facilities Act, other than the availability of sufficient funds in the appropriate allotment of the District of Columbia.

(d) An application for a grant or loan guarantee under this Act with respect to any project may not be approved unless an opportunity to review the application has been afforded to a body found by the Secretary to be a responsible metropolitan areawide planning body, and any recommendations of such body that were timely made have been considered by the appropriate State agency or the District of Columbia and have been submitted to the Secretary in connection with the application.

PAYMENTS OF GRANTS

SEC. 5. (a) Payments under grants made under this Act with respect to any project shall be made in the manner provided under the applicable Medical Facilities Act for payment of the Federal share of the cost of projects for which applications are approved under such Act; except that payments under grants made under this Act shall also be subject to such reasonable conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate to safeguard the Federal interest.

(b) The total of the payments of grants made under this Act with respect to any project, together with any payments made with respect thereto under a Medical Facilities Act, may not exceed—

(1) in the case of a construction project for a long-term care facility (including extended care facilities), a diagnostic or treatment center, an outpatient facility, or a rehabilitation facility, 66⅔ per centum of the cost of such project; and

(2) in the case of any other project (including a modernization project), 50 per centum of the cost of such project.

RECOVERY OF PAYMENTS

SEC. 6. Payments of grants under this Act shall be subject to recovery or recapture under the same conditions and to the same extent as is provided under the applicable Medical Facilities Act with respect to payments made thereunder.

MEANING OF TERMS

SEC. 7. The terms used in this Act shall have the same meaning as when such terms are used in the applicable Medical Facilities Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 25, strike out "of" and insert in lieu thereof "or".

Page 8, line 2, immediately after the word "areawide" insert "health".

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11628, the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1972 provides $7 million in grant funds over 4 fiscal years with an annual interest subsidy not to exceed $2 million per year to permit the hospitals to borrow sufficient funds to match the grant funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. STUCKEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman said $7 million. I believe the bill carries the amount of $70 million.

Mr. STUCKEY. $70 million.

Mr. GROSS. The bill is for at least $70 million; is that right?

Mr. STUCKEY. The gentleman is correct. It is $70 million.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has the precedent of the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Act of 1968—Public Law 90–457. H.R. 11628 provides for several changes from Public Law 90–457. The first change eliminates public institutions in that Congress determined that constructing funding for such facilities must be considered along with other District government capital needs. For this reason, no funds under the prior bill, Public Law 90–457, were appropriated for this purpose. The second change provides that the Public Law 90–457 direct loan language be changed to conform to the Hill-Burton program loan provisions applicable to hospitals nationwide and have an interest subsidy program for funds the hospitals borrow from the banks.

The necessity for special treatment of the Nation's Capital and its problems is well documented within records of this great body. The necessity for special consideration and treatment of hospitals in the Nation's Capital is also a matter with considerable documentation. Today's record should show in brief the essential arguments which have been accepted by this body as they relate specifically to hospital construction needs in the District of Columbia.

First. The nationwide Hill-Burton fund distribution formula is weighed heavily to the advantage of rural hospitals. Its application to the District of Columbia which serves at once as a city-county-State and the Capital of the Nation works an inequity that five Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare have recognized.

Second. The hospitals within the District of Columbia do not have available to them the opportunities for local governmental financial assistance as do the hospitals in our home States. Congress itself is and has been responsible for the decision as to the availability of such financial assistance. Hospitals in the District require comparable resource assistance if they are to meet their obligations to their community. For illustration, the great State of Georgia provided over $20 million to complement the Hill-Burton hospital allocations in a single year—during 1968. Other States, cities, and counties provide this assistance routinely throughout the country.

Third. The hospitals in the Nation's Capital provide substantial services to the District of Columbia each year at reimbursement rates set by Congress at substantially less than costs. This action places a financial burden on these institutions which runs into millions of dol-

lars annually. This contractual loss is on top of losses incurred by those who can not afford the services rendered.

Fourth. As was spoken so eloquently in subcommittee hearing by the Honorable John McCormack, our illustrious former Speaker of this body, the hospitals of the Nation's Capital are a distinct national asset and must have a quality of facility and services of which we can as a Nation be proud.

The treatment by the U.S. Government of hospitals in the Nation's Capital as the major employer should receive equivalent treatment accorded hospitals throughout the Nation by the States in which they reside.

For these principal reasons along with others of substantive detail, these 10 private hospitals in the District of Columbia urgently need this bill. Indeed the accumulated backlog of construction needs threatens hospital licensure and national joint commission on accreditation of hospitals require such renovations in a number of instances.

H.R. 11628 provides for expansion of emergency rooms and outpatient clinical facilities. It adds no acute general inpatient beds. It attempts to provide for the service priorities designed by the State and community planning agencies. It represents a coordinated community and hospital program of verified needs. It includes modernization of service facilities which have been reported as inadequate for years. It carries out the second phase of the program adopted by Congress in 1968.

The needs of these hospitals cannot be ignored. They are critical and will be addressed by this body in the future if not addressed effectively at this time. Congress has accepted this responsibility and should continue to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent (Mr. STUCKEY) was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia where I may find the departmental reports. I have read the report accompanying this bill, and there are no departmental reports so far as I can find. Did I overlook something in the report?

Mr. STUCKEY. They are not printed in the report, but we do have them here, if the gentleman would like to see them.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not customary to print the departmental views on legislation of this kind?

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of my colleagues for this vitally important measure, of which I am most pleased to be a cosponsor.

This bill, which when enacted will be known as the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1972, will authorize Federal financial assistance, through grants, loan guarantees, and loan interest subsidies, to aid in meeting the costs of projects for the modernization of private nonprofit hospitals, as well as both modernization and construction of long-term care facilities, diagnostic and treatment centers, outpatient facilities, rehabilitation centers, facilities for the mentally retarded, and community health centers, in the District of Columbia.

Over the past 25 years, extensive and far-reaching nationwide programs have been developed for the purpose of providing up to date, vastly improved health care facilities for all citizens of this country. This great work is still going forward, with very substantial financial support from the Federal Government in the form of grants and loans. These Federal programs of financial aid have been authorized in such legislation as the Lanham Act which has expired, the Hill-Burton Act, portions of the Public Health Service Act, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Construction Act, and others.

The District of Columbia has benefited of course from these Federal programs of aid for the construction of health facilities, as have all the States, but not nearly to as great an extent. For example, the allocation of Federal funds under the Hill-Burton Act, which is the main source of such Federal assistance, is based on a formula, a principal factor in which is the number of existing hospital beds per capita in the jurisdiction. On this point, the District of Columbia suffers an inequity, because some 30 to 40 percent of the hospital beds in the city are occupied by residents of nearby Virginia and Maryland; yet this fact cannot be considered in the District's Hill-Burton computation.

In fiscal year 1972, for example, whereas the District of Columbia has been allocated only $1,200,000 in grants under the Hill-Burton Act, Maryland has received $2,573,699, and Virginia has received $4,702,248. And yet nearly 40 percent of the hospital beds in the District are occupied by patients who reside in Maryland or Virginia.

Also, the per capita income level, which is another principal factor in the Hill-Burton formula, is unfair to the District of Columbia. Although the per capita income in the District is among the highest in the Nation, the Federal nature of the city is such that a large proportion of those with large incomes are temporary residents in the city who do not feel an obligation to support capital improvement fund drives that permanent residents do, here or elsewhere, or indeed to the extent that these same temporary Washington residents feel in relation to their "home" communities. For this reason, per capita income is a misleading figure as far as the District of Columbia is concerned.

The hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia are also at a substantial financial disadvantage, in comparison with such institutions in the various States, in that the latter all obtain substantial funding from State and municipal sources in the form of matching funds, loans, and the sale of bonds. None of these are available to the private medical facilities in the Nation's Capital.

In view of these facts, it is abundantly clear that the District of Columbia is unique in its dependency upon the Federal Government for financial support for the construction and modernization of its various private health facilities. In this respect, it is both necessary and equitable that the Federal Government function toward the District as the various States do in regard to the financing of medical facilities within their borders.

In recognition of this fact, the Congress over the years has done exactly that. As a first step, the Hospital Center Act was approved on August 7, 1946, as Public Law 79–648. This act was amended and extended a number of times, before it expired in 1962. During its 16 years of existence, this act provided $40,818,552 of Federal funds toward hospital construction projects in the District of Columbia whose total costs were $67,628.188. The private hospitals in the city which utilized these grants were Children's Hospital, Providence Hospital, Casualty Hospital, Columbia Hospital, Georgetown University Hospital, Sibley Hospital, Cafritz Memorial Hospital, and the Washington Hospital Center.

Again in 1968, the Congress recognized its obligation toward the District of Columbia in this respect by enacting Public Law 90–457, the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968, under which grants totaling approximately $40 million were authorized, as well as long-term, low-interest loans which the hospitals needed to finance their matching share of the costs of modernization and construction of health care facilities of various kinds, hospitals, extended care facilities, diagnostic centers, facilities for the mentally retarded, rehabilitation facilities, and community health centers.

The following is a listing of the projects which were approved under Public Law 90–457.

Hospitals	Grants	Loans	Totals
Cafritz Memorial	$500,000	----------	$500,000
Columbia Hospital for Women	500,000	----------	500,000
Providence	500,000	----------	500,000
Sibley Memorial	500,000	----------	500,000
George Washington	4,064,000	$4,976,842	9,040,842
Georgetown	6,189,000	11,080,000	17,269,000
Rogers Memorial	6,510,000	6,510,000	13,020,000
Washington Hospital Center	7,889,421	4,608,579	12,498,000
Children's	13,399,579	13,399,579	26,799,158
Total	40,052,000	40,575,000	80,627,000

Thus, some $80 million in grants and loans has been allocated to this fine purpose in the Nation's Capital through this act, which will expire on June 30, 1972.

This program of modernization and construction of health facilities in the District of Columbia, however, is not yet completed. Rather, the work carried forward under the funding authorized in Public Law 90–457 is really the first stage of the overall program. Some of the projects now underway cannot be completed without further financial assistance, and other elements of the program which

have not yet been started also must have adequate financial support.

Hence, inasmuch as the funding authorized in the act of 1968 has been fully allocated, H.R. 11628 has been designed to afford the necessary funding for the completion of the total program. Thus, although H.R. 11628 differs from Public Law 90–457 in some of its provisions, it is actually an extension of that act to all intents and purposes.

This bill will authorize Federal grants not in excess of $70 million in the aggregate, over the period from fiscal year 1972 through 1975. Such grants with respect to any project cannot exceed, in the case of a construction of a long-care facility, a diagnostic or treatment center, an outpatient facility, or a rehabilitation facility, 66⅔ percent of the total cost of the project; and in the case of any other project, including a modernization project, 50 percent of the total cost. In addition, non-Federal loans, by which the various institutions will be enabled to meet their share of the costs, will be guaranteed by the Federal Government as to the payment of principal and interest; and further, as much as 3 percent of the interest on these loans will be subsidized by the Federal Government. Precedent for these loan guarantees and interest subsidies exists in the 1971 amendments to the Hill-Burton Act.

The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will allocate these grants and loan interest subsidies, and adequate safeguards are provided in the bill to assure the propriety of all such funding, in the public interest.

Under present planning, the following institutions in the District of Columbia will participate in the program to be funded by the provisions of H.R. 11628: Cafritz Memorial Hospital, Children's National Medical Center, Columbia Hospital for Women, George Washington University Medical Center, Georgetown University Medical Center, Providence Hospital, Rogers Memorial Hospital, Sibley Memorial Hospital, Washington Hospital Center and Hadley Memorial Hospital.

The program of construction and modernization which this proposed legislation is intended to make possible encompasses the individual and collective efforts of the nonprofit community health care institutions in the District of Columbia to meet the expressed and researched needs of this city. In addition, it will bring the District's facilities into conformance with licensing and accreditation standards. In local city, county, and State jurisdictions throughout the Nation, financial assistance to meet such funding requirements is available from the governments themselves, in addition to individual and industrial contributions. The grant program embodied in H.R. 11628 is equivalent to the bond issues and direct contributions which are available to other jurisdictions. Because of the unique character of the Nation's Capital, however, where some 70 percent of the population is employed by the U.S. Government or its supportive industries, no such possibility exists.

Thus, it is incumbent upon the Congress to assure the means of completing this health care facilities program in the District of Columbia. This will be accomplished by the enactment of H.R. 11628, in the most effective and efficient means possible.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. I would like to know if matching funds would be required of the District of Columbia, or does the bill provide for Federal loans and grants to the District completely?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It provides for grants totaling $70 million, and interest subsidy payments of not more than $2 million per year for the duration of the non-Federal loans by which the hospitals will meet their share of the costs.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. We here in Congress have a responsibility to the District of Columbia in our role as a State legislature. There is no State legislature for the District of Columbia, and we do have a responsibility to provide the hospital and medical facilities that would ordinarily be provided to a State by a State legislature.

I would like to point out to you that much of the funds that are involved in this act are going towards facilities which will provide an increased measure of outpatient care to the people of the District of Columbia. So much of the spiraling cost of medical care today is due to the fact that medical practice has become increasingly oriented toward hospital care, a very costly form of care, and you will find if you will look at the committee report here, that the facilities which will be provided for Georgetown University Hospital, George Washington, and Cafritz are for outpatient care facilities. I think this will do much in the long run to reduce the cost of medical care for citizens of the District of Columbia and in time will be reflected as an economy for both the District and Congress.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that much of this money is going toward facilities for the mentally retarded, which are not only inadequate here in the District of Columbia, but also inadequate all across the Nation.

The need for additional care for the mentally retarded and the mentally handicapped is a much neglected area in legislation, so I urge support of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what all the committee amendments are. I have some question whether or not they are all committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. They are the ones printed in the bill. They are the committee amendments which have been printed in the bill and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHMITZ

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHMITZ:

Page 8, after line 5, insert section 4(e): "An application for a grant or loan guarantee under this Act with respect to any project may not be approved unless the institution making the application has filed with the Secretary a written declaration of policy that abortions will be performed in that institution under no circumstances other than when necessary to save the life of the mother, and the Secretary determines that this policy regarding abortion is in fact being enforced by the institution making the application."

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment, and I will reserve the point of order so the gentleman may speak.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1972, would authorize the expenditure of $70 million in grants and $60 million in loans from the taxpayers of America for various projects in seven hospitals in the District of Columbia. Since this money comes from the entire Nation, it is only right that we should take into account the wishes of the people of America and the standards in effect in the several States, in determining how this money may be used by the hospitals in our Nation's Capital.

Public opinion surveys indicate that at least half of the American people are opposed to abortion except in very limited, specific circumstances. The laws of a majority of our States—despite highly publicized changes in a minority—16—of them—still retain the traditional provision of Anglo-Saxon law that permits abortion only to save the life of the mother.

From 1901 to 1969, the law on abortions for the District of Columbia was the same in effect as this traditional Anglo-Saxon law, permitting them only when absolutely necessary for the sake of the "life and health" of the mother. This law was never challenged and rarely invoked since very few legal abortions were performed. But a Federal court decision interpreting this law to include mental as well as physical health has opened the floodgates. Now, for all practical purposes, all that is necessary to obtain a legal abortion in the District of Columbia is to find a physician and a hospital willing to perform it.

Since a large number of the abortions now performed in the District of Columbia take place in hospitals, we cannot look the other way and try to pretend this issue does not exist, when we vote to authorize or appropriate funds for these hospitals. In some of them at least, abortion is becoming a major part of their activities.

The most flagrant example is furnished by the Washington Hospital Center, one of the seven hospitals which would receive additional funding under the authority granted by the bill before us. On September 26, 1971, the Washington Post reported that the Washington

Hospital Center is operating a clinic which performed approximately 2,500 abortions between January and August of this year. This amounts to an average of twelve abortions per day, every day of the week. I do not see how it can reasonably be held that abortions in this volume are being restricted to exceptional situations involving serious danger to the mother.

To check the accuracy of this newspaper story, a woman member of my staff telephoned the Washington Hospital Center to ask about abortions, and was referred to a special telephone number handling such calls. Upon calling that number, she was informed that for $175 cash in hand she could come to their clinic one day, see their doctor, talk to a counselor, and have laboratory work done, and then have an abortion the next day by the suction method and leave just 10 minutes later.

I believe many of you would agree with me that this kind of assembly-line procedure is characteristic of, and properly described as, an "abortion mill."

On November 5 I brought these facts to the attention of William N. Bucher, director of the Hospital Council of the National Capital Area, who had come to my office earlier to ask my support for this legislation. He referred my letter to the administrator of the Washington Hospital Center, R. M. Loughery. On November 12 Mr. Loughery wrote to me admitting the truth of the Washington Post story.

> The statistics you quote are correct. However, each case is carefully evaluated and quite a number have been rejected when it is discovered that the pregnancy is no hazard to the physical or mental health of the patient. The 2500 cases are the result of referrals from in and out of this immediate area occasioned by the knowledge of the high level of professional competence available here and the low cost to the patient.

Despite this "low cost to the patient" of abortions at the Washington Hospital Center, Mr. Loughery stated that the women's clinic where the abortions are performed is in no need of funds because "it is financially self-sufficient." Comparing rates, time and volume of cases, it would seem likely that it is not only "financially self-sufficient," but showing a profit. It is inexcusable for an institution operating under Congressional authority, with Federal funding, to be engaging in a financially lucrative abortion practice on a grand scale, when a majority of the States in our country have fewer legal abortions in a year than this one hospital has in a week.

The bill before us would authorize a grant of $3 million and a loan of $2,700,000 to the Washington Hospital Center for the following stated purposes:

> To provide for a neighborhood health center, expansion of nuclear medicine department, outpatient and emergency departments.

These projects seem sufficiently all-encompassing to make it impossible to isolate their implementation from the activities of this hospital's abortion mill, despite the fact that its administrator carefully specifies in his letter to me that it is "six floors away" from the clinics receiving Federal aid.

When we provide funds for a hospital, we must consider it and its activities as a whole. If we give additional money for any of its projects, this releases other funds for other activities. We cannot evade our responsibility for the entire scope of what this hospital is doing, when we fund any part of its operation. And what the Washington Hospital Center is doing is destroying human lives with reckless abandon. By its own admission, 2,500 babies were killed within its walls during the first 8 months of this year. Contemplating that appalling fact, I find small comfort in knowing that my tax money is being kept all of six floors away from the place where this is happening.

Therefore, I propose to you, and introduce, the following amendment, which in effect would simply restore the law on abortion as it was in the District of Columbia before the courts began to meddle with it just 2 years ago, and would being the practice at least in federally funded District of Columbia hospitals into line with the law in the majority of our States from which that funding comes.

On page 8, line 5, of the bill before us (H.R. 11628), my amendment would insert as section 4(e) the following language:

> (e) An application for a grant or loan guarantee under this Act with respect to any project may not be approved unless the institution making the application has filed with the Secretary a written declaration of policy that abortions will be performed in that institution under no circumstances other than when necessary to save the life of the mother, and the Secretary determines that this policy regarding abortion is in fact being enforced by the institution making the application.

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I realize there is a good chance that this amendment might be ruled out of order, but I do believe the gentleman from California has brought up some very important points, and I hope this matter will be carefully scrutinized by the District Committee in further investigation.

I am concerned that the District of Columbia has become, or is on its way toward becoming an abortion mill with little concern for the laws. The question is not whether one is for or against the issue, but rather whether the law is being ignored. Inasmuch as the Supreme Court has upheld the District of Columbia criminal statutes permitting abortion only to preserve a woman's life or physical or mental health, I am hopeful that any violation of the District statute will be vigorously prosecuted.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia insist on his point of order?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, all of the hospitals in the District of Columbia have to abide by the laws of the District of Columbia and by title X of the Public Health Service Act, population research and voluntary planning programs, which deals with services rendered. The bill under consideration is a construction bill, to be a companion bill to the Hill-Burton Act. The bill authorizes grants for construction, and does not deal with operating rules and procedures. Therefore, the amendment is not germane to the pending legislation.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the point of order come too late?

The SPEAKER. The point of order was reserved when the amendment was read.

Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCHMITZ. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

My point is that the bill is an appropriation authorization bill, and money is being indirectly authorized for abortions. They are operating an abortion mill. Because of a court decision, the District of Columbia has for all practical purposes no abortion policy. Until they set up policies within the hospitals this money will be abused.

My amendment has to do with the authorization of appropriations in this bill.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHMITZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ABZUG. Is the gentleman suggesting we return to the situation where literally thousands of women are forced to go into back alleys to get criminal abortions, whereby the end result is countless numbers of deaths, rather than to have an orderly abortion procedure under proper medical care pursuant to law in a particular locality, as provided here?

Mr. SCHMITZ. I would like to go back further than that. I would like to go back to the time when women would not get pregnant except when they wanted to and only by their husbands in a family situation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The bill under consideration provides for the authorization of grants and loans for construction or modernization of hospitals. The amendment which the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ) has offered deals with the matter of limitations entirely unrelated to the construction or modernization of hospitals. The point of order is thereby sustained.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have three amendments which were adopted by the committee in a full committee meeting but it was too late to have them included in the report. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 8, after "loan." insert the following: "The Secretary shall approve an application for a guarantee of a loan under this section only if he determines that the terms, conditions, maturity, security (if any), and schedule and amounts of repayments with respect to the loan are sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States and are otherwise reasonable and in accord with regulations, including a determination that the rate of interest does not exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the risks assumed by the United States."

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. STUCKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABNERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STUCKEY. What the amendment does is to provide protection for the private institutions borrowing funds from a bank so that the borrowing institution may obtain a low interest rate. This gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the right to review the interest rates and see that they conform to the reasonable interest rates of that particular area.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, immediately after line 5, insert the following:

"(e) Before any application for a grant or loan guarantee is approved under this Act, the appropriate State agency or the District of Columbia shall certify to the Secretary whether the applicant has complied with all terms and conditions applicable to any previous grant it has received under a Medical Facilities Act and any other Act providing federal or District of Columbia funds for the construction or modernization of medical facilities in the District of Columbia and with any assurances or commitments made in applications or other documents submitted to any Committee of Congress, the Secretary, the appropriate State agency, the District of Columbia, or metropolitan area wide planning body, with respect to such grant. The Secretary shall not approve such application unless and until he determines, on the basis of such certification, that the applicant has fully complied with such terms, conditions and assurances."

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

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Speaker, for an explanation of this amendment, which I hope will be a little clearer than the last one.

Mr. STUCKEY. There is similar language in the Hill-Burton law, as I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi is aware. The committee simply felt that this language should be reiterated and therefore made explicit in this particular bill to assure adequate protection. By this amendment we ask the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to keep a sharp eye on the situation and use of these funds and that hospitals do carry out the intent of this act.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is the loan made to the hospital or to the District of Columbia? Under the Hill-Burton Act, as I understand it, the Hill-Burton grants—and there may be some other grants—but the loans are negotiated by the principal party constructing the hospital. They are made by the borrower. Who is the borrower here? The District of Columbia?

Mr. STUCKEY. No.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Or the hospital that gets the money?

Mr. STUCKEY. The hospital is the borrowing authority, but we have had some situations in the past, and some exist now, where these individual hospitals have not lived up to the intent of the 1968 act.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Are these loans not to be made to the District? They are given a grant and also making the loan to the private hospital. Is that the way this bill operates?

Mr. STUCKEY. What was the question of the gentleman?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The bill provides for $70 million in grants and many dollars in loans. Who borrows the money, the private hospitals or the District of Columbia?

Mr. STUCKEY. The private hospitals.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, that certainly is not comparable to the operations under the Hill-Burton Act because the loans are made to the political subdivision constructing the hospital.

Mr. STUCKEY. That is true, but the situation in the District of Collumbia is such that they are not able to borrow the funds because of the bonding companies and insurance companies.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why are they not able to do so?

Mr. STUCKEY. The rates which they would have to charge simply would not insure the bonding.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The District of Columbia is now borrowing for various and sundry purposes; is it not?

Mr. STUCKEY. If the Congress would see fit to authorize and back up the bondsmen, I am sure they would be able to do this.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The facts are that the Federal Government is not only to lend this money but will also be required to back up loans; is that not true?

Mr. STUCKEY. Only to the extent of 3 percent. The rest is provided for by the individual institution.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not what the report says. The report says that the Federal Government not only guarantees the loans but the principal.

Mr. STUCKEY. As I understand it, the Federal Government pays up to 3 percent of this interest.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I am reading from page 1 of the report where it says—no; I do not believe it is on page 1, but there is in this report somewhere language to the effect that the Federal Government not only guarantees the principal but also guarantees the interest and the loan.

Mr. STUCKEY. If the gentleman will look on page 2 about four paragraphs down he will see that it authorizes the Secretary to pay the loan guarantee in an amount sufficient to reduce by not to exceed 3 per centum the net effective interest rate otherwise payable on such loan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ABERNETHY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Beginning on line 21, it says that "through June 1976 may in accordance with the provisions of this act guarantee to any non-Federal lender which makes a loan to any such entity for such a project payment when due of the principal or any interest on such loan if such entity is eligible for a grant—"

That refers to both principal and interest. That is what the bill says. Is not that what the bill says?

Mr. STUCKEY. The $2 million with reference to the interest payments only goes up to 3 percent. So it does not fully guarantee all of the interest payments. That was the point I made earlier.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What does the language mean which I read?

Mr. STUCKEY. I do not think the gentleman read far enough down in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I read all of the paragraph.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Georgia a few questions about the bill.

On page 12 of the report it indicates that this bill providing $70 million in grants, over a 5-year period, starting in 1972, also includes $10 million in loan subsidies.

Does this mean that the Federal Government will give the $70 million in grants, $60 million on loan and then pay $10 million in interest?

The State of New Jersey in the entire year gets $5.5 billion the hard way. You want us to pay $10 million interest to the banking cartels. This is sheer madness.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time so that I might ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY) a question or two.

Do I understand that this bill appropriates and authorizes a total of about $130 million in loans and grants?

Mr. STUCKEY. I believe that is correct, it comes out to about $130 million.

Mr. HAYS. What is the population of the District of Columbia?

Mr. STUCKEY. Approximately 740,000.

Mr. HAYS. Not even twice as much as my district.

If we divide that $130 million in half that would be $65 million that a congres-

sional district ought to get. My district has not received one-tenth of that amount in the last 20 years for hospitals.

What makes these people so special here that you want to reach into the pockets of my taxpayers and give them 20 times as much as we have gotten for hospitals?

Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. STUCKEY. I think I can.

Mr. HAYS. I hope you can.

Mr. STUCKEY. I hope to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. HAYS. That may be hard to do indeed, but go ahead and try.

Mr. STUCKEY. First off, the District of Columbia does not meet the standards your district would meet under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. HAYS. Why do you not just make them meet the standards and have them scramble for this money the same way we have to do?

Mr. STUCKEY. I do not think there is any way that they can meet the standards. For instance, you have contributions for matching funds from the local and State governments, and also from the industries which are in your State. They pay a great, great portion of the money that goes into Hill-Burton hospitals in the gentleman's district.

Mr. HAYS. How do you get that figure? I do not know that industry pays anything.

Mr. STUCKEY. They contribute quite a bit.

Mr. HAYS. Do you mean if they have a fundraising drive?

Mr. STUCKEY. No; these are contributions from industry. You also have in your various areas hospitals who go out and conduct a fundraising drive.

Mr. HAYS. That is right, and that again comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. Do you think these people in this district would pay any money for this bill, or for fundraising drives?

Mr. STUCKEY. They have a different situation here.

Mr. HAYS. You are darned right we have got a different situation here. You have most of the people working for the Federal Government at pretty fancy salaries, or on relief, at more than anybody can get. So they are all pretty well taken care of, again at the expense of the people in my district.

I just do not understand why. You are not asking to give them $10 or $20 million, which would be three or four times as much as the rest of the people in the United States get, but you are giving them 20 or 30 times as much.

Mr. STUCKEY. We have to remember that we are going back a bit. We have had 8 years where no money has been appropriated. Part of this money will go to continue projects, and it will go to help finish some of these projects. These hospitals in the District of Columbia do meet the needs of the people in the country as a whole as well as in your district, and other districts, people who visit the Nation's Capital.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I suppose that maybe once every 10 or 12 years one of my constituents might get into a hospital here. That is not a very big argument.

But I think that the Members should consider this matter, and that they had better be prepared to go back to their districts and tell the people in their districts why you want to assist the District of Columbia at least 20 times as much per capita for hospitals in the District of Columbia as you have allowed for the hospitals in your districts.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not know half of it.

Mr. HAYS. I do not want to know too much. Do not tell me too much, I might not be able to stand it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. These are private hospitals. The Hill-Burton money is made available throughout the whole United States to public hospitals, but these are private hospitals.

Mr. HAYS. You mean money-making hospitals?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Not necessarily, but they can be; but they are private hospitals.

Mr. HAYS. I will bet you $1 million they will make something out of this one.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I agree with you.

Nobody audits these hospitals. The District of Columbia does not audit them. Nobody knows whether they are making or losing money. But here is a bill that provides that we are not only going to give them $70 million in principle, give them some grants, but they will loan them some more money, and the Government will guarantee the payment as well as subsidizing the interest. It is a terrible situation.

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYS. I will tell you one thing—maybe nobody audits them now, but if this bill passes you can bet your bottom dollar that, as chairman of the House Committee on Administration, I think I have enough influence with the GAO that they will be auditing them every day in the week and, boy, that will be a picnic—maybe they will not even take the money.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio is correct in that this bill does provide a more liberalized formula for Federal grants and loans than is provided in his congressional district or in any other State. But, as we explained during debate, the reason for this is that the District of Columbia is entirely urban. The formula as applied to other States and communities in the congressional districts include rural areas as well as urban centers. So the number of hospital beds per capita and the per capita income factor simply do not apply equitably to the District of Columbia with its density of population, as compared to its application to the States.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. What are you trying to tell me—that people in rural areas do not need hospital care or something? Per capita is per capita. If you have 800,000, they have as much incidence of sickness no matter where they live and the fact that they live in urban areas has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is exactly what I am trying to tell the gentleman—that the rural population is taken into consideration for the hospitals in the urban centers that also serve a rural population. Now the rural population in the District of Columbia is composed of people from all over the country. We have people from your district, and from all over the country, who come here and use these hospitals, and they do not make a contribution toward their construction or modernization.

Furthermore, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Mississippi, these hospitals affected by this bill are community hospitals—they are private, nonprofit hospitals, the same type of hospitals that receive grants and loans under the Hill-Burton Act in your district and in all other States. In that respect, the legislation is consistent with the Hill-Burton Act. This bill, may be said to be a sort of an amendment or supplement to the Hill-Burton Act, to help the only city in the country which does not participate equitably under its provisions.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I was out to the Washington Hospital Center not long ago to see a person who lives in the District and I walked a long way through the corridors and I did not see any beds in the corridors there like you can see in nearly every hospital in my district where they do not have enough beds for the patients.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Furthermore, I should point out that this is only an authorization for an appropriation. It is only an authorization bill, authorizing $70 million in grants. There is a loan guarantee provision for a total of about $60 million in non-Federal loans, but these loans will certainly be paid back by the institutions themselves.

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

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was granted permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of two bills—one of which will be before you later—pending in the District Committee for the benefit of private hospitals in the District of Columbia. The other bill which is not here, benefits Columbia Hospital and provides that we will take away from the Federal Government a building that is now occupied and actively used by a department of the Government. I just do not know when the Committee on the District of Columbia took it upon itself to give away real estate belonging to the citizens of this entire Nation; nevertheless that is what is pending in the committee and being accorded serious consideration.

They have not yet reported it out of the committee, and they ought not, but they have been trying to get it to a vote for quite some time. Not only do they

propose to take this building away from the Federal Government, give it to a private hospital and move out the Federal employees who are working there for and on behalf of your constituencies and mine—and where they will go, nobody knows—but they further told us, on being pressed, that they would be back seeking about $7 million for their new building. The facts are they are in the pending bill for a $4 million grant and a subsidized loan of $4.5 million. This will come out of the pockets of your taxpayers and mine.

If any member of the District Committee wants to challenge that, I will pause right now and let him challenge it.

No one having challenged the statement, then it must be accepted as absolutely accurate.

Now what do we have here?

This District of Columbia hospital gouge—and that is all it is—began in 1946. It began with the idea of building the large Washington General Hospital in the north central section of the District. Several private hospitals were consolidated into this operation. They gave up title to their several hospitals and built a large new facility. And we gave them more than half the cost of it, and a loan for the balance at 2½ percent. Congress provided the loan—and listen to this—would you like to have one like this in your district—that the loan would be repaid at such time and in such amounts as the Congress may hereafter determine.

I would like to get a loan like that.

Congress removed from the bill the provision which authorized private hospitals to get in on this free ride. Oh, but they stayed alive, and came back a short time later. In 1948 they got their amendment passed and thereupon began the most juicy hospital boondoggle ever initiated. These private hospitals—they say they do not operate for profit, but who knows whether or not they are making a profit? You go down and pay your hospital bill and you determine whether or not they are making a profit. You make that determination.

In 1951 they came back to the Congress for another free ride, all to the tune of more millions.

They came back in 1955 and got another bill passed. They always used the same argument, that this city does not fit into the Hill-Burton program. They never attempt to amend the Hill-Burton Act so as to make it properly apply to them.

Our colleagues who live in Maryland and Virginia in areas from which the people come to the city of Washington for hospitalization want to build the hospitals here for their constituents with your money instead of building them in their districts with their own tax money.

The private hospital lobby of the District returned to Congress again in 1957 with another bill. It passed. They came back in 1958 with another. It passed. They came back in 1962 with another, and it passed. And others on down to last year, when a total of many millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury were put into the District's private hospitals and medical schools. With this free ride having come around so often and for so many, many, many millions of dollars, I was absolutely amazed when this bill was introduced. I just could not believe my eyes.

They say they have started construction on several new facilities. Why did they start such if they did not have the money? If they had been under proper management they would not have begun construction of additions or new facilities if they did not have money to complete the job.

What does this hospital program already cost the Federal Government? I am not speaking of Hill-Burton. They are getting their Hill-Burton funds just as you are. It has cost the Federal Government up to now in loans and grants $83 million, exclusive of millions to the private medical schools. If any one of you wish to challenge that, get up and challenge it. Since there is no challenge, my statement must be accurate.

Here we are again today, not with a request for $83 million, my friends, but with a request for several times $83 million.

Have you looked at the committee report? Have you noticed that there is nothing in this report from the Bureau of the Budget? Have you noticed that there is not a recommendation in this report from this administration? Have you noticed that there is nothing in this committee report in the way of a report from the District government? What are they covering up? Why are they concealing, if they are concealing—and somebody is—the position of the District government and this administration on this bill?

Let me read to you the testimony of Deputy Assistant Secretary Seggal of this administration, who testified in the bill. First he said:

> This bill provides for grants, as we all know. It provides also for loan guarantees.

The Federal Government is guaranteeing the loan. The District government is not involved in this. This provides for loans to a private institution, and the Government is guaranteeing that they will pay, and if they do not pay then your people will pay off their notes. How do you like that?

Uncle Sam is guaranteeing an interest subsidy to the tune of $2 million per year, as well as all of the principal. What a deal. The interest would be at least 6, 7, 8, or maybe 10 percent, which means your taxpayers would pay 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7 percent on the subsidy and the borrower would pay only 3 percent. In fact, if the borrower defaults on the interest I understand the bill also calls for Uncle Sam to pay this, too. What a dream of a program for these private hospitals.

Listen to this. Here is what this administration says about this bill, that there will be an additional $70 million in grants and an estimated $304 million in low-interest subsidized loans. This is the testimony from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Think about it. Just let it soak in a minute. Why, you have not heard it all yet. I have enough material on this bill to give you another hour of this.

The HEW witness went on to say:

> The nonprofit private health facilities in the District could possibly receive by the close of fiscal year 1976 a grand total of more than $460 million.

Let that soak in. I understand they revised the figures later but they still ran into hundreds of millions.

Mr. Speaker, this I have just read is what HEW had to say. No wonder it was not included in the committee report.

This is the point made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), that the District is just getting more than its fair share, while the rest of us have to dig for most of our hospital funds.

I am amazed that the bill ever got here. When the bill was reported out, it was 20 minutes after 12 high noon. We had spent the morning in quite a hassle, which Members have read in the papers. I was one of those understanding the bill would not even be called and had departed the committee room. After I departed, it was said to the committee, so I have been told, that it was just a little noncontroversial bill. My, oh my Noncontroversial.

Let me go a little further. Here is a statement from a lady from the University of Pennsylvania who made a study of the operation of District hospitals.

She said:

> I do not believe the proposed legislation does enough to assure that more hospital care will be given to those who need it most.

Who is she talking about? She is talking about the poor and the elderly here in the District. And under the proposed legislation and current law, hospitals receiving Federal funds are required to provide a community service and a reasonable volume of free and below-cost care. She charges that the hospitals in the District of Columbia are not doing any such thing.

What else does she say? For instance, she names one of those hospitals; in short, the Cafritz Hospital—which is right on the edge of the gentleman's district in Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL). I do not blame him for getting all he can. When we had a bill like this before us a few years ago I suggested that he was digging money out of the Federal Goverment with a scoop. I do not blame him, I congratulate him, but I question the wisdom of Congress. The Cafritz Hospital has turned its back on the District, so the lady says. And it is not just Cafritz.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ABERNETHY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman read a letter, I believe, from the HEW that the total interest provided for in this bill was on loans which amounted to $304 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I read what the Deputy Assistant Secretary testified to before the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I should like to challenge those figures, because they provide for a $60 million loan in this bill. That $400 million is either a misprint or a typo or HEW does not know what it is talking about.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the gentleman hear the testimony of the Secretary? The gentleman was there; was he not?

Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman, and now I ask the gentleman a question. Was the gentleman present? I understand that he was. Then why did the gentleman not challenge the testimony of the witness?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I was present, but it cannot be $400 million. It just does not make sense.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In fact, the whole bill does not make sense.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia made a statement which was repeated in colloquy with me that my constituents use these hospitals. How many of them does the gentleman suppose will use these hospitals? And the inference was they would get the services for nothing. But when they leave the hospital, they get a big fat bill, do they not, and they cannot leave until they pay for it? Do they not? They have to pay for the services. Those services are not free at all.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They are supposed to pay.

Mr. HAYS. Then they do not get it any more than when they are at home.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This hospital, Cafritz, this witness said, has turned its back on the District. She said:

> Less than 30 percent of the patients in this hospital are from the District of Columbia.

That is one of the private, nonprofit hospitals here, with crocodile tears, wanting a part of these millions. And she says:

> The pattern in the several other Washington private hospitals is similar. Less than 35 percent of the patients at Providence and Sibley and others are from the District of Columbia.

Now, we hear all this talk about the poor, and there are poor people here as there are elsewhere; and the talk about building these superduper superior hospitals for the poor of the District. If I could use some of my southern language, "It just ain't so" that they are building them for the poor. The poor are being turned away while citizens from nearby areas contiguous to the District occupy the hospital beds. They pay better. These hospitals are being constructed for the benefit of our friends from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) and Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

It is time, after about 10 dips into the Federal Treasury to put a stop to this boondoggle and let Maryland and Virginia build their own hospitals instead of building private hospitals for them here in the District in the name of the poor.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Maryland. The gentleman has received so much benefit from this I feel he should get in the RECORD and have some time.

Mr. GUDE. I just want to say to the gentleman that, just like anyone else who wants to use these hospitals from my district or the district of anyone else, they pay a fair share.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not blame the gentleman. I congratulate him.

Listen; I worked for 3 years, for 3 hard years, to get only 35 beds for my little town. When we finally—yes, finally—got approval we had to issue bonds and put up a big slice of the money. And the remainder we got the Hill-Burton route.

I offered an amendment in the committee once on one of these bills, to do the same thing for your hospitals, and yours, and yours, and yours, and yours, that they are doing for Mr. BROYHILL and Mr. GUDE, but they voted me down. I did not have any lobbyist running up and down these halls seeking handouts for hospitals in the name of the poor, nor did I have men in certain high places pressuring you for such, and I think you know of whom I speak.

I have no personal interest in this. Whatever way this bill goes it will not affect me, my position or my status. It will take tax money away from my people and I do not like that, and you should not like it either. I have stood in the well of this House on every one of these bills, and I have opposed them. The trouble is we cannot get enough Members of this House to stay on the floor, listen to the debate, and get the facts. But I believe we have them here today.

I have not heretofore opposed these bills because I am against hospitals. I have said to them, "You take the same course I have to take." You go through Hill-Burton. And if you cannot get enough money under Hill-Burton, if the Hill-Burton formula does not fit this city, which is so fortunate to have such a large payroll here, then go seek out the appropriate committee and offer an amendment to amend the Hill-Burton act.

I may have been a little "pushy" today. There is so much about this the Members ought to know about. But I have said enough.

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

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

(By uanimous consent, Mr. ABERNETHY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi for making it very clear to the gentleman from Ohio and the other Members of the House that these hospitals do not serve the nearly 800,000 people who live in the District of Columbia alone, but they serve some nearly 3 million people in this metropolitan area. Therefore, one cannot compare the service area to that of a congressional district.

Second, one must clearly understand one cannot compare the population of the District of Columbia to that of other cities of comparable size. We do function as a city and as a State, and we have all those needs.

The gentleman is quite right in pointing out to the Congress that in many instances the people served by these hospitals are from 70 to 75 percent people from outside the District of Columbia. With that as a matter of record I would hope the Congress would recognize the work that has gone into this bill, the hearings that have been held, and the collective judgment reached by the District of Columbia Committee in offering this bill for your favorable consideration.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In response to the gentleman, my point is I do feel these people should build their own private hospitals just as we have to build ours. I think there will be those in this House who understand this. There is no obligation on the part of the Federal Government to construct private hospitals here for the benefit of outsiders, but that is what we are now called on to do.

Bear in mind that this administration—and the city government, the mayor downtown, went along with HEW—disapproved the enactment of this legislation.

This bill should be defeated. I urge you to vote it down.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Page 9, line 4, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 6.".

Page 9, immediately after line 7, insert the following:

"(b) The Secretary, the appropriate State agency, and the District of Columbia shall have the responsibility to enforce compliance by a recipient of a grant or loan guarantee under this Act, with the same terms and conditions as are applicable to applications for grants under the applicable Medical Facilities Act and with any assurance made in the application or other documents submitted to the Secretary, the appropriate State agency, the District of Columbia, or metropolitan area health planning body for grants or loan guarantees under this Act. Such enforcement shall include the initiation of appropriate legal action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to compel such compliance."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, members of the committee have tortured all reason and fact in an attempt to justify this special privilege bill.

The District of Columbia is well below the national average in unemployment. The District of Columbia has the most lush and constant payroll of any comparable city in the entire United States, and one of the lowest tax rates. So, in order to justify the necessity for this kind

of bill and raid upon the Nation's taxpayers——

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it not also true that the District of Columbia has the highest per capita earnings of any metropolitan area or city in the United States?

Mr. GROSS. The highest per capita what?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Earnings of any city in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Maryland is absolutely right. I said the lushest payroll per capita of any city of its size in the United States.

It is particularly torturing reason to say, as did the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) that this bill could be justified on the basis that there are *x* number of tourists coming into this city and, therefore, these hospital facilities should be provided for them. How in the world anyone could justify, even in part, this kind of a raid upon all the taxpayers of the country because of the visitors who come to Washington is beyond comprehension.

I say to you, as did the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT), this bill is sheer fiscal madness.

I urge Members to look at the report, pages 5 and 6, under the title of the fiscal year 1972 grant allocations to States for construction and modernization of hospitals and other health facilities.

Read what you get in your States by way of grant allocations and then compare it with what is proposed here for a half dozen private hospitals in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unconscionable raid upon the Nation's taxpayers and it ought to be defeated out of hand.

I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) for the fight they have made here this afternoon in an effort to kill this measure which never should have been approved by the House District Committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was very much disappointed when Congressman HUNGATE advised me that he was leaving the District Committee for the simple reason that the work on the District Committee was taking too much of his time. Mr. HUNGATE has made an excellent subcommittee chairman and I have granted every request that he has made of me as chairman, and referred all the bills that would come under the Judiciary Subcommittee to him for his consideration.

I was distressed to read a statement in the Saturday Evening Star and in the Sunday Star, written by Stephen Green, a reporter who has spent a great deal of time during the past 12 months trying to cause disruptions in the House District Committee. I have compiled a book of articles written by Mr. Green and in each of these articles there are derogatory and distorted statements concerning the House District Committee.

No lobbyist has contacted me concerning any of the controversial bills that were passed by the Senate and forwarded to the House during the past 2 or 3 weeks. In fact, I have not been bothered by lobbyists at all and the statement made by Mr. Green is an absolute lie.

Mr. Green states that a former clerk of the committee had me postpone a committee hearing one day last week from Monday to Tuesday, when, in fact, I was in South Carolina visiting my elder sister who is seriously ill in the Greenville, S.C., hospital. I could not return to Washington in time for a committee meeting on Monday and so advised each member of the committee. I also advised that I was calling the meeting for the next day, which would be Tuesday, and neither Bill McLeod nor any other person, had anything to do with my changing the date of the full committee meeting.

I have requested the Speaker to allocate a special room for Mr. HUNGATE and his subcommittee on three occasions during the past 6 months; however, the Speaker was unable to locate any space for this purpose. Another lie this reporter had made concerned Congressman JACOBS and the appointment of subcommittee chairmen. I have no personal reasons or objections against Mr. JACOBS and have always liked him even though we might not have agreed with the seniority rule. I was a very good friend of Mr. JACOBS' father when he was a Member of Congress.

I hope that Mr. HUNGATE will call the newspaper and straighten this matter out with this unreliable reporter as I have complained to the Star officials and have made an effort to keep reporters out of the committee who continuously bank one member against another with dastardly lies.

When a bill is reported to the full committee, all 26 members have an opportunity to amend or review a bill that has been reported by the subcommittee. There were several members that objected to several portions of three or four bills tied together and sent to the House by the Senate that were reported to the full committee by Mr. HUNGATE'S subcommittee.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in support of H.R. 11628, the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1972.

The health facilities construction program envisioned under H.R. 11628 and its predecessor legislation Public Law 90–457 is illustrative of a unique planning partnership of government, community, and health facilities.

In a time when we are deeply concerned with increasing health care costs which are basic to a national program of health insurance, the need for more effective community planning of health facility needs is of maximum importance.

The program envisioned under H.R. 11628 is a model which requires the review and consideration by each of our major metropolitan areas. Elements of control included in this legislation are the necessity that each proposed project be subjected to the priorities and subjective need criteria of both the official State level health facility planning body and the metropolitan area nongovernmental body. The third assurance that the program will accomplish its objectives is the legislative inclusion of the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Specifically, as the result of research by those groups and the facility and service groups themselves the H.R. 11628 program was devised. It does not include any additional general acute hospital beds since there exists no evidence of the need for such. It concentrates on the modernization and expansion of outpatient clinical and emergency room facilities. In our recent health manpower legislation hearing, we heard that we were facing a crucial shortage of health manpower resources. We heard further that no order to effect corrective changes within the health care delivery system that we must expand the 24-hour service facilities and the clinical diagnostic and treatment facilities of existing health care institutions. You will recall that Congress reviewed and revised the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction program funding emphasis to meet those needs.

The program envisioned with H.R. 11628 thus represents the results of an extremely well conceived evaluation of community and national considerations. One project in which I am personally deeply concerned is the completion of the Children's Hospital construction program. While partial funding was provided under Public Law 90–457, the second phase requirements were held because of the lack of funding availability. This project will result in a facility whose service program is already well known. I believe that the reason this Nation has achieved its greatness is that it has invested wisely in its children and their health. The Children's Hospital project is illustrative of such an investment and deserves the support of every member of this body.

The concern as to the request for grant funding from the Federal Government for District of Columbia health care facilities must be spoken to. Congress in its wisdom has limited the authority of the District of Columbia. Because of this, Congress has and must continue to assume certain otherwise unmet responsibilities.

The provision of financial assistance for construction of health care facilities in the District of Columbia has been one of these responsibilities assumed by Congress over the years. The record is clear, it has been spoken to by representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under each of the last five administrations.

You are already aware of the fact that industry has historically been responsive to the community's request for contributions. Government along with industry in each of our States has been of major assistance in meeting these construction costs. These opportunities exist only in a unique way in the District of Columbia.

The Federal Government is our industrial base providing health care benefits either directly or indirectly for some 70 percent of our population. The Federal Government serves the State, county, city functional authority and therefore becomes both our industrial base and governmental structure. This dual re-

sponsibility serves as the essential base of financial support.

I ask your support of H.R. 11628 to bring District of Columbia Hospitals into a position identical to the hospitals in each State of the Union. The provision of grant funds and the availability of loan interest subsidy are the factors to be equated. They have been equated within H.R. 11628 and must be considered and accepted.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my support for the passage of H.R. 11628, the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1972. This is a vital and timely bill, and I commend the District of Columbia Committee and its chairman (Mr. McMILLAN) for its fine work in bringing the bill before us for consideration at this time.

The bill authorizes supplementary Federal financial assistance to help meet the costs of projects for the modernization of nonprofit private hospitals in the District of Columbia, as well as the costs of projects for the construction and modernization of long-term care facilities, diagnostic or treatment centers, outpatient facilities, rehabilitation facilities, facilities for the mentally retarded, and communty health centers in the city. All of these types of health facilities are essential to the total health care system of the District of Columbia and the whole metropolitan area.

It is, of course, the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Congress to provide the necessary financial assistance for the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the city. The District of Columbia does not have the same resources to pay for the development of its health care system as do the 50 States.

Although it has received aid from the Hill-Burton hospital construction and modernization program, this aid has not been anywhere adequate to its needs. Allotment of grant assistance under the Hill-Burton program is based for the most part on two separate criteria, both of which work to the disadvantage of the District. First, the ratio of hospital beds per thousand beds is higher in the District than in any of the States because of the very high population density here.

In addition, the use of per capita income to allot funds under the Hill-Burton program works to the disadvantage of the District of Columbia, which has one of the highest per capita incomes in the country. Because the city is the seat of the Federal Government, a preponderance of its high-income residents are temporary residents, who do not feel the obligation to contribute to the growth and maintenance of the hospitals here that they do to the hospitals in their home communities throughout the Nation. The hospitals still have to provide services to these temporary residents and to a large proportion of persons in neighboring Maryland and Virginia.

This whole situation puts hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia at a gross disadvantage when they need to raise funds to proceed with natural growth and modernization. Health facilities age quickly and must continue to modernize and update if they are to keep pace with constantly improving techniques of medical care.

For the last quarter of a century the Congress has fulfilled its responsibility for the provision of assistance for the construction of facilities here in the Federal city. In 1946, the Hospital Center Act provided aid for the construction of the Washington Hospital Center. In 1962, Public Law 87–460 authorized grants for the construction of an addition to the George Washington University Hospital. The most important program enacted by the Congress for the construction of health facilities in the District was the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968. This legislation authorized a total of over $80 million in project grants and loans for construction and modernization of health facilities. The 1968 act expires at the completion of the present fiscal year, and the bill before us for consideration today will continue the fine work that legislation began.

There still exists a considerable backlog of need for improvement of health facilities in the District of Columbia that H.R. 11628, when enacted into law, will help to correct. Projects begun under the 1968 legislation need additional funding if they are to be brought to completion.

The District of Columbia is truly the Federal city and serves, in certain respects, the entire Nation. Tourism is high, and when visitors are stricken with illness or injury during their visits here, it is the responsibility of the hospitals here to take care of them.

If the hospitals in the District are to meet this responsibility as well as the continuing responsibility to meet the health needs of its own residents, they must receive financial assistance that no one can provide but the Federal Government and the Congress. This bill, H.R. 11628, will provide that assistance and I urge its immediate and unanimous passage at this time.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House the great concern and interest Speaker Emeritus John W. McCormack has in the passage of this legislation.

John W. McCormack feels so keenly with regard to this legislation that he testified before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, in favor of its passage, one of the few times he left the bedside of his beloved wife.

I mention this to my colleagues to illustrate what passage of this legislation means to the man who dedicated much of his life to the improvement of hospitals in the District of Columbia and the United States.

I include at this point, the testimony of John W. McCormack before the House Committee on the District of Columbia:

STATEMENT BY JOHN W. MCCORMACK

Members of the Committee, I would like to present for the record a statement of my interest in the hospitals of the District of Columbia. In discussing continued support of the construction of needed medical facilities, we should consider the congressional actions that have resulted in significant achievements in the District of Columbia. In all of these actions, I have been a staunch advocate in the interest of providing for the backlog of needed medical facilities.

In 1951, the Hospital Center Act was amended to authorize grants of up to 50 percent of the cost of constructing or renovating hospital facilities in the District. The District of Columbia was required to repay 50 percent of the Federal contribution. This was lowered to 30 percent in 1958 with respect to grants made after that time. Under the 1951 and subsequent amendments, grants of $17,420,453 have been made for projects having an estimated cost of approximately $44,400,000. The Act expired in 1962.

In 1962 legislation (P.L. 87–460) was enacted authorizing grants up to $2.5 million for 50 percent of the cost of constructing an addition to George Washington University Hospital. Funds for this purpose were appropriated by the Congress in the fiscal year 1964 and the project is now complete. In addition to the Hospital Center Act and P.L. 87–460, both of which applied solely to the District, Federal financial assistance has been given for the construction of hospitals and other medical facilities in Washington through two generally applicable Federal programs—the wartime defense housing and public works program, commonly referred to as the Lanham Act, and the program authorized by Title VI of the Public Health Service Act, commonly called the Hill-Burton program.

Under the Lanham Act, two hospitals in the District received a Federal contribution of $5,655,000. Under the Hill-Burton program, a total of $7,194,000 in grants was approved through fiscal year 1966 for 27 projects in the District. The allotment of funds to the District, which takes into account per capita income and population, is low in relationship to the facility construction problem.

The present bill (HR 11628) is an extension of Public Law 90–457. I personally supported the latter on the floor of the House.

The 1968 Act (PL 90–457) provided 80 million dollars in grants and loans toward meeting a backlog of needs. This backlog was caused by Federal legislative inequities within the Federal Health Facilities Acts as they apply to the District of Columbia. The present bill (HR 11628) provides 72 million dollars in grants and loan interest subsidies. It encompasses the individual and collective efforts of the non-profit health care institutions to meet community health needs in the most effective and economical manner. It provides for completion of several projects which are currently under construction.

Sponsors of projects for construction in the District of Columbia experience serious difficulty in raising the non-Federal share of the cost thereof. In local city, county, and state jurisdictions throughout the country, financial assistance to meet hospital construction fund requirements is forthcoming from the governments in addition to individual and industrial contributions. The grant program is equivalent to the bond issues and direct contributions in other jurisdictions. Because of the uniqueness of the Nation's Capital, where upwards of 70% of the population is employed by the United States Government or its supportive industries, no such possibility exists.

A dynamic and critical approach to meeting community needs as set forth within this legislation, emphasizes the provision of outpatient diagnostic and treatment facilities and the use of low cost extended care services. The legislation provides for the replacement of outmoded, uneconomical, and inefficient facilities and therefore compels cost consciousness. Incentive matching funds ratios emphasize this with 66⅔ per cent for extended care and diagnostic treatment facilities and 50 per cent for modernization and new construction.

It is my sincere hope that the wisdom of the members of this committee will continue the obligation of Congress to the hospitals

of the District of Columbia by guiding this bill through passage during this session.

I thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you this morning.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have not been here for all of the debate on this proposed legislation to authorize the construction of additional medical facilities for the District of Columbia, but after reading the report and hearing what I have, I am going to vote against the bill and would urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Here is one of those occasions when we can express ourselves on an authorizing piece of legislation and in my opinion the level of authorization is far too high, and I do not want to see us on our Appropriations Committee being whipsawed again by those who say we have to appropriate the money, because the Congress has authorized it.

Now when the regular HEW appropriation bill was before us, we included $24 million for grants and $16.5 million for loans, which was, as I recall, for Providence, Rogers, Children's, and Georgetown University Hospitals. Now I see here in this report it calls for additional amounts for Children's, Georgetown, Rogers, and George Washington Hospitals, and planning for Cafritz, Columbia, Providence, and Sibley.

Now I am not opposed to fulfilling our responsibility here in the District of Columbia, and I think up to this point we have been very generous when one considers what the District of Columbia has been receiving as against what the entire rest of the country has been getting for grants and loans for hospital construction.

I realize there is a peculiar problem when one considers the District of Columbia's lack of corporate gifts that we normally count on in other sections of the country. But as I recall, the per capita income here in the District of Columbia is one of the highest if not the highest in the country. The gentlemen from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) and from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) make the point that these hospitals serve their constituencies to a great degree, and they make very moving arguments in behalf of their beleaguered constituency.

The gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) says these hospitals cannot be considered to be serving only the three-quarters of a million people here in the District, but the 3 million people living in the metropolitan area. If that is the case, then it seems to me these very rich constituencies in nearby Maryland and Virginia ought to be paying their way proportionately for the construction of these hospitals. They have a corporate base from which to draw and certainly a very high paid or salaried group of people.

If the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia feel they are being shortchanged in the allotment of Hill-Burton funds, I would suggest they all three get together in a pooling of their resources to get the job done as far as hospital construction and modernization are concerned in the area. As a matter of fact, I just might propose legislation this coming year that would provide for this pooling of resources.

We simply do not have the kind of money available from Federal sources alone to build all the hospitals and modernize the existing ones required. The rest of the country has the same needs as the immediate Washington area, and those of us from out in the hinterlands would like to see the same kind of private individual effort being made in this locale as we are required to make.

This is just too much to be asked to go through the hoop for again so soon, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

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 being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 25, noes 69.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. 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 160, nays 200, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

YEAS—160

Abourezk	Fraser	Miller, Calif.
Abzug	Frelinghuysen	Minish
Adams	Frenzel	Mitchell
Addabbo	Garmatz	Monagan
Alexander	Gettys	Moorhead
Anderson, Calif.	Giaimo	Morgan
Annunzio	Gibbons	Morse
Aspin	Gonzalez	Mosher
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.
Begich	Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Bergland	Gude	Natcher
Bingham	Halpern	Nedzi
Boggs	Hamilton	Nelsen
Brademas	Hanley	Nix
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Obey
Broyhill, Va.	Harrington	Patten
Buchanan	Hastings	Pepper
Burke, Mass.	Hathaway	Perkins
Burton	Hawkins	Pike
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Byron	Helstoski	Preyer, N.C.
Carney	Hicks, Mass.	Price, Ill.
Casey, Tex.	Hogan	Pryor, Ark.
Celler	Holifield	Rangel
Clay	Howard	Reuss
Collins, Ill.	Jacobs	Riegle
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Robison, N.Y.
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Culver	Kee	Roe
Danielson	Keith	Rogers
Davis, S.C.	Kluczynski	Roncalio
Dellenback	Koch	Rooney, N.Y.
Dellums	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.
Dorn	Latta	Rosenthal
Dow	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Drinan	Lent	Roush
Dulski	Link	Roy
du Pont	McClory	Roybal
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Ryan
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	St Germain
Eilberg	McMillan	Sarbanes
Fascell	Macdonald, Mass.	Scheuer
Fish	Madden	Schwengel
Flood	Matsunaga	Seiberling
Ford, Gerald R.	Melcher	Shipley
Ford, William D.	Metcalfe	Sisk
	Mikva	Smith, Iowa
		Snyder
Staggers	Udall	Wilson, Charles H.
Stanton, J. William	Ullman	Wolff
Stokes	Van Deerlin	Wright
Stratton	Vanik	Yates
Stuckey	Waldie	Yatron
Tiernan	Whalen	Zablocki
	Williams	

NAYS—200

Abbitt	Fountain	Pettis
Abernethy	Frey	Peyser
Anderson, Ill.	Galifianakis	Pickle
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goodling	Pirnie
Archer	Gray	Poff
Arends	Griffin	Powell
Ashbrook	Gross	Price, Tex.
Aspinall	Grover	Purcell
Bennett	Hagan	Quie
Betts	Haley	Quillen
Bevill	Hammer-schmidt	Railsback
Biaggi	Harsha	Randall
Biester	Harvey	Rarick
Blackburn	Hays	Rhodes
Bow	Heckler, Mass.	Roberts
Bray	Heinz	Robinson, Va.
Brinkley	Henderson	Runnels
Brooks	Hillis	Ruppe
Broomfield	Hosmer	Ruth
Brotzman	Hull	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Hungate	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Hunt	Saylor
Broyhill, N.C.	Hutchinson	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Ichord	Schmitz
Burleson, Tex.	Jarman	Schneebeli
Burlison, Mo.	Johnson, Pa.	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Sebelius
Cabell	Jones, Ala.	Shoup
Caffery	Jones, N.C.	Shriver
Camp	Jones, Tenn.	Skubitz
Carter	Kazen	Slack
Cederberg	Keating	Smith, N.Y.
Chappell	Kemp	Stanton, James V.
Clancy	King	Steed
Clark	Kuykendall	Steele
Clausen, Don H.	Kyl	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Steiger, Wis.
Cleveland	Lennon	Stephens
Collier	Lloyd	Stubblefield
Collins, Tex.	Long, La.	Talcott
Colmer	Long, Md.	Taylor
Conable	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
Coughlin	McCormack	Teague, Tex.
Crane	McCulloch	Terry
Curlin	McDade	Thompson, Ga.
Daniel, Va.	McDonald, Mich.	Thomson, Wis.
Daniels, N.J.	McEwen	Thone
Davis, Ga.	McKay	Vander Jagt
Davis, Wis.	McKinney	Vigorito
de la Garza	Mahon	Wampler
Delaney	Mailliard	Ware
Denholm	Mann	Whalley
Dennis	Mathias, Calif.	White
Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Whitehurst
Dickinson	Mayne	Whitten
Downing	Mazzoli	Widnall
Duncan	Meeds	Wiggins
Edmondson	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Ohio	Winn
Esch	Mills, Md.	Wyatt
Eshleman	Minshall	Wylie
Evans, Colo.	Mizell	Wyman
Findley	Montgomery	Young, Fla.
Fisher	Myers	Young, Tex.
Flowers	Nichols	Zion
Foley	O'Konski	Zwach
Forsythe	Passman	

NOT VOTING—72

Anderson, Tenn.	Dwyer	Martin
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, La.	Mills, Ark.
Ashley	Erlenborn	Mink
Badillo	Evins, Tenn.	Mollohan
Baker	Flynt	Moss
Baring	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Hara
Belcher	Fuqua	O'Neill
Bell	Gallagher	Patman
Blanton	Gaydos	Pelly
Blatnik	Goldwater	Poage
Boland	Grasso	Pucinski
Bolling	Griffiths	Rees
Carey, N.Y.	Gubser	Reid, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Hall	Rousselot
Chisholm	Hanna	Sikes
Conte	Hansen, Idaho	Smith, Calif.
Conyers	Hébert	Spence
Dent	Hicks, Wash.	Springer
Derwinski	Horton	Sullivan
Diggs	Karth	Symington
Dingell	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	Lujan	Veysey
Dowdy	McClure	Waggonner
	McKevitt	Wydler

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Rousselot.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Dent with Mr. McKevitt.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Hicks of Washington with Mr. Veysey.
Mr. Blanton with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Symington.

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

Messrs. HAGAN and WIDNALL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION ACT OF 1971

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the Senate bill (S. 2878) to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2878

An act to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Election Act (D.C. Code sec. 1–1100 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec 1–1101), is amended (A) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That", (B) by striking out in clause (3) thereof the words "at large", (C) by striking out in clause (2) thereof the final "and", and (D) by redesignating clause (3) as clause (4), (E) by adding a new clause (3) as follows:

"(3) Alternates to the officials referred to in clauses (1) and (2) above, where permitted by political party rules; and",

and, (F) by adding at the end therof the following new subsection:

"(b) Candidates for office participating in an election of the officials referred to in clauses (2) and (3), or designated pursuant to clause (4), of subsection (a) of this section may be elected or designated, as the case may be, at large or by precinct or ward."

(2) Subsection (2) of section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'qualified elector' means any person (A) who, for the purpose of voting in an election under this Act, has resided or has been domiciled in the District continuously during the thirty-day period ending on the day of such election, (B) who is a citizen of the United States, (C) who is, or will be on the day of the next election, at least eighteen years old, (D) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned or is no longer subject to the jurisdiction of any court with respect thereto, (E) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, and (F) who certifies that he does not claim, and has not, within thirty days immediately preceding the day of the election, claimed the right to vote or voted in any election in any State or territory of the United States (other than the District of Columbia)."

(3) Subsection (4) of section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102) is amended by deleting "a school" and by inserting the word "an" in lieu thereof.

(4) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1104), is amended by striking "$50 per day, with a limit of $2500 per annum" and inserting "$75 per day with a limit of $11,250 per annum" in lieu thereof.

(5) Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon a comma and the following: "including upon approval by majority vote of the City Council, referendums, advisory elections, and other community elections such as those for model cities programs, as part of any regular election".

(6) Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended by striking "official" and inserting "sample" in lieu thereof.

(7) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended by deleting the word "school".

(8) Paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105) is amended (A) by striking "paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (4)" and by inserting "paragraphs (1), (2), or (3)" in lieu thereof, and (B) by inserting after "(69 Stat. 584)" the words "as amended."

(9) Section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended (A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and (B) by adding after subsection (a) the following:

"(b)(1) The Board shall, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May of each presidential election year, conduct a presidential preference primary election within the District of Columbia in which the registered qualified voters therein may express their preference for candidates of each political party of the District of Columbia for nomination for President.

"(2) No person shall be listed on the ballot as a candidate for nomination for President in such primary unless there shall have been filed with the Board no later than forty-five days before the date of such presidential primary election a petition on behalf of his candidacy signed by the candidate and at least one thousand qualified electors of the District of Columbia who are registered under section 7 of this Act, and of the same political party as the nominee.

"(3) Candidates for delegate and alternates where permitted by political party rules to a particular political party national convention convened to nominate that party's candidate for President shall be listed on the ballot of the presidential preference primary held under this Act as:

"(A) slates of candidates for delegates supporting a candidate for nomination for President: *Provided,* That there shall have been filed with the Board, no later than forty-five days before the date of such presidential primary, a petition on behalf of such slate's candidacy signed by the candidates on the slate, the candidates for nomination for President supported by the slate, and by at least one thousand qualified electors of the District of Columbia who are registered under section 7 of this Act, and of the same political party as the qualified voters of such slate;

"(B) as slates of candidates for delegates not committed to support any named candidate for nomination for president: *Provided,* That there shall have been filed with the Board, no later than forty-five days before the date of such presidential primary, a petition on behalf of such slate's candidacy, signed by the candidates on the slate and by at least one thousand qualified electors of the District of Columbia who have registered under section 7 of this Act, and of the same political party as the qualified voters and such slate;

"(C) as an individual candidate for delegate supporting a candidate for nomination for President: *Provided,* That such candidate for delegate shall have complied with subsection (a) section 8 of this Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) and the petition referred to that subsection is signed by the candidate for nomination for President supported by such candidate for delegate, and

"(D) as an individual not committed to support any named candidate for nomination for President: *Provided,* That such candidate for delegate shall have complied with subsection (a) section 8 of this Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108).

"(4) The Board shall (a) arrange the ballot for the presidential preference primary so as to enable each voter to indicate his choice for presidential nominee and for the slate of delegates and alternates pledged to support that prospective nominee with one mark, and provide an alternative to vote for individual delegates or uncommitted slates of delegates and (b) clearly indicate on the ballot the candidate for nomination for President which a slate or candidate for delegate supports.

"(5) The delegates and alternate delegates, of each political party within the District of Columbia to the national convention of that party convened for the nomination of the candidate of that political party for President, elected in accordance with this Act, shall be obligated to vote for the candidate for nomination who received at least a plurality of the votes cast in the presidential preference primary for all such candidates of that party for President held in the District of Columbia at which such delegates were elected on the first and second ballots cast at that convention for nominees for President, or until such time as such candidate receiving a plurality of such vote cast in the presidential preference primary withdraws his candidacy, but on subsequent ballots so cast each such delegate shall be free to cast his ballots in his discretion without restriction.

"(6) The Board shall by regulation specify such additional details as may be necessary and proper to effectuate the purposes and provisions of this subsection."

(10) Subsection (d) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105) is amended by striking "persons not absent from the District but who are physically unable", and inserting "either persons temporarily absent from the District or persons physically unable" in lieu thereof.

(11) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1107) is amended by striking in the second sentence "person" and inserting "qualified elector".

(12) Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of

section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1107), is amended (A) by striking from clause (A) the words "odd-numbered calendar year and of each presidential election year" and inserting "even-numbered year" in lieu thereof, and (B) by striking from clause (B) the words "presidential election" and inserting "even-numbered"' in lieu thereof, and (C) by inserting in clause (c), after the word special", the words, "or runoff."

(13) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Candidates for offices referred to in clause (1) of the first section of this Act and for offices designated pursuant to clause (3) of such section shall be the persons registered under section 7 who have been nominated for such office by petitions prepared and presented to the Board in accordance with rules prescribed by the Board, but not later than forty-five days before the date of the election, and signed by the following minimum number of qualified electors duly registered under section 7 of the same political party as the nominee:

"(1) in the case of petitions nominating candidates for offices referred to in clause (1) of the first section of this Act and of petitions nominating candidates designated for election at large pursuant to clause (3) of such section, signatures of at least two hundred such electors;

"(2) in the case of petitions nominating candidates for offices designated for election from a ward pursuant to clause (3) of such section, signatures of at least fifty such electors residing in such ward, or one-half of 1 per centum of the registered electors of such party residing in such ward, whichever is less; and

"(3) in the case of petitions nominating candidates for the office of Delegate and for member of the Board of Education, they shall be accompanied by a guarantee of $200 in the form of currency, surety or a bond, at the choice of the candidate. Such guarantee shall be forfeited by the candidate in the event he fails to receive at least 5 per centum of the vote cast in the election for which he presented a petition to the Board. In the event such candidate received at least 5 per centum of the vote cast, the guarantee shall be returned in full."

(14) Subsection (2) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No such person shall hold elected office pursuant to this Act unless—

"(1) he has been a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia since the beginning of the one-year period ending on the date of the election in which he was elected to such office; or

"(2) in the case of a person elected from a ward, he has been a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia since the beginning of the one-year period ending on the date of the election in which he was elected to such office, and a bona fide resident of the ward from which he was elected since the beginning of the six-month period ending on the date of such election;

and is a qualified elector registered under section 7 of this Act."

(15) Subsection (c) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) In each election of officials referred to in clause (1) of the first section of this Act, and in each election of officials designated for election at large pursuant to clause (3) of such section, the Board shall arrange the ballot of each party to enable the registered voters of such party to vote separately for each official duly qualified and nominated for election to such office; and

"(2) In each election of officials designated, pursuant to clause (3) of the first section of this Act, for election from a ward, the Board shall arrange the ballot of each party to enable the registered voters of such party, residing in such ward, to vote separately for each official duly qualified and nominated from such ward for election to such office from such ward."

(16) Subsection (f) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended by striking "August 15" and inserting "the third Tuesday in August" in lieu thereof.

(17) Subsection (i) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Each candidate in a primary election for the office of Delegate shall be nominated for such office by a petition (1) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth day before the date of such primary election; (2) signed by qualified electors registered under section 7 of this Act equal in number to 1 per centum of the total number of such electors in the District of Columbia who are of the same political party as the nominee, as shown by the records of the Board as of the ninety-ninth day before the date of such primary election, or by two thousand of such qualified electors who are of the same political party as the nominee, whichever is less, but in no case less than one hundred qualified electors. A nominating petition for a candidate in a primary election for the office of Delegate may not be circulated for signature before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions. The Board shall arrange the ballot of each political party in each such primary election so as to enable a voter of such party to vote for any one duly nominated candidate of that party for the office of Delegate."

(18) Paragraph (1) of subsection (j) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(j)(1) A duly qualified candidate for the office of Delegate may, subject to the provisions of this subsection, be nominated directly as such candidate for election in the next succeeding general election for such office (including any such election to be held to fill a vacancy). Such person shall be nominated by a petition (A) filed with the Board not less than the forty-fifth day before the date of such general election, and (B) signed by duly registered voters equal in number to 1½ per centum of the total number of registered voters of the District, as shown by the records of the Board as of the ninety-ninth day before the date of such election, or by three thousand persons duly registered under section 7 of this Act, whichever is less but in no case less than one hundred such duly registered voters. A nominating petition for such candidate for the office of Delegate may not be circulated for signature before the ninety-ninth day preceeding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of such nominating petitions.

(19) Subsection (m) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended to read as follows:

"(m)(1) Designation of offices of local party committeess to be filled by election pursuant to clause (3) of the first section of this Act shall be effected, in accordance with the provision of this subsection, by written communication signed by the chairman of such committee and filed with the Board not later than ninety days before the date of such election.

"(2) Such designation shall specify separately (A) the titles of the offices and the total number of members to be elected at large, if any, and (B) the title of the offices and the total number of members to be elected by ward, if any.

"(3) In the event that a party committee designates members to be elected by ward pursuant to clause (B) of paragraph (2) this subsection, the number of such officials to be elected from each of the wards shall be based on the relative numerical strength of such party in such ward, as compared with the total numerical strength of such party in the District, in each case as measured by the total number of registered voters of such party residing in each ward, (as shown by the records of the Board as one of one hundred-twenty days before such election) based on the method known as the method of equal proportion, with no ward to elect less than one member. The Board shall by regulation specify such adidtional details as may be necessary and proper to effectuate the purpose of this subsection."

(20) Paragraph (1) of subsection (n) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended by striking "qualified electors" and inserting "duly registered voters" in lieu thereof.

(21) Subsection (o) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) Each candidate in a general election for members of the Board of Education shall be nominated for such office by a petition (A) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth calendar day before the date of such general election; and (B) signed by at least two hundred persons who are duly registered under section 7 of this Act in the ward from which the candidate seeks election, or in the case of a candidate running at large, signed by at least fifty persons in each ward of the District who are duly registered in such ward, and such additional number of persons duly registered under section 7 of this Act, without regard to ward, as may be necessary for such petition to contain not less than one thousand persons. A nominating petition for a candidate in a general election for members of the Board of Education may not be circulated for signatures before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions. In a general election for members of the Board of Education, the Board shall arrange the ballot for each ward to enable a voter registered in that ward to vote for any one candidate duly nominated to be elected to such office from such ward, and to vote for as many candidates duly nominated for election at large to such office as there are Board of Education members to be elected at large in such election."

(22) Subsection (q) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended by inserting the words ", or slates of candidates" after the word "candidates".

(23) Section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended by adding at the end of that section the following:

"(r) Any petition of other document required to be filed under this Act by a particular date must be filed no later than 5 o'clock post meridian on such date."

(24) Subsection (l) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is repealed.

(25) Subsection (c) of section 9 of Such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1109), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any candidate or group of candidates may, not less than two weeks prior to such election, petition the Board for credentials authorizing watchers at one or more polling places and at the place or places where the vote is to be counted for the next election during voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board shall formulate rules and regulations not inconsistent with

this Act to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern the conduct of such watchers, and to limit the number of watchers so that the conduct of the election will not be unreasonably obstructed. Such rules and regulations should provide fair opportunity for watchers for all candidates or groups of candidates to challenge prospective voters whom the watchers believe to be unqualified to vote, to question the accuracy in the vote count, and otherwise to observe the conduct of the election at the polling places and the counting of votes."

(26) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The elections of the officials referred to in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first section and of officials designated pursuant to clause (4) of such section and the presidential preference primary under section 5(b) of this Act shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May of each presidential election year."

(27) Section 10(a)(7)(A) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended (A) by striking out "a majority" and inserting "at least 35 per centum" in lieu thereof and (B) by striking out "on the twenty-first day following such election" and inserting "either on the twenty-first day following such election or, in exceptional circumstances determined by the Board to make such date impracticable, not less than two weeks nor more than six weeks after the date on which the Board has determined the results of the preceding general election. At the time of announcing such determination the Board shall establish and announce the date of the run-off election, if one is required."

(28) Section 10(a)(7)(B) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking out "a majority" and inserting "at least 35 per centum" in lieu thereof.

(29) Paragraph (8) of subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking "less than a majority" and by inserting a period instead.

(30) Subsection (a) of section 11 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1111), is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "In no case, however, shall the petitioner be required to pay the cost of any recount in any such election if the difference in the number of votes received by the petitioner in connection with any office and the number of votes received by the person certified as having been elected to that office, in the case of an election from a ward, is less than 1 per centum or fifty votes, whichever is less, or in the case of an election at large, is less than 1 per centum or two hundred votes, whichever is less."

(31) Subsection (b) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), amended by striking "or" immediately before "delegate" and inserting "or alternate," immediately after "delegated."

(32) Subsection (d) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended by striking "or" immediately before "delegate" and inserting ", or alternate" immediately after "delegate".

(33) Subsection (e) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) Every independent committee or party committee which receives or expends funds on behalf of any candidate or group of candidates in an election for any office referred to in the first section of this Act, or in a primary election held under section 5(b) of this Act, shall have a chairman and a treasurer and shall maintain an address in the District of Columbia where notices may be sent. Every such committee shall register with the Board of Elections.

"(2) In any election held in the District of Columbia with respect to any office referred to in the first section of this Act, or with respect to a primary election held under section 5(b) of this Act, each candidate for election, and the treasurer of each independent or party committee, shall file with the Board of Elections not less than three nor more than five days before, and also within thirty days after, the date on which such primary or general election is held, an itemized statement, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing, setting forth—

"(A) a correct and itemized account of each contribution received by such candidate or committee, or by any person for such candidate or committee with his or its knowledge or consent, from any source, for use in connection with such election, together with the name of the actual contributor;

"(B) a correct and itemized account of each expenditure made by such candidate or committee or by any person for such candidate or committee, with his or its knowledge or consent, in connection with such election, together with the name and address of the person to whom such expenditure was made, the date of such expenditure, and the purpose for which it was made; and

"(C) a correct and itemized account of any unpaid debts and obligations incurred by such candidate or committee with respect to such election, and the balance, if any, of such contributions remaining in the candidate or committee's possession.

"(3) A statement required by this subsection to be filed by a candidate or the treasurer of an independent or party committee shall be signed by the candidate or the treasurer of such committee, as the case may be, and shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths. Such statement shall be deemed properly filed when deposited at the Board of Elections within the prescribed time. Such statement shall be preserved by the Board of Elections for a period of two years from the date of filing, shall constitute a part of the public records of such Board, and shall be open to public inspection.

"(4) In any case in which a candidate fails to timely file a statement required under this section to be filed prior to such election, the Board of Election shall, on the second day before such primary or general election in which such candidate is entered, cause to be published in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the District of Columbia an announcement stating that the candidate did not file a report of campaign expenditures as required by law. No candidate for election to any such office or participation in such primary shall be certified as having been elected to that office, or as a winner of any primary held pursuant to section 5(b) until all statements required to be filed by such candidate pursuant to this section have been filed. Any candidate or other person who willfully violates this section shall be subject to imprisonment for thirty days or a fine of $5,000, or both."

SEC. 2. (a) Title VI of article I of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–1567—47–1567e) is amended by adding at the end of that title the following new section:

"SEC. 7. (a) CREDIT FOR CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.—For the purpose of encouraging residents of the District to participate in the election process in the District, there shall be allowed to an individual a credit against the tax (if any) imposed by this article in an amount equal to 50 per centum of any campaign contribution made to any candidate for election to any office referred to in the first section of the District of Columbia Election Act, but in no event shall such credit exceed the amount of $20.

"(b) If the amount of credit allowed an individual by subsection (a) for a taxable year exceeds the amount of tax (computed without regard to such subsection but after allowance of any other credit allowable under this article) imposed under this article on such individual for such taxable year, a refund shall be allowed such individual to the extent that such credit exceeds the amount of such tax.

"(c)(1) A husband and wife filing separate returns for a taxable year for which a joint return could have been made by them may claim between them only the total credit (or refund) to which they would have been entitled under this section had a joint return been filed.

"(2) No individual for whom a personal exemption was allowed on another individual's return shall be entitled to a credit (or refund) under this section.".

(b) The table of contents of such article is amended by adding at the end of the part of such table relating to title VI the following:

"Sec. 7. Credit for campaign contributions.".

SEC. 3. Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101(c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Each member of the Board of Education elected from a ward shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the school election ward from which he seeks election, (B) have, for the six-month period immediately preceding his nomination, resided in the school election ward from which he is nominated, and (C) have, during the one-year period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(2) Each member of the Board of Education elected at large shall at time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the District of Columbia, and (b) have, during the one-year period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(3) No individual may hold the office of member of the Board of Education and (A) hold another elective office other than delegate or alternate delegate to a convention of a political party nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, or (B) also be an officer or employee of the District of Columbia government or of the Board of Education. A member will forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.".

SEC. 4. Subsection (i) of section 1 of the Act of June 25, 1910 (ch. 392, 36 Stat. 822), as amended (2 U.S.C. 241(i)), and section 591, title 18, United States Code, are each amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof a comma followed by the words "and the District of Columbia".

SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act and the amendments made thereby shall take effect as of January 1, 1972.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'MILLAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause of

S. 2878 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11992, as passed, as follows:

That the District of Columbia Election Act (D.C. Code, secs. 1–1100—1–1115), is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101, is amended (A) by striking out in clause (2) thereof the final "and", (B) by redesignating clause (3) as clause (4), (C) by adding a new clause (3) as follows:

"(3) Alternates to the officials referred to in clauses (1) and (2) above, where permitted by political party rules; and",

and (D) by inserting in clause (4) (as redesignated by this section) "or by ward" immediately after "large".

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102), is amended by striking out "a school" and inserting in lieu thereof "an".

(3) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102), is amended as follows:

(A) By striking out "The term" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in paragraph (7) of this section, the term".

(B) By striking out in clause (A) "one-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety-day period" and by inserting at the end thereof immediately before the semicolon ", except in the case of an election of electors of President and Vice President of the United States the period shall be thirty days".

(C) By striking out in clause (B) "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "eighteen".

(D) By striking out clause (C), and redesignating clause (D) as clause (C).

(4) Section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102), is amended by inserting at the end of that section the following:

"(7)(A) Any person in the District of Columbia who has been convicted of a crime in the United States which is a felony in the District of Columbia, may be a qualified elector, if otherwise qualified—

"(i) at the end of the five-year period beginning on the date he completes the sentence of incarceration imposed upon him for the last such crime committed by him, or in the case of a person who is granted parole or probation with respect to such last crime, beginning on the date he begins such parole or probation, if he successfully completes such parole or probation, or

"(ii) at the end of the three-year period beginning on the date he completes such sentence of incarceration, or in the case of a person who is granted parole or probation with respect to such last crime, beginning on the date he begins such parole or probation, if the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, after application made to such court by such person, certifies to the Board that such person has demonstrated such qualities of conduct and character as to warrant the restoration of his right to vote; or

"(iii) on the date upon which he receives a pardon with respect to such crime.

"(B) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'felony' shall includes any crime committed in the District of Columbia referred to in section 14 of this Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1114).

"(C) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to grant a pardon or amnesty to any person."

(5) Clause (3) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended by inserting immediately before "copy" the word "sample".

(6) Clause (4) of subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended by striking out "school".

(7) Section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105), is amended (A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and (B) by adding after subsection (a) the following:

"(b)(1) The Board shall, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May of each presidential election year, conduct a presidential preference primary election within the District of Columbia in which qualified electors therein may express their preference for candidates of each political party of the District of Columbia for nomination for President and may elect delegates, and alternates where permitted by the rules of a particular political party, to a particular political party national convention convened to nominate that party's candidate for President.

"(2) No person shall participate as a candidate for nomination for President in such primary unless there shall have been filed with the Board, not later than the forty-fifth day before such primary, (A) a petition on behalf of his candidacy signed by at least one thousand qualified electors of the District of Columbia who are registered under section 7 of this Act, and who are of the same political party as the prospective nominee, and (B) a written statement signed by the prospective nominee affirming that he wants his name listed on the ballot for such primary as a candidate for such nomination.

"(3) No person shall be listed on the ballot in such primary for election as such delegate, or alternate unless there shall been filed with the Board, not less than the forty-fifth day before such primary, (A) a petition in support of that prospective candidate for delegate or alternate, as the case may be, signed by at least one thousand qualified electors of the District of Columbia registered under section 7 of this Act who are of the same political party as the prospective candidate, and (B) if the prospective candidate is pledged to support a particular presidential candidate, a written statement signed by such presidential candidate affirming that such prospective candidate for delegate or alternate, as the case may be, is seeking that office with the approval of such presidential candidate and that such candidate for delegate or alternate was properly selected according to the rules of his political party relating to the nomination of candidates for delegate or alternate. If such presidential candidate fails to so indicate his approval of a candidate for delegate or alternate, such candidate shall appear on the ballot (if he files the appropriate petition) in such primary as a candidate for election as a delegate or alternate pledged to no presidential candidate.

"(4) The Board shall arrange the ballot for the presidential preference primary so as to enable each voter to indicate his choice for presidential nominee and for delegates, and alternates, pledged to support that prospective nominee with one mark.

(5) The delegates and alternate delegates, of each political party within the District of Columbia to the national convention of that party convened for the nomination of the candidate of that political party for President, elected, in accordance with this Act, shall be obligated, on the first and second ballots cast at that convention for nominees for President, to vote for the candidate for nomination who received at least a plurality of the votes cast in the presidential preference primary for all such candidates of that party for President held in the District of Columbia at which such delegates and alternates were elected, or until such candidate notifies each delegate in writing that he is no longer a candidate. On subsequent ballots so cast each such delegate shall be free to cast his ballots in his discretion without restriction.

(6) The Board shall by regulation specify such additional details as may be necessary and proper to effectuate the purposes and provisions of this subsection."

(8) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1107) is amended by striking out "section 2(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2) and (7) of section 2 of this Act".

(9) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read follows:

"(a)(1) Each candidate for election to the office of national committeeman or alternate, or national committeewoman or alternate, and for election as a member or official designated for election at large under clause (4) of the first section of this Act, shall be a qualified elector registered under section 7 of this Act who has been nominated for such office, or for election as such member or official, by a nominating petition (A) prepared in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Board, (B) signed by not less than one thousand qualified electors registered under such section 7 of this Act, who are of the same political party as the candidate, and (C) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth day before the date of the election held for such office, member, or official.

"(2) In the case of a nominating petition for a candidate for election as a member or official designated for election from a ward under clause (4) of such first section, such petition shall be prepared and filed in the same manner as a petition prepared and filed by a candidate under paragraph (1) of this subsection and signed by two hundred qualified electors residing in such ward, registered under section 7 of this Act, who are of the same political party as the candidate."

(10) Subsection (b) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended by striking out "three-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety-day".

(11) Subsection (i) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Each candidate in a primary election for the office of Delegate shall be nominated for such office by a nominating petition (1) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth day before the date of such primary election; (2) signed by qualified electors registered under section 7 of this Act, who are of the same political party as the candidate, and equal in number to 1 per centum of the total number of such electors in the District of Columbia, as shown by the records of the Board as of the ninety-ninth day before the date of such primary election, or by two thousand of such qualified electors, whichever is less. A nominating petition for a candidate in a primary election for the office of Delegate may not be circulated for signature before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions. The Board shall arrange the ballot of each political party in each such primary election so as to enable a voter of such party to vote for any one duly nominated candidate of that party for the office of Delegate."

(12) Subsection (j) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(j)(1) A duly qualified candidate for the office of Delegate may, subject to the provisions of this subsection, be nominated directly as such a candidate for election in the next succeeding general election for such office (including any such election to be held to fill a vacancy. Such person shall be nominated by a nominating petition (A) filed with the Board not less than the forty-fifth day before the date of such general election; and (B) signed by qualified electors registered under section 7 of this Act equal in number to 1½ per centum of the total number of such qualified electors in the District, as shown by the records of the Board as of the ninety-ninth day before the date of such election, or by three thousand of such qualified electors, whichever is less. No signatures on such a petition may be counted which have been made on such petition more than

ninety-nine days before the date of such election.

"(2) Nominations under this subsection for candidates for election in a general election for the office of Delegate shall be of no force and effect with respect to any person whose name has appeared on the ballot of a primary election for such office held within eight months before the date of such general election."

(13) Subsection (m) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended to read as follows:

"(m) Designations with respect to the election of officials under clause (4) of the first section of this Act by written communications filed with the Board not later than ninety days before the date of such election."

(14) Subsection (o) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) Each candidate in a general election for member of the Board of Education shall be nominated for such office by a nominating petition (A) filed with the Board not later than the forty-fifth calendar day before the date of such general election; and (B) signed by at least two hundred qualified electors who are duly registered under section 7 of this Act, who reside in the ward from which the candidate seeks election, or in the case of a candidate running at large, signed by at least one thousand of the qualified electors in the District of Columbia registered under such section 7. A nominating petition for a candidate in a general election for member of the Board of Education may not be circulated for signatures before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions. In a general election for members of the Board of Education, the Board shall arrange the ballot for each ward to enable a voter registered in that ward to vote for any one candidate duly nominated to be elected to such office from such ward, and to vote for as many candidates duly nominated for election at large to such office as there are Board of Education members to be elected at large in such election."

(15) Section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is amended by adding at the end of that section the following:

"(r) Any petition required to be filed under this Act by a particular date must be filed no later than 5 o'clock post meridian on such date."

(16) Subsection (1) of section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108), is repealed.

(17) Subsection (c) of section 9 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1109), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any candidate or group of candidates may, not less than two weeks prior to such election, petition the Board for credentials authorizing watchers at one or more polling places and at the place or places where the vote is to be counted for the next election during voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board shall formulate rules and regulations not inconsistent with this Act to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern the conduct of such watchers, and to limit the number of watchers so that the conduct of the election will not be unreasonably obstructed. Such rules and regulations should provide fair opportunity for watchers for all candidates or groups of candidates to challenge prospective voters whom the watchers believe to be unqualified to vote, to question the accuracy in the vote count, and otherwise to observe the conduct of the election at the polling places and the counting of votes."

(18) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The elections of the officials referred to in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first section of this Act, and of officials designated pursuant to clause (4) of such section, and the primary under section 5(b) of this Act, shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May of each presidential election year."

(19) Section 10(a)(7)(A) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking out "a majority" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least 40 per centum".

(20) Section 10(a)(7)(B) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking out "a majority" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least 40 per centum".

(21) The first sentence of paragraph (8) of subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110), is amended by striking out "less than a majority".

(22) Subsection (a) of section 11 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1111), is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "In no case, however, shall the petitioner be required to pay the cost of any recount in any such election if the difference in the number of votes received by the petitioner in connection with any office and the number of votes received by the person certified as having been elected to that office, in the case of an election from a ward, is less than 1 per centum or fifty votes, whichever is less, or in the case of an election at large, is less than 1 per centum or five hundred votes, whichever is less."

(23) Subsection (b) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended by striking out "or delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "delegate or alternate,".

(24) Subsection (d) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended by striking out "or delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "delegate or alternate,".

(25) Subsection (e) of section 13 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1113), is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) Every independent committee or party committee which receives or expends funds on behalf of any candidate or group of candidates in an election for any office referred to in the first section of this Act, or in a primary election held under section 5(b) of this Act, shall have a chairman and a treasurer and shall maintain an address in the District of Columbia where notices may be sent. Each such committee shall register with the Board of Elections as soon as its receipts or expenditures, or the sum of its receipts and expenditures total $100, or within ten days after its organization, whichever first occurs.

"(2) In any election held in the District of Columbia with respect to any office referred to in the first section of this Act, or with respect to a primary election held under section 5(b) of this Act, each candidate for election, and the treasurer of each independent or party committee, shall file with the Board of Elections on the tenth calendar day before, and also within thirty days after, the date on which such primary or general election was held, an itemized statement, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing, setting forth—

"(A) The name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution;

"(B) The total sum of the contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under subparagraph (A);

"(C) The total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

"(D) The name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such committee, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

"(E) The total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year and not stated under subparagraph (D);

"(F) The total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year.

"(3) The statements required to be filed by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

"(4) Every person (other than a political committee) who makes an expenditure in one or more items, other than by contribution to a political committee, aggregating $50 or more within a calendar year for the purpose of influencing any general or primary election held under this Act, shall file with the Board an itemized detailed statement of such expenditure in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(5) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

"(1) All contributions made to or for such committee;

"(2) The name and address of every person making any such contribution, and the date thereof;

"(3) All expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

"(4) The name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

"(6) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $10 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

"(7) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received.

"(8) Any candidate, treasurer of any independent committee, or party committee, or other person who willfully violates this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 30 days or both.".

SEC. 2. Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101(c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Each member of the Board of Education elected from a ward shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the school election ward from which he seeks election, (B) have, for the ninety-day period immediately preceding his nomination, resided in the school election ward from which he is nominated, and (C) have, during the ninety-day period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(2) Each member of the Board of Education elected at large shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the District of Columbia, and (B) have, during the ninety-day period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(3) No individual may hold the office of member of the Board of Education and (A) hold another elective office than delegate or alternate delegate to a convention of a political party nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, or (B) also be an officer or employee of the District of Columbia government or the Board of Education. A member will forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.".

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act and the amendments made thereby shall take effect as of January 1, 1972.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 11992) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2878, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2878) to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STUCKEY, MIKVA, NELSEN, and BROYHILL of Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the District of Columbia bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10367, SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN LAND CLAIMS OF ALASKAN NATIVES

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 10367, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I do this for two purposes: First, to direct a question to my colleague from Colorado. If the report is filed by midnight tonight is it the intention of the gentleman from Colorado to call up the conference report tomorrow?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield. It will be my intention to call it up tomorrow as soon as the Speaker will recognize me for that purpose.

Mr. SAYLOR. The second question I have is this: Since the conference report is almost in its final form, are the amendments that have been adopted germane?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if my friend will yield further, in my opinion each amendment that has been adopted is germane to the bill, although everything below the enacting clause was stricken and the new language of the Senate was in some controversy, it is germane to the provisions of the original House bill.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I shall be happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the nature of this legislation?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield further to me, this is to provide for the settlement of land claims of the Alaskan Natives and for other purposes. This is the Alaskan Natives' claims bill which passed this House by a sizable vote.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-746)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10367) "to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Congress finds and declares that—

(a) there is an immediate need for a fair and just settlement of all claims by Natives and Native groups of Alaska, based on aboriginal land claims;

(b) the settlement should be accomplished rapidly, with certainty, in conformity with the real economic and social needs of Natives, without litigation, with maximum participation by Natives in decisions affecting their rights and property, without establishing any permanent racially defined institutions, rights, privileges, or obligations, without creating a reservation system or lengthy wardship or trusteeship, and without adding to the categories of property and institutions enjoying special tax privileges or to the legislation establishing special relationships between the United States Government and the State of Alaska;

(c) no provision of this Act shall replace or diminish any right, privilege, or obligation of Natives as citizens of the United States or of Alaska, or relieve, replace, or diminish any obligation of the United States or of the State of Alaska to protect and promote the rights or welfare of Natives as citizens of the United States or of Alaska; the Secretary is authorized and directed, together with other appropriate agencies of the United States Government, to make a study of all Federal programs primarily designed to benefit Native people and to report back to the Congress with his recommendations for the future management and operation of these programs within three years of the date of enactment of this Act;

(d) no provision of this Act shall constitute a precedent for reopening, renegotiating, or legislating upon any past settlement involving land claims or other matters with any Native organizations, or any tribe, band, or identifiable group of American Indians;

(e) no provision of this Act shall effect a change or changes in the petroleum reserve policy reflected in sections 7421 through 7438 of title 10 of the United States Code except as specifically provided in this Act;

(f) no provision of this Act shall be construed to constitute a jurisdictional act, to confer jurisdiction to sue, nor to grant implied consent to Natives to sue the United States or any of its officers with respect to the claims extinguished by the operation of this Act; and

(g) no provision of this Act shall be construed to terminate or otherwise curtail the activities of the Economic Development Administration or other Federal agencies conducting loan or loan and grant programs in Alaska. For this purpose only, the terms "Indian reservation" and "trust or restricted Indian-owned land areas" in Public Law 89-136, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, shall be interpreted to include lands granted to Natives under this Act as long as such lands remain in the ownership of the Native villages or the Regional Corporations.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(b) "Native" means a citizen of the United States who is a person of one-fourth degree or more Alaska Indian (including Tsimshian Indians not enrolled in the Metlaktla Indian Community) Eskimo, or Aleut blood, or combination thereof. The term includes any Native as so defined either or both of whose adoptive parents are not Natives. It also includes, in the absence of proof of a minimum blood quantum, any citizen of the United States who is regarded as an Alaska Native by the Native village or Native group of which he claims to be a member and whose father or mother is (or, if deceased, was) regarded as Native by any village or group. Any decision of the Secretary regarding eligibility for enrollment shall be final;

(c) "Native village" means any tribe, band, clan, group, village, community, or association in Alaska listed in sections 11 and 16 of this Act, or which meets the requirements of this Act, and which the Secretary determines was, on the 1970 census enumeration date (as shown by the census or other evidence satisfactory to the Secretary, who shall make findings of fact in each instance), composed of twenty-five or more Natives;

(d) "Native group" means any tribe, band, clan, village, community, or village association of Natives in Alaska composed of less than twenty-five Natives, who comprise a majority of the residents of the locality;

(e) "Public lands" means all Federal lands and interests therein located in Alaska except: (1) the smallest practicable tract as determined by the Secretary, enclosing land actually used in connection with the administration of any Federal installation, and (2) land selections of the State of Alaska which have been patented or tentatively approved under section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act, as amended (72 Stat. 341, 77 Stat. 223), or identified for selection by the State prior to January 17, 1969;

(f) "State" means the State of Alaska;

(g) "Regional Corporation" means an Alaska Native Regional Corporation established under the laws of the State of Alaska in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

(h) "Person" means any individual, firm, corporation, association, or partnership;

(i) "Municipal Corporation" means any general unit of municipal government under the laws of the State of Alaska;

(j) "Village Corporation" means an Alaska Native Village Corporation organized under the laws of the State of Alaska as a business for profit or nonprofit corporation to hold, invest, manage and/or distribute lands, property, funds, and other rights and assets for and on behalf of a Native village in accordance with the terms of this Act.

(k) "Fund" means the Alaska Native Fund in the Treasury of the United States established by section 6; and

(l) "Planning Commission" means the Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission established by section 17.

DECLARATION OF SETTLEMENT

SEC. 4. (a) All prior conveyances of public land and water areas in Alaska, or any interest therein, pursuant to Federal law, and all tentative approvals pursuant to section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act, shall be regarded as an extinguishment of the aboriginal title thereto, if any

(b) All aboriginal titles, if any, and claims of aboriginal title in Alaska based on use and occupancy, including submerged land underneath all water areas, both inland and offshore, and including any aboriginal hunting or fishing rights that may exist, are hereby extinguished.

(c) All claims against the United States, the State, and all other persons that are based on claims of aboriginal right, title, use, or occupancy of land or water areas in Alaska, or that are based on any statute or treaty of the United States relating to Native use and occupancy, or that are based on the laws of any other nation, including any such claims that are pending before any Federal or state court or the Indian Claims Commission, are hereby extinguished.

ENROLLMENT

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall prepare within two years from the date of enactment of this Act a roll of all Natives who were born on or before, and who are living on, the date of enactment of this Act. Any decision of the Secretary regarding eligibility for enrollment shall be final.

(b) The roll prepared by the Secretary shall show for each Native, among other things, the region and the village or other place in which he resided on the date of the 1970 census enumeration, and he shall be enrolled according to such residence. Except as provided in subsection (c), a Native eligible for enrollment who is not, when the roll is prepared, a permanent resident of one of the twelve regions established pursuant to subsection 7(a) shall be enrolled by the Secretary in one of the twelve regions, giving priority in the following order to—

(1) the region where the Native resided on the 1970 census date if he had resided there without substantial interruption for two or more years;

(2) the region where the Native previously resided for an aggregate of ten years or more;

(3) the region where the Native was born; and

(4) the region from which an ancestor of the Native came:

The Secretary may enroll a Native in a different region when necessary to avoid enrolling members of the same family in different regions or otherwise avoid hardship.

(c) A native eligible for enrollment who is eighteen years of age or older and is not a permanent resident of one of the twelve regions may on the date he files an application for enrollment, elect to be enrolled in a thirteenth region for Natives who are non-residents of Alaska, if such region is established pursuant to subsection 7(c). If such region is not established, he shall be enrolled as provided in subsection (b). His election shall apply to all dependent members of his household who are less than eighteen years of age, but shall not affect the enrollment of anyone else.

ALASKA NATIVE FUND

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the United States Treasury an Alaska Native Fund into which the following moneys shall be deposited:

(1) $462,500,000 from the general fund of the Treasury, which are authorized to be appropriated according to the following schedule:

(A) $12,500,000 during the fiscal year in which this Act becomes effective;

(B) $50,000,000 during the second fiscal year;

(C) $70,000,000 during each of the third, fourth, and fifth fiscal years;

(D) $40,000,000 during the sixth fiscal year; and

(E) $30,000,000 during each of the next five fiscal years.

(2) Four percent interest per annum, which is authorized to be appropriated, on any amount authorized to be appropriated by this paragraph that is not appropriated within six months after the fiscal year in which payable.

(3) $500,000,000 pursuant to the revenue sharing provisions of section 9.

(b) None of the funds paid or distributed pursuant to this section to any of the Regional and Village Corporations established pursuant to this Act shall be expended, donated, or otherwise used for the purpose of carrying on propaganda, or intervening in (including the publishing and distributing of statements) any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office. Any person who willfully violates the foregoing provision shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both.

(c) After completion of the roll prepared pursuant to section 5, all money in the Fund, except money reserved as provided in section 20 for the payment of attorney and other fees, shall be distributed at the end of each three months of the fiscal year among the Regional Corporations organized pursuant to section 7 on the basis of the relative numbers of Natives enrolled in each region. The share of a Regional Corporation that has not been organized shall be retained in the Fund until the Regional Corporation is organized.

REGIONAL CORPORATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) For purposes of this Act, the State of Alaska shall be divided by the Secretary within one year after the date of enactment of this Act into twelve geographic regions, with each region composed as far as practicable of Natives having a common heritage and sharing common interests. In the absence of good cause shown to the contrary, such regions shall approximate the areas covered by the operations of the following existing Native associations:

(1) Arctic Slope Native Association (Barrow, Point Hope);

(2) Bering Straits Association (Seward Peninsula, Unalakleet, Saint Lawrence Island);

(3) Northwest Alaska Native Association (Kotzebue);

(4) Association of Village Council Presidents (southwest coast, all villages in the Bethel area, including all villages on the Lower Yukon River and the Lower Kuskokwim River);

(5) Tanana Chiefs' Conference (Koyukuk, Middle and Upper Yukon Rivers, Upper Kuskokwim, Tanana River);

(6) Cook Inlet Association (Kenai, Tyonek, Eklutna, Iliamna);

(7) Bristol Bay Native Association (Dillingham, Upper Alaska Peninsula);

(8) Aleut League (Aleutian Islands, Pribilof Islands and that part of the Alaska Peninsula which is in the Aleut League);

(9) Chugach Native Association (Cordova, Tatitlek, Port Graham, English Bay, Valdez, and Seward);

(10) Tlingit-Haida Central Council (southeastern Alaska, including Metlakatla);

(11) Kodiak Area Native Association (all villages on and around Kodiak Island); and

(12) Copper River Native Association (Copper Center, Glennallen, Chitina, Mentasta).

Any dispute over the boundaries of a region or regions shall be resolved by a board of arbitrators consisting of one person selected by each of the Native associations involved, and an additional one or two persons, whichever is needed to make an odd number of arbitrators, such additional person or persons to be selected by the arbitrators selected by the Native associations involved.

(b) The Secretary may, on request made within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, by representative and responsible leaders of the Native associations listed in subsection (a), merge two or more of the twelve regions: *Provided*, That the twelve regions may not be reduced to less than seven, and there may be no fewer than seven Regional Corporations.

(c) If a majority of all eligible Natives eighteen years of age or older who are not permanent residents of Alaska elect, pursuant to subsection 5(c), to be enrolled in a thirteenth region for Natives who are non-residents of Alaska, the Secretary shall establish such a region for the benefit of the Natives who elected to be enrolled therein, and they may establish a Regional Corporation pursuant to this Act.

(d) Five incorporators within each region, named by the Native association in the region, shall incorporate under the laws of Alaska a Regional Corporation to conduct business for profit, which shall be eligible for the benefits of this Act so long as it is organized and functions in accordance with this Act. The articles of incorporation shall include provisions necessary to carry out the terms of this Act.

(e) The original articles of incorporation and bylaws shall be approved by the Secretary before they are filed, and they shall be submitted for approval within eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act. The articles of incorporation may not be amended during the Regional Corporation's first five years without the approval of the Secretary. The Secretary may withhold approval under this section if in his judgment inequities among Native individuals or groups of Native individuals would be created.

(f) The management of the Regional Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors, all of whom, with the exception of the initial board, shall be stockholders over the age of eighteen. The number, terms, and method of election of members of the board of directors shall be fixed in the articles of incorporation or bylaws of the Regional Corporation.

(g) The Regional Corporation shall be authorized to issue such number of shares of common stock, divided into such classes of shares as may be specified in the articles of incorporation to reflect the provisions of this Act, as may be needed to issue one hundred shares of stock to each Native enrolled in the region pursuant to section 5.

(h)(1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, stock issued pursuant to subsection (g) shall carry a right to vote in elections for the board of directors and on such other questions as properly may be presented to stockholders, shall permit the holder to receive dividends or

other distributions from the Regional Corporation, and shall vest in the holder all rights of a stockholder in a business corporation organized under the laws of the State of Alaska, except that for a period of twenty years after the date of enactment of this Act the stock, inchoate rights thereto, and any dividends paid or distributions made with respect thereto may not be sold, pledged, subjected to a lien or judgment execution, assigned in present or future, or otherwise alienated: *Provided,* That such limitation shall not apply to transfers of stock pursuant to a court decree of separation, divorce or child support.

(2) Upon the death of any stockholder, ownership of such stock shall be transferred in accordance with his last will and testament or under the applicable laws of intestacy, except that (A) during the twenty-year period after the date of enactment of this Act such stock shall carry voting rights only if the holder thereof through inheritance also is a Native, and (B), in the event the deceased stockholder fails to dispose of his stock by will and has no heirs under the applicable laws of intestacy, such stock shall escheat to the Regional Corporation.

(3) On January 1 of the twenty-first year after the year in which this Act is enacted, all stock previously issued shall be deemed to be canceled, and shares of stock of the appropriate class shall be issued without restrictions required by this Act to each stockholder share for share.

(i) Seventy per centum of all revenues received by each Regional Corporation from the timber resources and subsurface estate patented to it pursuant to this Act shall be divided annually by the Regional Corporation among all twelve Regional Corporations organized pursuant to this section according to the number of Natives enrolled in each region pursuant to section 5. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to the thirteenth Regional Corporation if organized pursuant to subsection (c) hereof.

(j) During the five years following the enactment of this Act, not less than 10% of all corporate funds received by each of the twelve Regional Corporations under section 6 (Alaska Native Fund), and under subsection (i) (revenues from the timber resources and subsurface estate patented to it pursuant to this Act), and all other net income, shall be distributed among the stockholders of the twelve Regional Corporations. Not less than 45% of funds from such sources during the first five year period, and 50% thereafter, shall be distributed among the Village Corporations in the region and the class of stockholders who are not residents of those villages, as provided in subsection to it. In the case of the thirteenth Regional Corporation, if organized, not less than 50% of all corporate funds received under section 6 shall be distributed to the stockholders.

(k) Funds distributed among the Village Corporations shall be divided among them according to the ratio that the number of shares of stock registered on the books of the Regional Corporation in the names of residents of each village bears to the number of shares of stock registered in the names of residents in all villages.

(l) Funds distributed to a Village Corporation may be withheld until the village has submitted a plan for the use of the money that is satisfactory to the Regional Corporation. The Regional Corporation may require a village plan to provide for joint ventures with other villages, and for joint financing of projects undertaken by the Regional Corporation that will benefit the region generally. In the event of disagreement over the provisions of the plan, the issues in disagreement shall be submitted to arbitration, as shall be provided for in the articles of incorporation of the Regional Corporation.

(m) When funds are distributed among Village Corporations in a region, an amount computed as follows shall be distributed as dividends to the class of stockholders who are not residents of those villages: The amount distributed as dividends shall bear the same ratio to the amount distributed among the Village Corporations that the number of shares of stock registered on the books of the Regional Corporation in the names of nonresidents of villages bears to the number of shares of stock registered in the names of village residents: *Provided,* That an equitable portion of the amount distributed as dividends may be withheld and combined with Village Corporation funds to finance projects that will benefit the region generally.

(n) The Regional Corporation may undertake on behalf of one or more of the Village Corporations in the region any project authorized and financed by them.

(o) The accounts of the Regional Corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licenced public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of the State or the United States. The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Regional Corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Regional Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agent, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons. Each audit report or a fair and reasonably detailed summary thereof shall be transmitted to each stockholder, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(p) In the event of any conflict between the provisions of this section and the laws of the State of Alaska, the provisions of this section shall prevail.

(q) Two or more Regional Corporations may contract with the same business management group for investment services and advice regarding the investment of corporate funds.

VILLAGE CORPORATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) The Native residents of each Native village entitled to receive lands and benefits under this Act shall organize as a business for profit or nonprofit corporation under the laws of the State before the Native village may receive patent to lands or benefits under this Act, except as otherwise provided.

(b) The initial articles of incorporation for each Village Corporation shall be subject to the approval of the Regional Corporation for the region in which the village is located. Amendments to the articles of incorporation and the annual budgets of the Village Corporations shall, for a period of five years, be subject to review and approval by the Regional Corporation. The Regional Corporation shall assist and advise Native villages in the preparation of articles of incorporation and other documents necessary to meet the requirements of this subsection.

(c) The provisions concerning stock alienation, annual audit, and transfer of stock ownership on death or by court decree provided for Regional Corporations in section 7 shall apply to Village Corporations except that audits need not be transmitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

REVENUE SHARING

SEC. 9. (a) The provisions of this section shall apply to all minerals that are subject to disposition under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended and supplemented.

(b) With respect to conditional leases and sales of minerals heretofore or hereafter made pursuant to section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act, and with respect to mineral leases of the United States that are or may be subsumed by the State under section 6 (h) of the Alaska Statehood Act, until such time as the provisions of subsection (c) become operative the State shall pay into the Alaska Native Fund from the royalties, rentals, and bonuses hereafter received by the State (1) a royalty of 2 per centum upon the gross value (as such gross value is determined for royalty purposes under such leases or sales) of such minerals produced or removed from such lands, and (2) 2 per centum of all rentals and bonuses under such leases or sales, excluding bonuses received by the State at the September 1969 sale of minerals from tentatively approved lands and excluding rentals received pursuant to such sale before the date of enactment of this Act. Such payment shall be made within sixty days from the date the revenues are received by the State.

(c) Each patent hereafter issued to the State under the Alaska Statehood Act, including a patent of lands heretofore selected and tentatively approved, shall reserve for the benefit of the Natives, and for payment into the Alaska Native Fund, (1) a royalty of 2 per centum upon the gross value (as such gross value is determined for royalty purposes under any disposition by the State) of the minerals thereafter produced or removed from such lands, and (2) 2 per centum of all revenues thereafter derived by the State from rentals and bonuses from the disposition of such minerals.

(d) All bonuses, rentals, and royalties received by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act from the disposition by it of such minerals in public lands in Alaska shall be distributed as provided in the Alaska Statehood Act except that prior to calculating the shares of the State and the United States as set forth in such Act (1) a royalty of 2 per centum upon the gross value of such minerals produced (as such gross value is determined for royalty purposes under the sale or lease), and (2) 2 per centum of all rentals and bonuses shall be deducted and paid into the Alaska Native Fund. The respective shares of the State and the United States shall be calculated on the remaining balance.

(e) The provisions of this section shall be enforceable by the United States for the benefit of the Natives, and in the event of default by the State in making the payments required, in addition to any other remedies provided by law, there shall be deducted annually by the Secretary of the Treasury from any grant-in-aid or from any other sums payable to the State under any provision of Federal law an amount equal to any such underpayment, which amount shall be deposited in the Fund.

(f) Revenues received by the United States or the State as compensation for estimated drainage of oil or gas shall, for the purposes of this section, be regarded as revenues from the disposition of oil and gas. In the event the United States or the State elects to take royalties in kind, there shall be paid into the Fund on account thereof an amount equal to the royalties that would have been paid into the Fund under the provisions of this section had the royalty been taken in cash.

(g) The payments required by this section shall continue only until $500,000,000 have been paid into the Alaska Native Fund. Thereafter the provisions of this section shall not apply, and the reservation required in patents under this section shall be of no further force and effect.

(h) When computing the final payment into the Fund the respective shares of the United States and the State with respect to payments to the Fund required by this section shall be determined pursuant to this subsection and in the following order:

(1) first, from sources identified under subsections (b) and (c) hereof; and

(2) then, from sources identified under subsection (d) hereof.

(i) The provisions of this section do not apply to mineral revenues received from the Outer Continental Shelf.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

SEC. 10 (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any civil action to contest the authority of the United States to legislate on the subject matter or the legality of this Act shall be barred unless the complaint is filed within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, and no such action shall be entertained unless it is commenced by a duly authorized official of the State. Exclusive jurisdiction over such action is hereby vested in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska. The purpose of this limitation on suits is to insure that, after the expiration of a reasonable period of time, the right, title, and interest of the United States, the Natives, and the State of Alaska will rest with certainty and finality and may be relied upon by all other persons in their relations with the State, the Natives, and the United States.

(b) In the event that the State initiates litigation or voluntarily becomes a party to litigation to contest the authority of the United States to legislate on the subject matter or the legality of this Act, all rights of land selection granted to the State by the Alaska Statehood Act shall be suspended as to any public lands which are determined by the Secretary to be potentially valuable for mineral development, timber, or other commercial purposes, and no selections shall be made, no tentative approvals shall be granted, and no patents shall be issued for such lands during the pendency of such litigation. In the event of such suspension, the State's right of land selection pursuant to section 6 of the Alaska Statehood Act shall be extended for a period of time equal to the period of time the selection right was suspended.

WITHDRAWAL OF PUBLIC LANDS

SEC. 11. (a) (1) The following public lands are withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and from selection under the Alaska Statehood Act, as amended:

(A) The lands in each township that encloses all or part of any Native village identified pursuant to subsection (b);

(B) The lands in each township that is contiguous to or corners on the township that encloses all or part of such Native village; and

(C) The lands in each township that is contiguous to or corners on a township containing lands withdrawn by paragraph (B) of this subsection.

The following lands are excepted from such withdrawal: lands in the National Park System and lands withdrawn or reserved for national defense purposes other than Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4.

(2) All lands located within the townships described in subsection (a) (1) hereof that have been selected by, or tentatively approved to, but not yet patented to, the State under the Alaska Statehood Act are withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and from the creation of third party interests by the State under the Alaska Statehood Act.

(3) (A) If the Secretary determines that the lands withdrawn by subsections (a) (1) and (2) hereof are insufficient to permit a Village or Regional Corporation to select the acreage it is entitled to select, the Secretary shall withdraw three times the deficiency from the nearest unreserved, vacant and unappropriated public lands. In making this withdrawal the Secretary shall, insofar as possible, withdraw public lands of a character similar to those on which the village is located and in order of their proximity to the center of the Native village: *Provided*, That if the Secretary, pursuant to section 17, and 22(e) determines there is a need to expand the boundaries of a National Wildlife Refuge to replace any acreage selected in the Wildlife Refuge System by the Village Corporation the withdrawal under this section shall not include lands in the Refuge.

(B) The Secretary shall make the withdrawal provided for in subsection (3) (A) hereof on the basis of the best available information within sixty days of the date of enactment of this Act, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

(b) (1) The Native villages subject to this Act are as follows:

NAME OF PLACE AND REGION

Afognak, Afognak Island.
Akhiok, Kodiak.
Akiachak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Akiak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Akutan, Aleutian.
Alakanuk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Alatna, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Aleknagik, Bristol Bay.
Allakaket, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Ambler, Bering Strait.
Anakturuk Pass, Arctic Slope.
Andreafsey, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Aniak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Anvik, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Arctic Village, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Atka, Aleutian.
Atkasook, Arctic Slope.
Atmautluak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Barrow, Arctic Slope.
Bearer, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Belkofsky, Aleutian.
Bethel, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Bill Moore's, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Biorka, Aleutian.
Birch Creek, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Brevig Mission, Bering Strait.
Buckland, Bering Strait.
Candle, Bering Strait.
Cantwell, Tanana.
Canyon Village, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Chalkytsik, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Chanilut, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Cherfornak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Cherak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Chignik, Kodiak.
Chignik Lagoon, Kodiak.
Chignik Lake, Kodiak.
Chistochina, Copper River.
Chitina, Copper River.
Chukwuktoligamute, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Circle, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Clark's Point, Bristol Bay.
Copper Center, Copper River.
Crooked Creek, Upper Kuskokwim.
Deering, Bering Strait.
Dillingham, Bristol Bay.
Dot Lake, Tanana.
Eagle, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Eek, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Egegik, Bristol Bay.
Eklutna, Cook Inlet.
Ekuk, Bristol Bay.
Ekwok, Bristol Bay.
Elim, Bering Strait.
Emmonak, Southwest Costal Lowland.
English Bay, Cook Inlet.
False Pass, Aleutian.
Fort Yukon, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Gakona, Copper River.
Galena, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Gambell, Bering Sea.
Georgetown, Upper Kuskokwim.
Golorin, Bering Strait.
Goodnews Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Grayling, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Gulkana, Copper River.
Hamilton, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Holy Cross, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Hooper Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowlands.
Hughes, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Huslia, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Igiugig, Bristol Bay.
Illiamna, Cook Inlet.
Inalik, Bering Strait.
Ivanof Bay, Aleutian.
Kaguyak, Kodiak.
Kaktorik, Arctic Slope.
Kalskag, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kaltag, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Karluk, Kodiak.
Kasigluk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kiana, Bering Strait.
King Cove, Aleutian.
Kipnuk, Southeast Coastal Lowland.
Kiralina, Bering Strait.
Kobuk, Bering Strait.
Kokhanok, Bristol Bay.
Koliganek, Bristol Bay.
Kongiganak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kotlik, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kotzebue, Bering Strait.
Koyuk, Bering Strait.
Koyukuk, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Kwethluk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kwigillingok, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Larsen Bay, Kodiak.
Levelock, Bristol Bay.
Lime Village, Upper Kuskokwim.
Lower Kalskag, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
McGrath, Upper Kuskokwim.
Makok, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Manley Hot Springs, Tanana.
Monokotak, Bristol Bay.
Marshall, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Mary's Igloo, Bering Strait.
Medfra, Upper Kuskokwim.
Mekoryuk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Mentasta Lake, Copper River.
Minchumina Lake, Upper Kuskokwim.
Minto, Tanana.
Mountain Village, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nabesna Village, Tanana.
Naknek, Bristol Bay.
Napaimute, Upper Kuskokwim.
Napakiak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nightmute, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nelson Lagoon, Aleutian.
Nenana, Tanana.
Newhalen, Cook Inlet.
New Stuyahok, Bristol Bay.
Newtok, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nightmate, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nikolai, Upper Kuskokwim.
Nikolski, Aleutian.
Ninilchik, Cook Inlet.
Noatak, Bering Strait.
Nome, Bering Strait.
Nondalton, Cook Inlet.
Nooiksut, Arctic Slope.
Noorvik, Bering Strait.
Northeast Cape, Bering Sea.
Northway, Tanana.
Nulato, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Nunapitchuk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Ohogamiut, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Old Harbor, Kodiak.
Oscarville, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Ouzinkie, Kodiak.
Paradise, Noyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Pauloff Harbor, Aleutian.
Pedro Bay, Cook Inlet.
Perryville, Kodiak.
Pilot Point, Bristol Bay.
Pilot Station, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Pitkas Point, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Platinum, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Point Hope, Arctic Slope.
Point Lay, Arctic Slope.
Portage Creek (Ohgsenakale), Bristol Bay.
Port Graham, Cook Inlet.
Port Heiden (Meshick), Aleutian.
Port Lions, Kodiak.
Quinhagak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Rampart, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Red Devil, Upper Kuskokwim.
Ruby, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.

Russian Mission or Chauthalue (Kuskokwim), Upper Kuskokwim.
Russian Mission (Yukon), Southwest Coastal Lowland.
St. George, Aleutian.
St. Mary's, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
St. Michael, Bering Strait.
St. Paul, Aleutian.
Salamatof, Cook Inlet.
Sand Point, Aleutian.
Savonoski, Bristol Bay.
Savoonga, Bering Sea.
Scammon Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Selawik, Bering Strait.
Seldovia, Cook Inlet.
Shageluk, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Shaktoolik, Bering Strait.
Sheldon's Point, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Shishmaref, Bering Strait.
Shungnak, Bering Strait.
Siana, Copper River.
Sleetmute, Upper Kuskokwim.
South Naknek, Bristol Bay.
Squaw Harbor, Aleutian.
Stebbins, Bering Strait.
Stevens Village, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Stony River, Upper Kuskokwim.
Takotna, Upper Kuskokwim.
Tanacross, Tanana.
Tanana, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Tatilek, Chugach.
Tazlina, Copper River.
Telida, Upper Kuskokwim.
Teller, Bering Strait.
Tetlin, Tanana.
Togiak, Bristol Bay.
Toksook Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Tulusak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Tuntutuliak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Tununak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Twin Hills, Bristol Bay.
Tyonek, Cook Inlet.
Ugashik, Bristol Bay.
Unalakleet, Bering Strait.
Unalaska, Aleutian.
Unga, Aleutian.
Uyak, Kodiak.
Venetie, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Wainwright, Arctic Slope.
Wales, Bering Strait.
White Mountain, Bering Strait.

(2) Within two and one-half years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review all of the villages listed in subsection (b)(1) hereof, and a village shall not be eligible for land benefits under subsections 14 (a) and (b), and any withdrawal for such village shall expire, if the Secretary determines that—

(A) less than twenty-five Natives were residents of the village on the 1970 census enumeration date as shown by the census or other evidence satisfactory to the Secretary, who shall make findings of fact in each instance; or,

(B) the village is of a modern and urban character, and the majority of the residents are non-Native.

Any Native group made ineligible by this subsection shall be considered under subsection 14(h).

(3) Native villages not listed in subsection (b)(1) hereof shall be eligible for land and benefits under this Act and lands shall be withdrawn pursuant to this section if the Secretary within two and one-half years from the date of enactment of this Act, determines that—

(A) twenty-five or more Natives were residents of an established village on the 1970 census enumeration date as shown by the census or other evidence satisfactory to the Secretary, who shall make findings of fact in each instance; and

(B) the village is not of a modern and urban character, and a majority of the residents are Natives.

NATIVE LAND SELECTIONS

Sec. 12(a)(1). During a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Village Corporation for each Native village identified pursuant to section 11 shall select, in accordance with rules established by the Secretary, all of the township or townships in which any part of the village is located, plus an area that will make the total selection equal to the acreage to which the village is entitled under section 14. The selection shall be made from lands withdrawn by subsection 11(a): *Provided*, That no Village Corporation may select more than 69,120 acres from lands withdrawn by subsection 11(a)(2), and not more than 69,120 acres from the National Wildlife Refuge System, and not more than 69,120 acres in a National Forest: *Provided further*, That when a Village Corporation selects the surface estate to lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System or Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, the Regional Corporation for that region may select the subsurface estate in an equal acreage from other lands withdrawn by subsection 11(a) within the region, if possible.

(2) Selections made under this subsection (a) shall be contiguous and in reasonably compact tracts, except as separated by bodies of water or by lands which are unavailable for selection, and shall be in whole sections, wherever feasible, in units of not less than 1,280 acres.

(b) The difference between twenty-two million acres and the total acreage selected by Village Corporations pursuant to subsection (a) shall be allocated by the Secretary among the eleven Regional Corporations (which excludes the Regional Corporation for southeastern Alaska) on the basis of the number of Natives enrolled in each region. Each Regional Corporation shall reallocate such acreage among the Native villages within the region on an equitable basis after considering historic use, subsistence needs, and population. The action of the Secretary or the Corporation shall not be subject to judicial review. Each Village Corporation shall select the acreage allocated to it from the lands withdrawn by subsection 11(a).

(c) The difference between thirty-eight million acres and the 22 million acres selected by Village Corporations pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be allocated among the eleven Regional Corporations (which excludes the Regional Corporation for southeastern Alaska) as follows:

(1) The number of acres each Regional Corporation is entitled to receive shall be computed (A) by determining on the basis of available data the percentage of all land in Alaska (excluding the southeastern region) that is within each of the eleven regions, (B) by applying that percentage to thirty-eight million acres reduced by the acreage in the southeastern region that is to be selected pursuant to section 16, and (C) by deducting from the figure so computed the number of acres within that region selected pursuant to subsections (a) and (b).

(2) In the event that the total number of acres selected within a region pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) exceeds the percentage of the reduced thirty-eight million acres allotted to that region pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(B), that region shall not be entitled to receive any lands under this subsection (c). For each region so affected the difference between the acreage calculated pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(B) and the average selected pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be deducted from the acreage calculated under subsection (c)(1)(C) for the remaining regions which will select lands under this subsection (c). The reductions shall be apportioned among the remaining regions so that each region's share of the total reduction bears the same proportion to the total reduction as the total land area in that region (as calculated pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(A)) bears to the total land area in all of the regions whose allotments are to be reduced pursuant to this paragraph.

(3) Before the end of the fourth year after the date of enactment of this Act, each Regional Corporation shall select the acreage allocated to it from the lands within the region withdrawn pursuant to subsection 11(a)(1), and from the lands within the region withdrawn pursuant to subsection 11(a)(3) to the extent lands withdrawn pursuant to subsection 11(a)(1) are not sufficient to satisfy its allocation: *Provided*, That within the lands withdrawn by subsection 11(a)(1) the Regional Corporation may select only even numbered townships in even numbered ranges, and only odd numbered townships in odd numbered ranges.

(d) To insure that the Village Corporation for the Native village at Dutch Harbor, if found eligible for land grants under this Act, has a full opportunity to select lands within and near the village, no federally owned lands, whether improved or not, shall be disposed of pursuant to the Federal surplus property disposal laws for a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act. The Village Corporation may select such lands and improvements and receive patent to them pursuant to subsection 14(a) of this Act.

(c) Any dispute over the land selection rights and the boundaries of Village Corporations shall be resolved by a board of arbitrators consisting of one person selected by each of the Village Corporations involved, and an additional one or two persons, whichever is needed to make an odd number of arbitrators, such additional person or persons to be selected by the arbitrators selected by the Village Corporations.

SURVEYS

Sec. 13(a). The Secretary shall survey the areas selected or designated for conveyance to Village Corporations pursuant to the provisions of this Act. He shall monument only exterior boundaries of the selected or designated areas at angle points and at intervals of approximately two miles on straight lines. No ground survey or monumentation will be required along meanderable water boundaries. He shall survey within the areas selected or designated land occupied as a primary place of residence, as a primary place of business, and for other purposes, and any other land to be patented under this Act.

(b) All withdrawals, selections, and conveyances pursuant to this Act shall be as shown on current plats of survey or protraction diagrams of the Bureau of Land Management, or protraction diagrams of the Bureau of the State where protraction diagrams of the Bureau of Land Management are not available, and shall conform as nearly as practicable to the United States Land Survey System.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS

Sec. 14. (a) Immediately after selection by a Village Corporation for a Native village listed in section 11 which the Secretary finds is qualified for land benefits under this Act, the Secretary shall issue to the Village Corporation a patent to the surface estate in the number of acres shown in the following table:

If the village had on the 1970 census enumeration date a Native population between—

It shall be entitled to a patent to an area of public lands equal to—

	Acres
25 and 99	69,120
100 and 199	92,160
200 and 399	115,200
400 and 599	138,240
600 or more	161,280

The lands patented shall be those selected by the Village Corporation pursuant to subsection 12(a). In addition, the Secretary shall issue to the Village Corporation a patent to the surface estate in the lands selected pursuant to subsection 12(b).

(b) Immediately after selection by any Village Corporation for a Native village listed in section 16 which the Secretary finds is qualified for land benefits under this Act, the Secretary shall issue to the Village Corporation a patent to the surface estate to 23,040 acres. The lands patented shall be the lands within the township or townships that enclose the Native village, and any additional lands selected by the Village Corporation from the surrounding townships withdrawn for the Native village by subsection 16(a).

(c) Each patent issued pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be subject to the requirements of this subsection. Upon receipt of a patent or patents:

(1) the Village Corporation shall first convey to any Native or non-Native occupant, without consideration, title to the surface estate in the tract occupied as a primary place of residence, or as a primary place of business, or as a subsistence campsite, or as headquarters for reindeer husbandry;

(2) the Village Corporation shall then convey to the occupant, either without consideration or upon payment of an amount not in excess of fair market value, determined as of the date of initial occupancy and without regard to any improvements thereon, title to the surface estate in any tract occupied by a nonprofit organization:

(3) the Village Corporation shall then convey to any Municipal Corporation in the Native village or to the State in trust for any Municipal Corporation established in the Native village in the future, title to the remaining surface estate of the improved land on which the Native village is located and as much additional land as is necessary for community expansion, and appropriate rights-of-way for public use, and other foreseeable community needs: *Provided*, That the amount of lands to be transferred to the Municipal Corporation or in trust shall be no less than 1,280 acres;

(4) the Village Corporation shall convey to the Federal Government, State or to the appropriate Municipal Corporation, title to the surface estate for existing airport sites, airway beacons, and other navigation aids, together with such additional acreage and/or easements as are necessary to provide related services and to insure safe approaches to airport runways; and

(5) for a period of ten years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Regional Corporation shall be afforded the opportunity to review and render advice to the Village Corporations on all land sales, leases or other transactions prior to any final commitment.

(d) The Secretary may apply the rule of approximation with respect to the acreage limitations contained in this section.

(e) Immediately after selection by a Regional Corporation, the Secretary shall convey to the Regional Corporation title to the surface and/or the subsurface estates, as is appropriate, in the lands selected.

(f) When the Secretary issues a patent to a Village Corporation for the surface estate in lands pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), he shall issue to the Regional Corporation for the region in which the lands are located a patent to the subsurface estate in such lands, except lands located in the National Wildlife Refuge System and lands withdrawn or reserved for national defense purposes, including Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, for which in lieu rights are provided for in subsection 12(a)(1): ***Provided,*** That the right to explore, develop, or remove minerals from the subsurface estate in the lands within the boundaries of any Native village shall be subject to the consent of the Village Corporation.

(g) All conveyances made pursuant to this Act shall be subject to valid existing rights. Where, prior to patent of any land or minerals under this Act, a lease, contract, permit, right-of-way, or easement (including a lease issued under section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act) has been issued for the surface or minerals covered under such patent, the patent shall contain provisions making it subject to the lease, contract, permit, right-of-way, or easement, and the right of the lessee, contractee, permittee, or grantee to the complete enjoyment of all rights, privileges, and benefits thereby granted to him. Upon issuance of the patent, the patentee shall succeed and become entitled to any and all interests of the State or the United States as lessor, contractor, permittor, or grantor, in any such leases, contracts, permits, rights-of-way, or easements covering the estate patented, and a lease issued under section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act shall be treated for all purposes as though the patent had been issued to the State. The administration of such lease, contract, permit, right-of-way, or easement shall continue to be by the State or the United States, unless the agency responsible for administration waives administration. In the event that the patent does not cover all of the land embraced within any such lease, contract, permit, right-of-way, or easement, the patentee shall only be entitled to the proportionate amount of the revenues reserved under such lease, contract, permit, right-of-way, or easement by the State or the United States which results from multiplying the total of such revenues by a fraction in which the numerator is the acreage of such lease, contract, permit, the right-of-way, or easement which is included in the patent and the denominator is the total acreage contained in such lease, contract, permit, right-of-way, or easement.

(h) The Secretary is authorized to withdraw and convey 2 million acres of unreserved and unappropriated public lands located outside the areas withdrawn by sections 11 and 16, and follows:

(1) The Secretary may withdraw and convey to the appropriate Regional Corporation fee title to existing cemetery sites and historical places;

(2) The Secretary may withdraw and convey to a Native group that does not qualify as a Native village, if it incorporates under the laws of Alaska, title to the surface estate in not more than 23,040 acres surrounding the Native group's locality. The subsurface estate in such land shall be conveyed to the appropriate Regional Corporation;

(3) The Secretary may withdraw and convey to the Natives residing in Sitka, Kenai, Juneau, and Kodiak, if they incorporate under the laws of Alaska, the surface estate of lands of a similar character in not more than 23,040 acres of land, which shall be located in reasonable proximity to the municipalities. The subsurface estate in such lands shall be conveyed to the appropriate Regional Corporation unless the lands are located in a Wildlife Refuge;

(4) The Secretary shall withdraw only such lands surrounding the villages and municipalities as are necessary to permit the conveyance authorized by paragraphs (2) and (3) to be planned and effected;

(5) The Secretary may convey to a Native, upon application within two years from the date of enactment of this Act the surface estate in not to exceed 160 acres of land occupied by the Native as a primary place of residence on August 31, 1971. Determination of occupancy shall be made by the Secretary, whose decision shall be final. The subsurface estate in such lands shall be conveyed to the appropriate Regional Corporations;

(6) The Secretary shall charge against the 2 million acres authorized to be conveyed by this section all allotments approved pursuant to section 18 during the four years following the date of enactment of this Act;

(7) The Secretary may withdraw and convey lands out of the National Wildlife Refuge System and out of the National Forests, for the purposes set forth in subsections (h), (1), (2), (3), and (5); and

(8) Any portion of the 2 million acres not conveyed by this subsection shall be allocated and conveyed to the Regional Corporations on the basis of population.

TIMBER SALE CONTRACTS

SEC. 15. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing National Forest timber sale contracts that are directly affected by conveyances authorized by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to modify any such contract, with the consent of the purchaser, by substituting, to the extent practicable, timber on other national forest lands approximately equal in volume, species, grade, and accessibility for timber standing on any land affected by such conveyances, and, on request of the appropriate Village Corporation the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make such substitution to the extent it is permitted by the timber sale contract without the consent of the purchaser.

THE TLINGIT-HAIDA SETTLEMENT

Sec. 16. (a) All public lands in each township that encloses all or any part of a Native village listed below, and in each township that is contiguous to or corners on such township, except lands withdrawn or reserved for national defense purposes, are hereby withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and from selection under the Alaska Statehood Act, as amended:

Angoon, Southeast.
Craig, Southeast.
Hoonah, Southeast.
Hydaburg, Southeast.
Kake, Southeast.
Kasaan, Southeast.
Klawock, Southeast.
Klukwan, Southeast.
Saxman, Southeast.
Yakutat, Southeast.

(b) During a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act, each Village Corporation for the villages listed in subsection (a) shall select, in accordance with rules established by the Secretary, an area equal to 23,040 acres, which must include the township or townships in which all or part of the Native village is located, plus, to the extent necessary, withdrawn lands from the townships that are contiguous to or corner on such township. All selections shall be contiguous and in reasonably compact tracts, except as separated by bodies of water, and shall conform as nearly as practicable to the United States Lands Survey System.

(c) The funds appropriated by the Act of July 9, 1968 (82 Stat. 307), to pay the judgment of the Court of Claims in the case of The Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, et al. against The United States, numbered 47,900, and distributed to the Tlingit and Haida Indians pursuant to the Act of July 13, 1970 (84 Stat. 431), are in lieu of the additional acreage to be conveyed to qualified villages listed in section 11.

JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

SEC. 17. (a)(1) There is hereby established the Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska. The Planning Commission shall be composed of ten members as follows:

(A) The Governor of the State (or his designate) and four members who shall be appointed by the Governor. During the Plan-

ning Commission's existence at least one member appointed by the Governor shall be a Native as defined by this Act.

(B) One member appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate, and four members who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The Governor of the State and the member appointed by the President pursuant to subsection (a) (1) (B), shall serve as cochairmen of the Planning Commission. The initial meeting of the Commission shall be called by the cochairmen. All decisions of the Commission shall require the concurrence of the cochairmen.

(3) Six members of the Planning Commission shall constitute a quorum. Members shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) (A) Except to the extent otherwise provided in subparagraph (B) of this subsection, members of the Planning Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission. All members of the Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(B) Any member of the Planning Commission who is designated or appointed from the Government of the United States or from the Government of the State shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment. The member of the Commission appointed by the President pursuant to subsection (a) (1) (B) shall be compensated as provided by the President at a rate not in excess of that provided for level V of the Executive Schedule in title 5, United States Code.

(5) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Planning Commission, the cochairmen, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power—

(A) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as they deem necessary, and

(B) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 a day for individuals.

(6) (A) The Planning Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, hold such hearings, take such testimony, receive such evidence, print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission, subcommittee, or member deems advisable.

(B) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by a cochairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this section.

(7) The Planning Commission shall—

(A) undertake a process of land-use planning, including the identification of and the making of recommendations concerning areas planned and best suited for permanent reservation in Federal ownership as parks, game refuges, and other public uses, areas of Federal and State lands to be made available for disposal, and uses to be made of lands remaining in Federal and State ownership;

(B) make recommendations with respect to proposed land selections by the State under the Alaska Statehood Act and by Village and Regional Corporations under this Act;

(C) be available to advise upon and assist in the development and review of land-use plans for lands selected by the Native Village and Regional Corporations under this Act and by the State under the Alaska Statehood Act;

(D) review existing withdrawals of Federal public lands and recommend to the President of the United States such additions to or modifications of withdrawals as are deemed desirable;

(E) establish procedures, including public hearings. for obtaining public views on the land-use planning programs of the State and Federal Governments for lands under their administration;

(F) establish a committee of land-use advisers to the Commission. made up of representatives of commercial and industrial land users in Alaska, recreational land users, wilderness users, environmental groups, Alaska Natives, and other citizens;

(G) make recommendations to the President of the United States and the Governor of Alaska as to programs and budgets of the Federal and State agencies responsible for the administration of Federal and State lands;

(II) make recommendations from time to time to the President of the United States Congress, and the Governor and legislature of the State as to changes in laws, policies, and programs that the Planning Commission determines are necessary or desirable;

(I) make recommendations to insure that economic growth and development is orderly, planned and compatible with State and national environmental objectives, the public interest in the public lands, parks, forests, and wildlife refuges in Alaska, and the economic and social well-being of the Native people and other residents of Alaska;

(J) make recommendations to improve coordination and consultation between the State and Federal Governments in making resource allocation and land use decisions; and

(K) make recommendations on ways to avoid conflict between the State and the Native people in the selection of public lands.

(8) (A) On or before January 31 of each year, the Planning Commission shall submit to the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Governor and legislature of the State a written report with respect to its activities during the preceding calendar year.

(B) The Planning Commission shall keep and maintain accurate and complete records of its activities and transactions in carrying out its duties under this Act, and such records shall be available for public inspection.

(C) The principal office of the Planning Commission shall be located in the State.

(9) (A) The United States shall be responsible for paying for any fiscal year only 50 per centum of the costs of carrying out subsections (a) and (b) for such fiscal year.

(B) For the purpose of meeting the responsibility of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each succeeding fiscal year.

(10) On or before May 20, 1976, the Planning Commission shall submit its final report to the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Governor and Legislature of the State with respect to its planning and other activities under this Act, together with its recommendations for programs or other actions which it determines should be taken or carried out by the United States and the State. The Commission shall cease to exist effective December 31, 1976.

(b) (1) The Planning Commission shall identify public easements across lands selected by Village Corporations and the Regional Corporations and at periodic points along the courses of major waterways which are reasonably necessary to guarantee international treaty obligations, a full right of public use and access for recreation, hunting, transportation, utilities, docks, and such other public uses as the Planning Commission determines to be important.

(2) In identifying public easements the Planning Commission shall consult with appropriate State and Federal agencies, shall review proposed transportation plans, and shall receive and review statements and recommendations from interested organizations and individuals on the need for and proposed location of public easements: *Provided*, That any valid existing right recognized by this Act shall continue to have whatever right of access as is now provided for under existing law and this subsection shall not operate in any way to diminish or limit such right of access.

(3) Prior to granting any patent under this Act to the Village Corporation and Regional Corporations, the Secretary shall consult with the State and the Planning Commission and shall reserve such public easements as he determines are necessary.

(c) In the event that the Secretary withdraws a utility and transportation corridor across public lands in Alaska pursuant to his existing authority, the State, the Village Corporations and the Regional Corporations shall not be permitted to select lands from the area withdrawn.

(d) (1) Public Land Order Numbered 4582, 34 Federal Register 1025, as amended, is hereby revoked. For a period of ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act all unreserved public lands in Alaska are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining (except locations for metalliferous minerals) and the mineral leasing laws. During this period of time the Secretary shall review the public lands in Alaska and determine whether any portion of these lands should be withdrawn under authority provided for in existing law to insure that the public interest in these lands is properly protected. Any further withdrawal shall require an affirmative act by the Secretary under his existing authority, and the Secretary is authorized to classify or reclassify any lands so withdrawn and to open such lands to appropriation under the public land laws in accord with his classifications. Withdrawals pursuant to this paragraph shall not affect the authority of the Village Corporations, the Regional Corporations, and the State to make selections and obtain patents within the areas withdrawn pursuant to section 11.

(2) (A) The Secretary, acting under authority provided for in existing law, is directed to withdraw from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and from selection under the Alaska Statehood Act, and from selection by Regional Corporations pursuant to section 11, up to, but not to exceed, eighty million acres of unreserved public lands in the State of Alaska, including previously classified lands, which the Secretary deems are suitable for addition to or creation as units of the National Park, Forest Wildlife Refuge, and Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems: *Provided*, That such withdrawals shall not affect the authority of the State and the Regional and Village Corporations to make selections and obtain patents within the areas withdrawn pursuant to section 11.

(B) Lands withdrawn pursuant to paragraph (A) hereof must be withdrawn within nine months of the date of enactment of this Act. All unreserved public lands not with-

drawn under paragraph (A) or subsection 17 (d) (1) shall be available for selection by the State and for appropriation under the public land laws.

(C) Every six months, for a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall advise the Congress of the location, size and values of lands withdrawn pursuant to paragraph (A) and submit his recommendations with respect to such lands. Any lands withdrawn pursuant to paragraph (A) not recommended for addition to or creation as units of the National Park, Forest, Wildlife Refuge, and Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems at the end of the two years shall be available for selection by the State and the Regional Corporations, and for appropriation under the public land laws.

(D) Areas recommended by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (C) shall remain withdrawn from any appropriation under the public land laws until such time as the Congress acts on the Secretary's recommendations, but not to exceed five years from the recommendation dates. The withdrawal of areas not so recommended shall terminate at the end of the two year period.

(E) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, initial identification of lands desired to be selected by the State pursuant to the Alaska Statehood Act and by the Regional Corporations, pursuant to section 12 of this Act may be made within any area withdrawn pursuant to this subsection (d), but such lands shall not be tentatively approved or patented so long as the withdrawals of such areas remain in effect: *Provided*, That selection of lands by Village Corporations pursuant to section 12 of this Act shall not be affected by such withdrawals and such lands selected may be patented and such rights granted as authorized by this Act. In the event Congress enacts legislation setting aside any areas withdrawn under the provisions of this subsection which the Regional Corporations or the State desired to select, then other unreserved public lands shall be made available for alternative selection by the Regional Corporations and the State. Any time periods established by law for Regional Corporations or State selections are hereby extended to the extent that delays are caused by compliance with the provisions of this subsection (2).

(3) Any lands withdrawn under this section shall be subject to administration by the Secretary under applicable laws and regulations, and his authority to make contracts and to grant leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements shall not be impaired by the withdrawal.

REVOCATION OF INDIAN ALLOTMENT AUTHORITY IN ALASKA

SEC. 18. (a) No Native covered by the provisions of this Act, and no descendant of his, may hereafter avail himself of an allotment under the provisions of the Act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. 389), as amended and supplemented, or the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 363). Further, the Act of May 17, 1906 (34 Stat. 197), as amended, is hereby repealed. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any application for an allotment that is pending before the Department of the Interior on the date of enactment of this Act may, at the option of the Native applicant, be approved and a patent issued in accordance with said 1887, 1910, or 1906 Act, as the case may be, in which event the Native shall not be eligible for a patent under subsection 14(h)(5) of this Act.

(b) Any allotments approved pursuant to this section during the four years following enactment of this Act shall be charged against the two million acre grant provided for in subsection 14(h).

REVOCATION OF RESERVATIONS

SEC. 19. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except where inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, the various reserves set aside by legislation or by Executive or Secretarial Order for Native allowed shall not be controlled by any hourly charge customarily charged by the claimant.

(3) The amount allowed for out-of-pocket expenses shall not include office overhead, and shall be limited to expenses that were necessary, reasonable, unreimbursed and actually incurred.

(4) The amounts allowed for services rendered shall not exceed in the aggregate $2,000,000, of which not more than $100,000 shall be available for the payment of consultants' fees. If the approved claims exceed the aggregate amounts allowable, the Chief Commissioner shall authorize payment of the claims on a pro rata basis.

(5) Upon the filing of a claim, the clerk of the Court of Claims shall forward a copy of such claims to the individuals or entities on whose behalf services were rendered or fees and expenses were allegedly incurred, as shown by the pleadings, to the Attorney General of the United States, to the Attorney General of the State of Alaska, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to any other person who appears to have an interest in the claim, and shall give such persons ninety days within which to file an answer contesting the claim.

(6) The Chief Commissioner may designate a trial commissioner for any claim made under this section and a panel of three commissioners of the court to serve as a reviewing body. One member of the review panel shall be designated as presiding commissioner of the panel.

(7) Proceedings in all claims shall be pursuant to rules and orders prescribed for the purpose by the Chief Commissioner who is hereby authorized and directed to require the application of the pertinent rules of practice of the Court of Claims insofar as feasible. Claimants may appear before a trial commissioner in person or by attorney, and may produce evidence and examine witnesses. In the discretion of the Chief Commissioner or his designate, hearings may be held in the localities where the claimants reside if convenience so demands.

(8) Each trial commissioner and each review panel shall have authority to do and perform any acts which may be necessary or proper for the efficient performance of their duties, and shall have the power of subpena, the power to order audit of books and records, and the power to administer oaths and affirmations. Any sanction authorized by the rules of practice of the Court of Claims, except contempt, may be imposed on any claimant, witness, or attorney by the trial commissioner, review panel, or Chief Commissioner. None of the rules, regulations, rulings, findings, or conclusions authorized by this section shall be subject to judicial review.

(9) The findings and conclusions of the trial commissioner shall be submitted by him, together with the record in the case, to the review panel of commissioners for review by it pursuant to such rules as may be provided for the purpose, which shall include provision for submitting the decision of the trial commissioner to the claimant and any party contesting the claim for consideration, exception, and argument before the panel. The panel, by majority vote, shall adopt or modify the findings or the conclusions of the trial commissioner.

(10) The Court of Claims is hereby authorized and directed, under such conditions as it may prescribe, to provide the facilities and services of the office of the clerk of the court for the filing, processing, hearing, and dispatch of claims made pursuant to this section and to include within its annual appropriations the costs thereof and other costs of administration, including (but without limitations to the items herein listed) the salaries and traveling expenses of its auditors and the commissioners serving as trial commissioners and panel members, mailing and service of process, necessary physical facilities, equipment, and supplies, and personnel (including secretaries, reporters, auditors, and law clerks).

(e) The Chief Commissioner shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, and report to the Congress, the amount of each claim allowed and the name and address of the claimant. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to such person from the Alaska Native Fund the amounts certified. No award under this section shall bear interest.

(f) (1) No remuneration on account of any services or expenses for which a claim is made or could be made pursuant to this section shall be received by any person for such services and expenses in addition to the amount paid in accordance with this section, and any contract or agreement to the contrary shall be void.

(2) Any person who receives, and any corporation or association official who pays, on account of such services and expenses, any remuneration in addition to the amount allowed in accordance with this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both.

(g) A claim for actual costs incurred in filing protests, preserving land claims, advancing land claims settlement legislation, and presenting testimony to the Congress on proposed Native land claims may be submitted to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims by any bona fide association of Natives. The claim must be submitted within six months from the date of enactment of this Act, and shall be in such form and contain such information as the Chief Commissioner shall prescribe. The Chief Commissioner shall allow such amounts as he determines are reasonable, but he shall allow no amount for attorney and consultant fees and expenses which shall be compensable solely under subsection (b) through (e). If approved claims under this subsection aggregate more than $600,000, each claim shall be reduced on a pro rata basis. The Chief Commissioner shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, and report to the Congress, the amount of each claim allowed and the name and address of the claimant. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to such claimant from the Alaska Native Fund the amount certified. No award under this subsection shall bear interest.

TAXATION

SEC. 21. (a) Revenues originating from the Alaska Native Fund shall not be subject to any form of Federal, State, or local taxation at the time of receipt by a Regional Corporation, Village Corporation, or individual Native through dividend distributions or in any other manner. This exemption shall not apply to income from the investment of such revenues.

(b) The receipt of shares of stock in the Regional or Village Corporations by or on behalf of any Native shall not be subject to any form of Federal, State or local taxation.

(c) The receipt of land or any interest therein pursuant to this Act or of cash in order to equalize the values of properties exchanged pursuant to subsection 22(f) shall not be subject to any form of Federal, State or local taxation. The basis for computing gain or loss on subsequent sale or other disposition of such land or interest in land for purposes of any Federal, State or local tax imposed on or measured by income shall be the fair value of such land or interest in land at the time of receipt.

(d) Real property interests conveyed, pursuant to this Act, to a Native individual, Native group, or Village or Regional Corporation which are not developed or leased to third parties, shall be exempt from State and local real property taxes for a period of twenty years after the date of enactment of

this Act: *Provided*, That municipal taxes, local real property taxes, or local assessments may be imposed upon leased or developed real property within the jurisdiction of any governmental unit under the laws of the State: *Provided further*, That easements, rights-of-way, leaseholds, and similar interests in such real property may be taxed in accordance with State or local law. All rents, royalties, profits, and other revenues or proceeds derived from such property interests shall be taxable to the same extent as such revenues or proceeds are taxable when received by a non-Native individual or corporation.

(e) Real property interests conveyed pursuant to this Act to a Native individual, Native group, or Village or Regional Corporation shall, so long as the fee therein remains not subject to State or local taxes on real estate, continue to be regarded as public lands for the purpose of computing the Federal share of any highway project pursuant to title 23 of the United States Code, as amended and supplemented, for the purpose of the Johnson-O'Malley Act of April 16, 1934, as amended (25 U.S.C. 45a), and for the purpose of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 967, 1100), and so long as there are also no substantial revenues from such lands, continue to receive forest fire protection services from the United States at no cost.

MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 22. (a) None of the revenues granted by section 6, and none of the lands granted by this Act to the Regional and Village Corporation and to Native groups and individuals shall be subject to any contract which is based on a percentage fee of the value of all or some portion of the settlement granted by this Act. Any such contract shall not be enforceable against any Native as defined by this Act or any Regional or Village Corporation and the revenues and lands granted by this Act shall not be subject to lien, execution or judgment to fulfill such a contract.

(b) The Secretary is directed to promptly issue patents to all persons who have made a lawful entry on the public lands in compliance with the public land laws for the purpose of gaining title to homesteads, headquarters sites, trade and manufacturing sites, or small tract sites (43 U.S.C. 682), and who have fulfilled all requirements of the law prerequisite to obtaining a patent. Any person who has made a lawful entry prior to August 31, 1971, for any of the foregoing purposes shall be protected in his right of use and occupancy until all the requirements of law for a patent have been met even though the lands involved have been reserved or withdrawn in accordance with Public Land Order 4582, as amended, or the withdrawal provisions of this Act. *Provided*, That occupancy must have been maintained in accordance with the appropriate public land laws: *Provided further*, That any person who entered on public lands in violation of Public Land Order 4582, as amended, shall gain no rights.

(c) On any lands conveyed to Village and Regional Corporations, any person who prior to August 31, 1971, initiated a valid mining claim or location under the general mining laws and recorded notice of said location with the appropriate State or local office shall be protected in his possessory rights, if all requirements of the general mining laws are complied with, for a period of five years and may, if all requirements of the general mining laws are complied with, proceed to patent.

(d) The provisions of Revised Statute 452 (43 U.S.C. 11) shall not apply to any land grants or other rights granted under this Act.

(e) If land within the National Wildlife Refuge System is selected by a Village Corporation pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the secretary shall add to the Refuge System other public lands in the State to replace the lands selected by the Village Corporation.

(f) The Secretary, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized to exchange any lands or interests therein in Alaska under their jurisdiction for lands or interests therein of the Village Corporations, Regional Corporations, individuals, or the State for the purpose of effecting land consolidations or to facilitate the management or development of the land. Exchanges shall be on the basis of equal value, and either party to the exchange may pay or accept cash in order to equalize the value of the properties exchanged.

(g) If a patent is issued to any Village Corporation for land in the National Wildlife Refuge System, the patent shall reserve to the United States the right of first refusal if the land is ever sold by the Village Corporation. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, every patent issued by the Secretary pursuant to this Act—which covers lands lying within the boundaries of a National Wildlife Refuge on the date of enactment of this Act shall contain a provision that such lands remain subject to the laws and regulations governing use and development of such Refuge.

(h)(1) All withdrawals made under this Act, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, shall terminate within four years of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That any lands selected by Village or Regional Corporations or by a Native group under section 12 shall remain withdrawn until conveyed pursuant to section 14.

(2) The withdrawal of lands made by subsection 11(a)(2) and section 16 shall terminate three years from the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any withdrawals made under section 17 of this Act.

(4) The Secretary is authorized to terminate any withdrawal made by or pursuant to this Act whenever he determines that the withdrawal is no longer necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

(i) Prior to a conveyance pursuant to section 14, lands withdrawn by or pursuant to sections 11, 14, and 16 shall be subject to administration by the Secretary, or by the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of National Forest lands, under applicable laws and regulations, and their authority to make contracts and to grant leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements shall not be impaired by the withdrawal.

(j) In any area of Alaska for which protraction diagrams of the Bureau of Land Management or the State do not exist, or which does not conform to the United States Land Survey System, or which has not been surveyed in a manner adequate to withdraw and grant the lands provided for under this Act, the Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, and the deeds granted shall note that upon completion of an adequate survey appropriate adjustments will be made to insure that the beneficiaries of the land grants receive their full entitlement.

(k) Any patents to lands under this Act which are located within the boundaries of a national forest shall contain such conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to assure that:

(1) the sale of any timber from such lands shall, for a period of five years, be subject to the same restrictions relating to the export of timber from the United States as are applicable to national forest lands in Alaska under rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(2) such lands are managed under the principle of sustained yield and under management practices for protection and enhancement of environmental quality no less stringent than such management practices on adjacent national forest lands for a period of twelve years.

(l) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, no Village or Regional Corporation shall select lands which are within two miles from the boundary, as it exists on the date of enactment of this Act, of any home rule or first class city (excluding borough) or which are within six miles from the boundary of Ketchikan.

REVIEW BY CONGRESS

Sec. 23. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress annual reports on implementation of this Act. Such reports shall be filed by the Secretary annually until 1984. At the beginning of the first session of Congress in 1985 the Secretary shall submit, through the President, a report of the status of the Natives and Native groups in Alaska, and a summary of actions taken under this Act, together with such recommendations as may be appropriate.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 24. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

PUBLICATION

Sec. 25. The Secretary is authorized to issue and publish in the Federal Register, pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SAVING CLAUSE

Sec. 26. To the extent that there is a conflict between any provision of this Act and any other Federal laws applicable to Alaska, the provisions of this Act shall govern.

SEPARABILITY

Sec. 27. If any provision of this Act or the applicability thereof is held invalid the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

And the Senate agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
MORRIS UDALL,
LLOYD MEEDS,
NICK BEGICH,
JOHN KYL,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
LEE METCALF,
MIKE GRAVEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,
TED STEVENS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The Managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the Bill (H.R. 10367) "to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives, and for other purposes," submit this joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

I. GENERAL

A. Introduction

The language agreed upon by the managers is the result of long and careful consideration of the House passed bill and the Senate's amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House passed bill. The House bill and the Senate amendment were in major respects substantially different and the conference report—the compromise between the

two measures—is in some respects different from the measures passed by the House and the Senate. The conference report is the final product of nine days of meetings by the conference committee since November 30, 1971.

The conference committee concurs on the relevant history and on the main facts at issue; there is general agreement on the principles of law involved and on the limits within which the formulation of public policies must be conducted; there is general consensus on the structural elements which constitute the settlement; and there is a common recognition that the institutions and machinery of settlement are in large measure dictated by the nature of the problem and the elements of the settlement.

Among individual conferees, and among individual members of the House and the Senate, there are, of course, wide differences of opinions on specific issues: on amounts of money and land; on elements of the settlement; on some of the institutions established; and on emphasis and on detail. The specific resolutions proposed to each of these differences by the conference committee represents a compromise. These compromises were, however, recognized as being essential to the development of a conference report which will do justice to the Native people, insure a viable and economically healthy State government, and allow the fulfillment of the reasonable expectations and legitimate interests of all Alaskans and all Americans.

The conference report reflects a willingness on the part of the individual conferees after careful study of the issues involved to concur in the clear necessity for adoption of a *settlement package,* while reserving the right of all Members of Congress to debate further at another time and in connection with other legislation, their individual views on some of the specific policies which are of necessity incorporated in this complex omnibus settlement.

B. Major provisions

The major provisions of the conference report are set out below:

1. Land.

(a) The Natives will receive title to a total of 40,000,000 acres, both surface and subsurface rights, divided among the some 220 villages and 12 Regional Corporations.

(b) The villages will receive the surface estate only in approximately 18½ million acres of land in the 25 township areas surrounding each village, divided among the villages according to population.

(c) The villages will receive the surface estate in an additional 3½ million acres, making a total of 22 million acres, divided among the villages by the Regional Corporations on equitable principles.

(d) The Regional Corporations will receive the subsurface estate in the 22 million acres patented to the villages, and the full title to 16 million acres selected within the 25 township areas surrounding the villages. This land will be divided among the 12 Regional Corporations on the basis of the total area in each region, rather than on the basis of population.

(e) An additional 2 million acres, which completes the total of 40 million, will be conveyed as follows:

(1) Existing cemetery sites and historical sites will be conveyed to the Regional Corporations.

(2) The surface estate in not more than 23,040 acres, which is one township, will be conveyed to each of the Native groups that is too small to qualify as a Native village. The subsurface estate will go to the Regional Corporations.

(3) The surface estate in not more than 160 acres will be conveyed to each individual Native who has a principal place of residence outside the village areas. The subsurface estate will go to the Regional Corporations.

(4) The surface estate in not to exceed 23,040 acres will be conveyed to Natives in four towns that originally were Native villages, but that are now composed predominantly of non-Natives. These conveyances will be near the towns, but far enough away to allow for growth and expansion of the towns. The subsurface estate will go to the Regional Corporations.

(5) The balance of the 2 million acres, if any, will be conveyed to the Regional Corporations.

(f) If the entire 40 million acres cannot be selected from the 25 township areas surrounding the Villages because of topography or restrictions on the acreage which may be selected from within the Wildlife Refuge System, lieu selection areas will be withdrawn by the Secretary of the Interior as close to the 25 township areas as possible.

2. Money.

The Natives will be paid $462,500,000 over an eleven-year period from funds in the United States Treasury, and an additional $500,000,000 from mineral revenues received from lands in Alaska hereafter conveyed to the State under the Statehood Act, and from the remaining Federal lands, other than Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, in Alaska. Most of the $500,000,000 paid to the Natives would otherwise be paid to the State under existing law, and the State has agreed to share in the settlement of Native claims in this manner.

3. Corporate Organization.

(a) The Natives in each of the Native villages will be organized as a profit or nonprofit corporation to take title to the surface estate in the land conveyed to the village, to administer the land, and to receive and administer a part of the money settlement.

(b) Twelve Regional Corporations will be organized to take title to the subsurface estate in the land conveyed to the villages, and full title to the additional land divided among the Regional Corporations. The Regional Corporations will also receive the $962,500,000 grant, divided among them on the basis of Native population. Each Regional Corporation must divide among all twelve Regional Corporations 70 percent of the mineral revenues received by it.

Each Regional Corporation must distribute among the Village Corporations in the region not less than 50 percent of its share of the $962,500,000 grant, and 50 percent of all revenues received from the subsurface estate. This provision does not apply to revenues received by the Regional Corporations from their investment in business activities.

For the first five years, 10 percent of the revenues from the first two sources mentioned above must be distributed among the individual Native stockholders of the corporation.

(c) Natives who are not permanent residents of Alaska may, if they desire, organize a 13th Regional Corporation, rather than receive stock in one of the 12 Regional Corporations. The 13th Regional Corporation will receive its pro rata share of the $962,500,000 grant, but it will receive no land and will not share in the mineral revenues of the other Regional Corporations.

4. Other Major Provisions.

(a) *Land Use Planning.*

A Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission is established. The Planning Commission has no regulatory or enforcement functions, but has important advisory responsibilities.

(b) *National Interest Areas.*

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw from selection by the State and Regional Corporations (but not the Village Corporations) and from the operation of the public land laws up to, but not to exceed, 80 million acres of unreserved lands which, in his view, may be suitable for inclusion in the National Park, Forest, Wildlife Refuge, and Wild and Scenic River Systems.

(c) *Interim Operation of the Public Land Laws.*

The Secretary is authorized, where appropriate, under his existing authority, to withdraw public lands and to classify or reclassify such lands and to open them to entry, location and leasing in a manner which will protect the public interest and avoid a "land rush" and massive filings on public lands in Alaska immediately following the expiration of the so-called "land freeze".

(d) *Reservation of Easements.*

Appropriate public access and recreational site easements will be reserved on lands granted to Native Corporations to insure that the larger public interest is protected.

(e) *Attorney and Consultant Fees.*

Fees to attorneys and consultants are limited to $2 million. All contracts based on a percentage fee related to the value of the lands and revenues granted by this Act are declared unenforceable.

(f) *Valid Existing Rights.*

All valid existing rights, including inchoate rights of entrymen and mineral locators, are protected.

(g) *National Petroleum Reserve No. 4 and Wildlife Refuges.*

No subsurface estate is granted in Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4 or in the National Wildlife Refuges, but an in lieu selection of subsurface estate in an equal amount of acreage outside these areas is provided for the Regional Corporations.

(h) *National Forests.*

Appropriate limitations are placed on the amount of lands which may be granted from National Forests to Native villages located in the National Forests.

C. Other issues

1. In sections 7 and 8 of the conference report authorizing the creation of Regional and Village Corporations, the conference committee has adopted a policy of self-determination on the part of the Alaska Native people. The conference committee anticipates that there will be responsible action by the board members and officers of the corporations and that there will not be any abuses of the intent of this Act. The conference committee does not contemplate that the Regional and Village Corporations will allow unreasonable staff, officer, board member, consultant, attorney, or other salaries, expenses and fees. The conference committee also contemplates that the Regional and Village Corporations will not expend funds for purposes other than those reasonably necessary in the course of ordinary business operations.

2. The Senate amendment to the House bill provided for the protection of the Native peoples' interest in and use of subsistence resources on the public lands. The conference committee, after careful consideration, believes that all Native interests in subsistence resource lands can and will be protected by the Secretary through the exercise of his existing withdrawal authority. The Secretary could, for example, withdraw appropriate lands and classify them in a manner which would protect Native subsistence needs and requirements by closing appropriate lands to entry by non-residents when the subsistence resources of these lands are in short supply or otherwise threatened. The conference committee expects both the Secretary and the State to take any action necessary to protect the subsistence needs of the Natives.

3. Villages located on the Pribilof Islands present a special problem because the fur seals which frequent the islands are the subject of an International Treaty. It is the conference committee's recommendation that the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the State and the Planning Commission, reserve the appropriate rights and interests in land to insure the fulfillment of the United States' obligations under the Treaty.

4. Under the provisions of subsection 12 (c)(3) ". . . the Regional Corporation may select only even numbered townships in even numbered ranges, and only odd numbered townships in odd numbered ranges." This language is meant to insure "checkerboard" selections by the Regional Corporations. The State of Alaska would then be permitted to concurrently select lands in the alternate townships not subject to selection by the Regional Corporations.

The effect of this provision of the bill is to limit the selections of the Regional Corporation to townships 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, et cetera, North or South of a principal or special base line, in ranges 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, et cetera, East or West of a principal or special meridian. With respect to odd numbered ranges, East or West of a principal or special meridian, i.e. Range 1 West, Range 1 East, Range 3 West, Range 3 East, et cetera, the Regional Corporation could select from townships 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, et cetera, North or South of a principal or special base line. The numbering system of the townships and ranges is the system used by the United States Land Survey System.

It is recognized that if a principal or special meridian or base line should intersect an area withdrawn for selection, a slightly modified selection pattern might result; however, those cases seemed so limited as to not do substantial violence to the intended "checkerboard" selection system contemplated.

5. Section 20 provides for the compensation of attorneys and consultants for services and expenses in the representation of Natives, Native Villages, or Native Associations in claims pending before any state or Federal court or the Indian Claims Commission which are dismissed pursuant to this Act, or in the preparation of this Act and previously proposed legislation to settle the Alaska Native claims based upon aboriginal title, use, or occupancy. The Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims must determine the amount of the claims, within the limits of funds authorized. It is intended that payment for such services shall only be compensated from the funds provided therefor by this section, and penalties are provided in the event other reimbursement is paid.

Under the provisions of subsection 20(g), the Chief Commissioner is also authorized to allow and certify for payment such amounts as he determines are reasonable, but not more than $600,000 in the aggregate, for actual costs incurred by Native Associations in advancing land claims legislation. Attorney or consultant fees or expenses may not be paid from this sum. The penalty provisions of subsection 20(f)(2) would be applicable to any violation of this section. An attorney or consultant who has already been paid by a Native Association could of course return the payment and submit a claim under the attorney/consultant part of the section.

II. MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONFERENCE REPORT AND THE BILL PASSED BY THE HOUSE

1. Land

Both bills provided for a conveyance to the Natives of 40 million acres. In the House bill, the Natives would have first choice of approximately 18½ million acres from the 25 townships surrounding each Village. The State would then complete its selections under the Statehood Act (about 103½ million acres). After that the Natives would select the rest of the 40 million acres, but selections would not be limited to the 25 township areas.

In the conference report, the State does not make its selection before all of the Native lands have been selected, but the State's interests are recognized as follows:

(a) State selections made before the date of the Secretarial Order imposing a "land freeze", amounting to about 26 million acres, are protected against Native selection, except that a Native Village (not the Regional Corporations) may select from the area surrounding the Village not to exceed three townships of the lands previously selected by the State.

(b) The Regional Corporations can select lands within the 25 township areas only on a checkerboard pattern of odd and even numbers, and the State may select the checkerboarded townships not available to the Regional Corporations.

(c) The withdrawal of land to facilitate Native selections will terminate in four years, and State selections will not thereafter be impeded.

(d) State selections may proceed immediately in areas outside the 25 township areas around Native Villages, and lieu selection areas.

2. Money

The House bill provided for a grant of $425,000,000 from the U.S. Treasury over a ten year period, and $500,000,000 from mineral revenues most of which would otherwise go to the State.

In the conference report, the $425,000,000 grant is increased to $462,500,000, which is half way between the House figure and the Senate figure.

3. Corporate organization

The Conferees retained the provisions of the House bill providing for twelve Regional Corporations and a Village Corporation for each Native Village, but made one addition and one modification. The addition is the option of the Natives who are not permanent residents of Alaska to organize a 13th Regional Corporation which will receive and administer their share of the $962,500,000 grant. The modification is the restriction of membership in the Village Corporations to Natives, rather than all residents.

4. Land use planning

The House bill withdraws all unreserved public lands in Alaska for an indefinite period, and permits the Secretary of the Interior to classify the withdrawn areas and reopen them to entry when he determines that such action is desirable in the public interest.

The Conferees retained the substance of this provision, but made the statutory withdrawal for only ninety days and directed the Secretary to make any further withdrawal that may be needed under his existing authority.

In addition, the Conferees authorized the Secretary to withdraw not to exceed 80 million acres of unreserved public land that he thinks may be suitable for addition to the National Park, Forest, Wildlife Refuge, and Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems. The withdrawal is for a maximum of seven years. The Secretary must submit recommendations to Congress each six months, for two years, and the lands recommended for addition to the Federal Systems will remain withdrawn until Congress acts, but not to exceed five years. The withdrawal will not affect the right of the Village Corporations and the State to select and get title to lands within the 25 township areas. The withdrawal will prevent the Regional Corporations from getting title to land within the 25 township areas, and the State from getting title to any of the withdrawn areas.

In addition, the Conferees provided for a Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska, with a life of five years. The Commission has no regulatory authority.

III. MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONFERENCE REPORT AND THE SENATE'S AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO THE HOUSE PASSED BILL

Set forth below is a brief explanation of the major differences between the conference report recommended by the conference committee and the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House bill which was adopted by the Senate. The section references below are to the conference report and the discussion following each section indicates the action taken by the conference committee with respect to the appropriate provisions of the Senate passed amendment.

Section 2. Declaration of policy

The substance of the conference report language is the same as section 2 of the Senate amendment. Subsection 2(g) of the conference report is to be strictly construed and the conference committee does not intend that lands granted to Natives under this Act be considered "Indian reservation" lands for purposes other than those specified in this Act. The lands granted by this Act are not "in trust" and the Native villages are not Indian "reservations."

Subsection 2(e) is from the Senate amendment and makes clear that no change in the present policy with respect to Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4 is intended. Native villages located in the Reserve would receive title to surface estate lands only. All mineral and other subsurface rights within the Reserve remain in the ownership of the United States. To insure that a total of 40 million acres of land in fee title is granted to the Native people by this Act, the appropriate Regional Corporation for these villages is granted the right to select the subsurface estate in an equal amount of acreage outside of the boundaries of the Reserve.

Section 3. Definitions

The language of the Senate amendment defining "public lands" was adopted by the conference committee. This language excludes from the definition lands selections by the State under the Statehood Act, but those lands are specifically dealt with elsewhere in the Act.

Section 4. Declaration of settlement

The conference report language is, in substance, the same as the language of the Senate amendment. It is the clear and direct intent of the conference committee to extinguish *all* aboriginal claims and *all* aboriginal land titles, if any, of the Native people of Alaska and the language of settlement is to be broadly construed to eliminate such claims and titles as any basis for any form of direct or indirect challenge to land in Alaska. The conference committee added a reference in this section to claims "based upon the laws of any other nation". The purpose of the reference is to extinguish any land claims based upon the laws and legal system of Russia or any other country if any such land claims exist.

Section 5. Enrollment

The conference report language was, for the most part, taken from the House passed bill. The Senate amendment (Section 6) provided for the establishment of an Alaska Native Commission which would prepare the final enrollment, resolve disputes and perform other functions under the Act. The conference report provides that enrollment will be the responsibility of the Secretary of Interior rather than the Native Commission, and that most land and other disputes will be settled by arbitration as provided elsewhere in the conference report.

Subsection 5(c) of the conference report deals with the enrollment of Natives who are not residents of Alaska and provides an opportunity for them to elect to be enrolled in a special thirteenth Regional Corporation if a majority of all eligible non-resident Natives favor the creation of such a corporation.

Section 6. Alaska Native Fund

The conference committee split the difference between the $425 million Federal appropriation in the House passed bill and the $500 million in subsection 5(a) of the Senate

amendment, and recommended $462,500,000. The payout schedule for the revenues in the Fund is essentially that of the Senate amendment and insures that the bulk of the Federally appropriated funds will be paid out in the early years, thus greatly increasing the present worth of the right to receive these revenues.

The conference committee also recommended the adoption of the Senate amendment's limitation on the use of funds received by corporations under the Act for political purposes.

Section 7. Regional corporations

The Senate amendment provided for the creation of two Federally chartered Statewide corporations, one to handle investments, and one to perform social welfare functions and to hold title to the mineral estate of lands granted by the bill. In addition, the Senate amendment required: (a) the establishment of seven business for profit Regional Corporations; (b) the establishment of two corporations to be composed of first, non-resident Natives (the "National Corporation"), and second, urban Natives (the "Urban Corporation"); (c) the incorporation of nonprofit membership corporations for each eligible Native Village; and (d) the creation of an Alaska Native Foundation.

The conference report provides for the establishment of 12 Regional Corporations for resident Alaska Natives and permits the creation of a 13th Regional Corporation for non-resident Natives if a majority of non-resident Natives so elect. This 13th Regional Corporation, if created, would serve the same purposes and functions which were to be performed by the National Corporation in the Senate amendment (section 12).

The conference report language provides that the Regional Corporations shall be organized as business for profit corporations. This requirement is in accord with the Senate amendment. In addition, the investment functions to be carried out by the Alaska Native Investment Corporation under Section 10 of the Senate amendment have been assigned in the conference report to the Regional Corporations. Authority to allow the Regional Corporations to join together, to pool investment funds, and to employ the same business management group for the management and administration of investments is found in subsection 7(k) of the conference report. This general grant of authority parallels the specific authority granted to the Investment Corporation in section 10 of the Senate amendment.

The functions to be performed by the Alaska Native Services and Development Corporation under section 8 of the Senate amendment have, for the most part, been redistributed by the conference committee. The Regional Corporations under the conference report language would receive the title to the subsurface estate of the lands granted by the Act. The Regional Corporations would also perform some social welfare functions of regional benefit, would assist the Village Corporations to organize, and would review and advise on the land transactions of the Village Corporations to insure against fraud and over-reaching.

The Regional Corporations provided for in the conference report are authorized to merge with other Regional Corporations. This will provide a means of reducing administrative costs and overhead and improving general corporate efficiency.

Section 25 of the Senate amendment would have established an Alaska Native Foundation to carry on the social welfare functions of the Statewide Services and Development Corporation after the Federal charter for the Services Corporation expired. The conference report does not prohibit the Native people from establishing a charitable foundation at some future date and the Senate conferees receded on this item.

The Senate amendment contained specific language in a number of sections which dealt with conflict of laws questions between the Act and State Corporation law. This potential problem is dealt with in subsection 7(p) of the conference report which provides that the provisions of sections 7 and 8 prevail in the event of any conflict.

The conference committee considered, but decided not to adopt, language from the Senate amendment to guard against any special State legislation which might impair the activities and economic viability of the Corporations established by the conference report. It was the conference committee's conclusion that the State would deal fairly in all respects with Native corporations.

Consideration was also given to language in the Senate amendment authorizing Regional Corporations to contribute to the costs of organizing and maintaining local and borough government in rural areas of Alaska. The language was not adopted for the reason that the conference committee concludes that Regional and Village Corporations as established would have this authority.

Section 8. Village corporations

This section was drawn from section 11 of the Senate amendment. The House bill provided for land and revenue grants to units of municipal government, or to Village Corporations. Under the conference report, before any lands may be granted an eligible village must organize as a non-profit or business for profit corporation to hold title to lands.

Section 9. Revenue sharing

Sections 9 and 10 of the conference report, with minor exceptions, are substantially the same as section 18 of the Senate amendment.

Section 10. Statute of Limitations

Section 9 of the conference report is patterned after section 18 (g) of the Senate amendment. Congressional authority for enactment of this section, and other provisions of the conference report is based, in part, upon section 4 of the Alaska Statehood Act.

Section 11. Withdrawal of public lands

The Senate amendment provided for two optional land grant provisions. The first, in brief, was for 40 million acres (38½ million acres around Villages and 1½ million acres of floating selections). The second was for 50 million acres (20 million acres around Villages; 10 million acres of lands to be selected for economic potential; and 20 million acres of permit lands to provide subsistence use protection). The Natives would select one of the options at an election to be held within one year of the enactment of the Act.

The conference committee concluded that lands granted under the Act should be granted as soon as possible and that the areas from which they would be granted should be immediately identifiable. For this reason, the conference report does not provide for a "free floating" selection.

Section 11 of the conference report withdraws lands around villages, including villages located on lands selected by or tentatively approved to the State. This section also provides for the withdrawal of in lieu lands adjacent to the 25 township area to insure that the land selection rights of Native Villages and Regional Corporations will be fully protected and will not be frustrated by competing State selections or the creation of new interests in lands under the public land laws.

Subsection 11(b) is, in part, drawn from section 13 of the Senate amendment and provides that Native villages not listed in the bill may, if they meet designated criteria, later qualify for benefits under the Act.

Section 12. Native land selections

Section 12 of the conference report provides for the selection of lands granted to the Native people. In major respects, it parallels section 14 and subsection 13(k) of the Senate amendment.

Section 13. Surveys

Section 13 of the conference report parallels portions of sections 13 and 15 of the Senate amendment and specifies in greater detail, both here and in subsection 22(j), the manner in which land surveys are to be conducted.

Section 14. Conveyance of lands

Section 14 of the conference report provides the conveyance of lands granted by the Act. This subsection parallels in structure and purpose the provisions of section 15 of the Senate amendment.

Section 15. Timber sale contracts

Section 15 of the conference report authorizes the modification of timber sale contracts and is similar to language in subsection 23(t) of the Senate amendment.

Section 16. The Tlingit-Haida settlement

Subsection 16 of the conference report provides appropriate and necessary limitations with respect to land grants to Native villages located in the National Forests in Southeast Alaska which participated in the Tlingit-Haida judgment. The parallel language of the Senate amendment is in Section 23.

Section 17. Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission

Section 17 of the conference report is based upon section 24 of the Senate amendment. Section 17 consists of four major sections and these are discussed below.

1. The Planning Commission has been modified by reducing the membership to ten members. In addition, the regulatory powers found in section 24 have been revised so that the Commission's functions are limited to providing advice, coordination and making recommendations to State and Federal government. The enforcement powers granted under section 24(a)(10) have been eliminated and it is the intent of the conference committee that the Federal government and the State will take such actions as are necessary to administer lands under their respective jurisdictions in a manner which will facilitate a process of joint land use planning in Alaska and permit the attainment of both economic requirements and national and state environmental objectives.

2. Subsection 17(b) of the conference report is substantially the same as section 24(d) of the Senate amendment. This subsection provides for the advance reservation of easements and camping and recreation sites necessary for public access across lands granted to Village and Regional Corporations.

3. Subsection 17(c) of the conference report provides that if the Secretary should withdraw a utility and transportation corridor across the public lands in Alaska, the State and the Village and Regional Corporations may not select lands from the area withdrawn for the corridor. In making the withdrawal the Secretary would be acting on the basis of his existing authority such as the Pickett Act and the President's implied authority.

The language adopted by the conference committee is new. The Senate's amendment, in subsection 24(b), would have withdrawn the corridor for the proposed trans-Alaska oil pipeline, maintained the corridor under Federal jurisdiction, and established a mangement regime to insure the protection of adjacent public lands and visitors to the area. While the conference report does not contain these specific provisions, many of them will be within the Secretary's authority to achieve if he should decide to withdraw the corridor.

4. Subsection 17(d) of the conference report is patterned, in major respects, after subsection 24(c) of the Senate amendment and, in part, after subsection 9(g) of the House passed bill.

The language adopted by the conference committee provides in subsection (d)(1) for a 90-day withdrawal of *all* unreserved public lands in Alaska from all forms of appropriation except locations for metalliferous minerals. The purpose of this withdrawal is twofold:

First, to permit the Secretary an opportunity to make the withdrawals for National Park, Forest, Refuge and Wild Rivers directed under subsection 2(A);

Second, to permit the Secretary time to determine if there are other public land areas in Alaska which should be withdrawn, classified, or reclassified before they are opened to unlimited and uncontrolled entry, location and leasing under the public land laws. Subsection 9(g) of the House passed bill and subsection 24(c) of the Senate amendment did not limit the time of the withdrawal authority for this second purpose.

The language recommended by the conference committee deals in greater detail with the withdrawal and study of National interest areas and contingencies not dealt with in the House passed bill and the Senate amendment and thus obviates any necessity for providing for a withdrawal of all public lands in Alaska for an unlimited period of time.

The "classification" and "reclassification" authority granted under subsection 7(d)(1) is *new* legislative authority. The authority is limited to Alaska and to the purposes provided for in subsection 17(d). It is, however, a very broad and important delegation of discretion and authority and the conference committee anticipates that the Secretary will use this authority to insure that the purposes of this Act and the land claims settlement are achieved, that the larger public interest in the public lands of Alaska is protected, and that the immediate and unrestricted operation of all the public land laws 90 days after date of enactment—absent affirmative action by the Secretary under his existing authority—does not result in a land rush, in massive filings under the Mineral Leasing Act, and in competing and conflicting entries and mineral locations.

Subsection 17(d)(2) of the conference report directs the Secretary to withdraw up to 80 million acres of unreserved public lands including lands previously classified such as lands within the Iliamna, Copper River; Brooks Range, White Mountain and other classification areas, which he deems are suitable for consideration by the Congress for addition to or creation as new units of the National Park, Forest, Wildlife Refuge, and Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems. This subsection also provides a procedure and sets time limits for terminating withdrawals, for transmitting recommendations to the Congress, and for in lieu selections by the State and Regional Corporations in the event that Congress enacts legislation setting aside these areas for public use and enjoyment.

Subsection 17(d)(3) of the conference report continues the Secretary's full authority over and responsibility for any lands withdrawn by this section and to make contracts and to grant leases, permits and rights-of-way, or easements over any lands withdrawn under this section by the affirmative action of the Secretary after the date of the enactment of this Act. This authority is necessary to protect the lands involved, to provide for their proper administration, and to insure that the Secretary continues to have the full authority he now possesses under existing law with respect to contracts, leases, permits, rights-of-way, and easements. A similar section on the Secretary's authority to administer lands withdrawn by the operation of this Act is found in subsection 22(f) of the conference report.

A major purpose of both of these provisions is, of course, to insure that the Secretary has the authority to grant any contracts, leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements which may in the future be necessary in connection with Village and Regional construction and local improvement projects, State or local highways and roads, electrical transmission lines, and other types of activities and projects which may involve the use of some withdrawn areas. This language would also permit the Secretary, if he should so decide in the future, to grant the necessary rights-of-way, permits, and other legal authority necessary for the construction of the proposed trans-Alaska oil pipeline. The conference committee did not consider the proposed pipeline in connection with the resolution of the differences between the bills, nor did the House or Senate Committees consider the proposed pipeline in connection with hearings on this subject. Accordingly, the conference committee takes no position on what action the Secretary should take with respect to the pending application. The conference committee does, however, want it clearly understood that *if* the Secretary should, after full and careful evaluation, and after completion of the environmental impact statement required by the National Environmental Policy Act, decide to grant the necessary permits, nothing in this conference report is intended to, nor should be construed in any manner to limit, diminish, or condition the Secretary's existing authority to take any action required to implement this decision.

Language similar to the provisions discussed above is found in section 24(c)(3) of the Senate amendment and in the House passed bill.

Section 18. Revocation of Indian Allotment Authority in Alaska

Subsection 19 of the conference report is taken from the House passed bill and requires an election by Natives with respect to whether to pursue their allotment or to take under the provisions of the conference report providing for a grant of title to the lands on which their primary place of residence is located. The companion provision in the Senate amendment is section 20.

Section 19. Revocation of Reservations

Subsection 19 of the conference report is, with a few modifications, taken from the House passed bill. The parallel language of the Senate amendment is found in section 22 and, if adopted by the conference committee, would have permitted participation in monetary benefits granted by the Act even if a Native Village decided to acquire title to their existing reservation.

Section 20. Attorney and Consultant Fees

Section 20 of the conference report provides for the payment of attorney and consultant fees. The parallel language of the Senate amendment is section 26. The Senate language is substantially the same, except that the total amount of fees granted has been reduced to $2 million. In addition, the conference report authorizes the $600,000 granted by subsection 5(g)(1) of the Senate amendment in this section.

Section 21. Taxation

Section 21 of the conference report provides for the tax treatment to be accorded lands and revenues granted by this Act for the settlement of the Alaska Native claims. It parallels section 27 of the Senate amendment and with some deletions and modifications is substantively the same.

Section 22. Miscellaneous

The conference committee in Section 22 added a miscellaneous section to the conference report to pick up a number of provisions from both the House passed bill and the Senate amendment and to deal with problems created by the action of the conference committee in combining the two. Set out below is a discussion of those provisions which are not self-explanatory.

(a) Subsection (a) provides that none of the revenues or lands granted by this Act may be subject to any contract, present or future, which is based on a percentage fee of the value of all or some of the settlement granted. The purpose is, of course, to protect the Native people. This provision would not apply to future percentage fee contracts which are not related to the value of the settlement and which are to be paid out of investment earnings.

(j) Subsection (j) provides for adjustments in deeds to conform to the United States Land Survey System when the lands conveyed have not been adequately surveyed at the time of conveyance. No similar provision was included in either the House or Senate bill, but the conference committee adopted the language to correct this oversight, and to prevent the delay of conveyance which could occur without this provision. The language was deemed necessary in view of the short period provided for the selection and conveyance of lands of the Natives.

(k) Subsection (k) provides that sales and timber management of lands granted to the Natives from the National Forest shall, for a period of five years, continue to be in accordance with rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture (sustained yield). A similar provision was contained in the Senate bill.

Section 23. Review by Congress

Both the House and the Senate bills provided for an annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Act; however, the Senate bill provided for reports to be submitted on March 1 of each year for thirteen years. The conference report requires an annual report until 1984, but does not specify a reporting date. The conference report requires a final report in 1985 in lieu of 1992 as required by the House bill. The Senate bill contemplated detailed reports from the Alaska Native Commission, but this provision was deleted as unnecessary since the conference report does not provide for the Commission.

Section 24. Appropriations

The provision adopted by the conference committee is a simple authorization to appropriate "such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act." It is recognized that the Secretary will require additional personnel and other funds in complying with the directives contained in the conference report, and such sums may be appropriated under this provision. The Senate bill also requested the President to advance moneys from his contingency fund for "start-up" of the various corporations authorized by the Senate bills. Due to the different corporate structure and the provision for a $12.5 million appropriation for 1972, such provisions were not deemed appropriate.

The appropriations for the Federal payments into the Alaska Native Fund are already limited by the provisions of subsection 6(a).

Section 25. Publication

The conference committee adopted the House language as section 25 of its report, which is almost identical to the Senate language, and is of similar intent.

Section 26. Saving Clause

The conference committee adopted the House language as section 26 of its report. The Senate provision contained the statement: "Except as specifically provided for in this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as repealing any other provision of

Federal law applicable to Alaska." That sentence was eliminated as being unnecessary.

Section 27. Separability

The provisions of the House and Senate bills concerning separability were identical, and are included in the conference report as section 21.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
MORRIS K. UDALL,
LLOYD MEEDS,
NICK BEGICH,
JOHN KYL,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
LEE METCALF,
MIKE GRAVEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,
TED STEVENS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE DAVID PACKARD

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn over the weekend that Dave Packard, the second man in the Department of Defense, is unfortunately resigning and leaving Government service.

It has been my privilege to know Dave Packard for a number of years. I have always had the greatest admiration and respect for him not only as a most successful businessman and as a community leader and benefactor but more recently as the second man in the vast organization that we call the Department of Defense.

All of us know intimately our former colleague and good friend, Mel Laird, who is Secretary of Defense, but I think Mel Laird would be the very first one to admit that he could not do the first-class job that is being done in the Department of Defense without the help and assistance of his good right arm, Dave Packard. I personally wish that Dave Packard could see fit to remain and carry on the outstanding service that he has given to his country for the last 3 years. For very personal reasons he is leaving Government service. He has done an outstanding job. He has accomplished some things to make the Department of Defense work better, to produce more for less money, and to make our military forces better prepared to meet the problems that they have to face 365 days of the year.

I extend to Dave Packard our best wishes for continued health and happiness and success, and to say without reservation or qualification he will be badly missed in Government service.

ADDITIONAL DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8856) to authorize an additional Deputy Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 136(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "eight" and inserting in lieu thereof "nine".

SEC. 2. Section 5315(13) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Assistant Secretaries of Defense (9).".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Defense."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TODAY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the remainder of the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair declares a recess of the House subject to the call of the Chair.

The Chair will state that the Chair will cause the bells to be rung 15 minutes prior to the reconvening of the House.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2891

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 2891.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-745)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2891) to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"This title may be cited as the 'Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971".

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 1970

SEC. 2. Title II of Act entitled "An Act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1970 (Public Law 91-379), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—COST OF LIVING STABILIZATION

"§ 201. Short title

"This title may be cited as the 'Economic Stabilization Act of 1970'.

"§ 202. Findings

"It is hereby determined that in order to stabilize the economy, reduce inflation, minimize unemployment, improve the Nation's competitive position in world trade, and protect the purchasing power of the dollar, it is necessary to stabilize prices, rents, wages, salaries, dividends, and interest. The adjustments necessary to carry out this program require prompt judgments and actions by the executive branch of the Government. The President is in a position to implement promptly and effectively the program authorized by this title.

"§ 203. Presidential authority

"(a) The President is authorized to issue such orders and regulations as he deems appropriate, accompanied by a statement of reasons for such orders and regulations, to—

"(1) stabilize prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels not less than those prevailing on May 25, 1970, except that prices may be stabilized at levels below those prevailing on such date if it is necessary to eliminate windfall profits or if it is otherwise necessary to carry out the purposes of this bill; and

"(2) stabilize interest rates and corporate dividends and similar transfers at levels consistent with orderly economic growth.

Such orders and regulations shall provide for the making of such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent gross inequities, and shall be consistent with the standards issued pursuant to subsection (b).

"(b) In carrying out the authority vested in him by subsection (a), the President shall issue standards to serve as a guide for determining levels of wages, salaries, prices, rents, interest rates, corporate dividends, and similar transfers which are consistent with the purposes of this title and orderly economic growth. Such standards shall—

"(1) be generally fair and equitable;

"(2) provide for the making of such general exceptions and variations as are necessary to foster orderly economic growth and to prevent gross inequities, hardships, serious market disruptions, domestic shortages of raw materials, localized shortages of labor, and windfall profits;

"(3) take into account changes in productivity and the cost of living, as well as well as such other factors consistent with the purposes of this title as are appropriate;

"(4) provide for the requiring of appropriate reductions in prices and rents whenever warranted after consideration of lower costs, labor shortages, and other pertinent factors; and

"(5) call for generally comparable sacrifices by business and labor as well as other segments of the economy.

"(c)(1) The authority conferred on the President by this section shall not be exercised to limit the level of any wage or salary (including any insurance or other fringe benefit offered in connection with an employment contract) scheduled to take effect after November 13, 1971, to a level below that which has been agreed to in a contract which (A) related to such wage or salary, and (B) was executed prior to August 15, 1971, unless the President determines

that the increase provided in such contract is unreasonably inconsistent with the standards for wage and salary increases published under subsection (b).

"(2) The President shall promptly take such action as may be necessary to permit the payment of any wage or salary increase (including any insurance or other fringe benefit offered in connection with an employment contract) which (A) was agreed to in an employment contract executed prior to August 15, 1971, (B) was scheduled to take effect prior to November 14, 1971, and (C) was not paid as a result of orders issued under this title, unless the President determines that the increase provided in such contract is unreasonably inconsistent with the standards for wage and salary increases published under subsection (b).

"(3) In addition to the payment of wage and salary increases provided for under paragraphs (1) and (2), beginning on the date on which this subsection takes effect, the President shall promptly take such action as may be necessary to require the payment of any wage or salary increases (including any insurance or other fringe benefits offered in connection with employment) which have been, or in the absence of this subsection would be, withheld under the authority of this title, if the President determines that—

(A) such increases were provided for by law or contract prior to August 15, 1971; and

(B) prices have been advanced, productivity increased, taxes have been raised, appropriations have been made, or funds have otherwise been raised or provided for in order to cover such increases.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, this title shall be implemented in such a manner that wage increases to any individual whose earnings are substandard or who is amongst the working poor shall not be limited in any manner, until such time as his earnings are no longer substandard or he is no longer a member of the working poor.

"(e) Whenever the authority of this title is implemented with respect to significant segments of the economy, the President shall require the issuance of regulations or orders providing for the stabilization of interest rates and finance charges, unless he issues a determination, accompanied by a statement of reasons, that such regulations or orders are not necessary to maintain such rates and charges at levels consonant with orderly economic growth.

"(f) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised to preclude the payment of any increase in wages—

"(1) required under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or effected as a result of enforcement action under such Act; or

"(2) required in order to comply with wage determinations made by any agency in the executive branch of the Government pursuant to law for work (A) performed under contracts with, or to be performed with financial assistance from, the United States or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or (B) performed by aliens who are immigrants or who have been temporarily admitted to the United States pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; or

"(3) paid in conjunction with existing or newly established employee incentive programs which are designed to reflect directly increases in employee productivity.

"(g) For the purposes of this section the term 'wages' and 'salaries' do not include contributions by any employer pursuant to a compensation adjustment for—

"(1) any pension, profit sharing, or annuity and savings plan which meets the requirements of section 401 (a), 404 (a) (2), or 403 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

"(2) any group insurance plan; or

"(3) any disability and health plan;

unless the President determines that the contributions made by any such employer are unreasonably inconsistent with the standards for wage, salary, and price increases issued under subsection (b).

"(h) No State or portion thereof shall be exempted from any application of this title with respect to rents solely by virtue of the fact that it regulates rents by State or local law, regulation or policy.

"(i) Rules, regulations, and orders promulgated under this title shall insofar as practicable be designed to encourage labor-management cooperation for the purpose of achieving increased productivity, and the Executive Director of the National Commission on Productivity shall when appropriate be consulted in the formulation of policies, rules, regulations, orders, and amendments under this title.

"§ 204. Delegation

"The President may delegate the performance of any function under this title to such officers, departments, and agencies of the United States as he deems appropriate, or to boards, commissions, and similar entities composed in whole or in part of members appointed to represent different sectors of the economy and the general public. Members of such boards, commissions, and similar entities shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; except that—

"(1) the foregoing requirement with respect to Senate confirmation does not apply to any member of any such board, commission, or similar entity (other than the Chairman of the Pay Board, established by section 7 of Executive Order Numbered 11627 of October 15, 1971, and the Chairman of the Price Commission, established by section 8 of such Executive order) who is serving, pursuant to appointment by the President, on such board, commission, or similar entity on the date of enactment of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, and who continues to serve, pursuant to such appointment, on such board, commission, or similar entity after such date; and

"(2) any person serving in the Office of Chairman of such Pay Board, and any person serving in the Office of Chairman of such Price Commission, on the date of enactment of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, may continue to serve in such capacity on an interim basis without regard to the foregoing requirement with respect to Senate confirmation until the expiration of sixty days after the date of enactment of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, and the provisions of sections 910–913 of title 5, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to the procedure to be followed in the Senate in considering the nomination of any person to either of such offices submitted to the Senate by the President during such sixty-day period, except that references in such provisions to a 'resolution with respect to a reorganization plan' shall be deemed for the purpose of this section to refer to such nominations.

Where such boards, commissions, and similar entities are composed in part of members who serve on less than a full-time basis, legal authority shall be placed in their chairmen who shall be employees of the United States and who shall act only in accordance with the majority vote of members. Nothing in section 203, 205, 207, 208, or 209 of title 18, United States Code, shall be deemed to apply to any member of any such board, commission, or similar entity who serves on less than a full-time basis because of membership on such board, commission, or entity.

"§ 205. Confidentiality of information

"All information reported to or otherwise obtained by any person exercising authority under this title which contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, shall be considered confidential for the purposes of that section, except that such information may be disclosed to other persons empowered to carry out this title solely for the purpose of carrying out this title or when relevant in any proceeding under this title.

"§ 206. Subpena power

"The head of an agency exercising authority under this title, or his duly authorized agent, shall have authority, for any purpose related to this title, to sign and issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant books, papers, and other documents, and to administer oaths. Witnesses summoned under the provisions of this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States. In case of refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person under the provisions of this section, the head of the agency authorizing such subpena, or his delegate, may request the Attorney General to seek the aid of the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found to compel such person, after notice, to appear and give testimony, or to appear and produce documents before the agency.

"§ 207. Administrative procedure

"(a) The functions exercised under this title are excluded from the operation of subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, except as to the requirements of sections 552, 553, and 555(e) of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) Any agency authorized by the President to issue rules, regulations, or orders under this title shall, in regulations prescribed by it, establish procedures which are available to any person for the purpose of seeking an interpretation, modification, or rescission of, or seeking an exception or exemption from, such rules, regulations, and orders. If such person is aggrieved by the denial of a request for such action under the preceding sentence, he may request a review of such denial by the agency. The agency shall, in regulations prescribed by it, establish appropriate procedures, including hearings where deemed advisable, for considering such requests for action under this section.

"(c) To the maximum extent possible, the President or his delegate shall conduct formal hearings for the purpose of hearing arguments or acquiring information bearing on a change or a proposed change in wages, salaries, prices, rents, interest rates, or corporate dividends or similar transfers, which have or may have a significantly large impact upon the national economy, and such hearings shall be open to the public except that a private formal hearing may be conducted to receive information considered confidential under section 205 of this title.

"§ 208. Sanctions; criminal fine and civil penalty

"(a) Whoever willfully violates any order or regulation under this title shall be fined not more than $5,000 for each violation.

"(b) Whoever violates any order or regulation under this title shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $2,500 for each violation.

"§ 209. Injunctions and other relief

"Whenever it appear to any person authorized by the President to exercise authority under this title that any individual or organization has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage in any acts or practices constituting a violation of any order or regulation under this title, such person may request the Attorney General to bring an action in the appropriate district court of the United States to enjoin such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a temporary restraining order or a preliminary or permanent injunction shall be granted without bond. Any such court may also issue mandatory injunctions commanding any person to comply with any such order or regulation. In addition to

such injunctive relief, the court may also order restitution of moneys received in violation of any such order or regulation.

"§ 209. Injunctions and other relief

"(a) Any person suffering legal wrong because of any act or practice arising out of this title, or any order or regulation issued pursuant thereto, may bring an action in a district court of the United States, without regard to the amount in controversy, for appropriate relief, including an action for a declaratory judgment, writ of injunction (subject to the limitations in section 211), and/or damages.

"(b) In any action brought under subsection (a) against any person renting property or selling goods or services who is found to have overcharged the plaintiff, the court may, in its discretion, award the plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs, plus whichever of the following sums is greater:

"(1) an amount not more than three times the amount of the overcharge upon which the action is based, or

"(2) not less than $100 or more than $1,000;

except that in any case where the defendant establishes that the overcharge was not intentional and resulted from a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted to the avoidance of such error the liability of the defendant shall be limited to the amount of the overcharge: *Provided*, That where the overcharge is not willful within the meaning of section 208(a) of this Act, no action for an overcharge may be brought by or on behalf of any person unless such person has first presented to the seller or renter a bona fide claim for refund of the overcharge and has not received repayment of such overcharge within ninety days from the date of the presentation of such claim.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the term 'overcharge' means the amount by which the consideration for the rental of property or the sale of goods or services exceeds the applicable ceiling under regulations or orders issued under this title.

"§ 211. Judicial review

"(a) The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of cases or controversies arising under this title, or under regulations or orders issued thereunder, notwithstanding the amount in controversy; except that nothing in this subsection or in subsection (h) of this section affects the power of any court of competent jurisdiction to consider, hear, and determine any issue by way of defense (other than a defense based on the constitutionality of this title or the validity of action taken by any agency under this title) raised in any proceeding before such court. If in any such proceeding an issue by way of defense is raised based on the constitutionality of this title or the validity of agency action under this title, the case shall be subject to removal by either party to a district court of the United States in accordance with the applicable provisions of chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b)(1) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States from judges of the United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. Except as provided in subsection (d)(2) of this section, the court shall not have power to issue any interlocutory decree staying or restraining in whole or in part any provision of this title, or the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued thereunder. In all other respects, the court shall have the powers of a circuit court of appeals with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this title. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases over which it has jurisdiction under this title. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all appeals from the district courts of the United States in cases and controversies arising under this title or under regulations or orders issued thereunder. Such appeals shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal with the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals within thirty days of the entry of judgment by the district court.

"(c) In any action commenced under this title in any district court of the United States in which the court determines that a substantial constitutional issue exists, the court shall certify such issue to the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals. Upon such certification, the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals shall determine the appropriate manner of disposition which may include a determination that the entire action be sent to it for consideration or it may, on the issues certified, give binding instructions and remand the action to the certifying court for further disposition.

"(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), no regulation of any agency exercising authority under this title shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless a final judgment determines that the issuance of such regulation was in excess of the agency's authority, was arbitrary or capricious, or was otherwise unlawful under the criteria set forth in section 706(2) of title 5, United States Code, and no order of such agency shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless a final judgment determines that such order is in excess of the agency's authority, or is based upon findings which are not supported by substantial evidence.

"(2) A district court of the United States or the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals may enjoin temporarily or permanently the application of a particular regulation or order issued under this title to a person who is a party to litigation before it. Appeals from interlocutory decisions by a district court of the United States under this paragraph may be taken in accordance with the provisions of section 1292(b) of title 28, United States Code; except that reference in such section to the courts of appeals shall be deemed to refer to the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals.

"(e)(1) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, no interlocutory or permanent injunction restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of this title, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, shall be granted by any district court of the United States or judge thereof. Any such court shall have jurisdiction to declare (A) that a regulation of an agency exercising authority under this title is in excess of the agency's authority, is arbitrary or capricious, or is otherwise unlawful under the criteria set forth in section 706(2) of title 5, United States Code, or (B) that an order of such agency is invalid upon a determination that the order is in excess of the agency's authority, or is based upon findings which are not supported by substantial evidence.

"(2) Any party aggrieved by a declaration of a district court of the United States respecting the validity of any regulation or order issued under this title may, within thirty days after the entry of such declaration, file a notice of appeal therefrom in the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals. In addition, any party believing himself entitled by reason of such declaration to a permanent injunction restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of such regulation or order may file, within the same thirty-day period, a motion in the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals requesting such injunctive relief. Following consideration of such appeal or motion, the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals shall enter a final judgment affirming, reversing or modifying the determination of the district court and granting such permanent injunctive relief, if any, as it deems appropriate.

"(f) The effectiveness of a final judgment of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals enjoining or setting aside in whole or in part any provision of this title, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, shall be postponed until the expiration of thirty days from the entry thereof, except that if a petition for a writ of certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court under subsection (g) within such thirty days, the effectiveness of such judgment shall be postponed until an order of the Supreme Court denying such petition becomes final, or until other final disposition of the action by the Supreme Court.

"(g) Within thirty days after entry of any judgment or order by the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a United States court of appeals as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the constitutional validity of any provision of this title or of any regulation or order issued under this title. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal or State, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the constitutional validity of any provision of this title or of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this title authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"(h) The provisions of this section apply to any actions or suits pending in any court, Federal or State, on the date of enactment of this section in which no final order or judgment has been rendered. Any affected party seeking relief shall be required to follow the procedures of this title.

"§ 212. Personnel

"(a) Any agency or officer of the Government carrying out functions under this title is authorized to employ such personnel as the President deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) The President may appoint five officers to be responsible for carrying out functions of this title of whom three shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level III of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5314) and two at the rate prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316). Appropriate titles and the order of succession among such officers may be designated by the President.

"(c) Any member of a board, commission, or similar entity established by the President pursuant to authority conferred by this title who serves on less than a full-time basis shall receive compensation from the date of his appointment at a rate equal to the per diem equivalent of the rate prescribed for level IV

of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315) when actually engaged in the performance of his duties as such member.

"(d) (1) In addition to the number of positions which may be placed in GS–16, 17, and 18, under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code, not to exceed twenty positions may be placed in GS–16, 17, and 18, to carry out the functions under this title.

"(2) The authority under this subsection shall be subject to the procedures prescribed under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code, and shall continue only for the duration of the exercise of functions under this title.

"(e) The President may require the detail of employees from any executive agency to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(f) The President is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, such advisory committees as he deems appropriate for the purpose of consultation with and advice to the President in the performance of his functions under this title. Members of advisory committees, other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such committees or while otherwise serving at the request of the President may be paid compensation at rates not exceeding those authorized for individuals under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(g) (1) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, officers and employees of the Government who are appointed, work days, to any position for carrying out functions under this title are entitled, upon separation from such position, to reemployment in the position occupied at the time of appointment or in a position of comparable grade and salary.

"(2) An officer or employee who, at the time of his appointment under paragraph (1) of this subsection, is covered by section without a break of service of one or more 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, shall continue to be covered thereunder while carrying out functions under this title.

"§ 213. Experts and consultants

"Experts and consultants may be employed as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, for the performance of functions under this title, and individuals so employed may be compensated at rates not to exceed the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule established by section 5332 of title 5, United States Code. Such contracts may be renewed from time to time without limitation. Service of an individual as an expert or consultant under this section shall not be considered as employment or the holding of an office or position bringing such individual within the provisions of section 3323(a) of title 5, United States Code, section 872 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, or any other law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees.

"§ 214. Small business

"(a) It is the sense of the Congress that small business enterprises should be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this title.

"(b) In order to carry out the policy stated in subsection (a)—

"(1) the Small Business Administration shall to the maximum extent possible provide small business enterprises with full information concerning (A) the provisions of this title relating or of benefit to such enterprises, and (B) the activities of the various departments and agencies under this title;

"(2) in administering this title, such exemptions shall be provided for small business enterprises as may be feasible without impeding the accomplishment of the purposes of this title; and

(3) in administering this title, special provision shall be made for the expeditious handling of all requests, applications, or appeals from small business enterprises.

"§ 215. Mass transportation systems

"No company, or other entity constituting a public benefit corporation, charged by law or contract with the responsibility to operate a mass transportation facility or facilities, the fares of which are not otherwise regulated, shall increase any fare without first obtaining approval under this section from the President or his delegate.

"§ 216. Reports

"(a) In transmitting the Economic Report required under section 3(a) of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1022), the President shall include a section describing the actions taken under this title during the preceding year and giving his assessment of the progress attained in achieving the purposes of this title. The President shall also transmit quarterly reports to the Congress not later than thirty days after the close of each calendar quarter describing the actions taken under this title during the preceding quarter and giving his assessment of the progress attained in achieving the purposes of this title.

"(b) In carrying out his authority under this title, the President shall study and evaluate the relationship between excess profits, the stabilization of the economy, and the creation of new jobs. The results of such study shall be incorporated in the quarterly reports referred to in subsection (a).

"§ 217. Funding.

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(b) The President may accept and use in furtherance of the purposes of this title money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available for such purposes by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or otherwise.

"§ 218. Expiration

"The authority to issue and enforce orders and regulations under this title expires at midnight April 30, 1973, but such expiration shall not affect any action or pending proceeding, civil or criminal, not finally determined on such date, nor any action or proceeding based upon any act committed prior to May 1, 1973.

"§ 219. Ratification

"The assignment of personnel and expenditure of funds pursuant to the authority conferred on the President by this title prior to the date of enactment of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971 are hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed.

"§ 220. Severability

"If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the title, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any provision of section 3(c) of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–656), or of section 5305 of title 5 United States Code, as added by section 3(a) of Public Law 91-656, and the provisions of the alternative plan submitted by the President to the Congress pursuant thereto on August 31, 1971, such comparability adjustments in the rates of pay of each Federal pay system as may be required under such sections 5305 and 3(c), based on the 1971 Bureau of Labor Statistics survey—

(1) shall not be greater than the guidelines established for the wage and salary adjustments for the private sector that may be authorized under authority of any statute of the United States, including the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–379; 84 Stat. 799), as amended, and that may be in effect on December 31, 1971; and

(2) shall be placed into effect on the first day of the first pay period that begins on or after January 1, 1972.

Pay adjustments under section 4 or 5 of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 in connection with the comparability adjustments referred to in the preceding sentence (A) shall be made as though "level V" in subsection (d) of such section 4 and subsection (e) of such section 5 (and in section 5308 of title 5, United States Code) read "level IV", (B) shall be made without regard to the parenthetical phrase in subsection (a) (1) (A) of such section 5, and (C) shall be placed into effect as provided in paragraph (2) of the preceding sentence.

NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY POLICY

SEC. 4. (a) (1) It is the policy of the United States to promote efficient production, marketing, distribution, and use of goods and services in the private sector, and improve the morale of the American worker, all of which are essential to a prosperous and secure free world, and to achieve the objectives of national economic policy.

(2) The Congress finds that the persistence of inflationary pressures, and of a high rate of unemployment, the underutilization and obsolescence of production facilities, and the inadequacy of productivity are damaging to the effort to stabilize the economy.

(3) The Congress, therefore, finds a national need to increase economic productivity which depends on the effectiveness of management, the investment of capital for research, development, and advanced technology and on the training and motivation of the American worker.

(4) The Congress further finds that at a time when economic stabilization programs require price-wage restraints, management and labor have a strong mutual interest in containing "cost-push" inflation and increasing output per man-hour so that real wages may increase without causing increased prices, and that, without in any way infringing on the rights of management or labor, machinery should be provided for translating this mutuality of interest into voluntary action.

(b) It shall be the objective of the President's National Commission on Productivity (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission")—

(1) to enlist the cooperation of labor, management, and State and local governments, in a manner calculated to foster and promote increased productivity through free competitive enterprise toward the implementation of the national policy declared in the Employment Act of 1946 to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power";

(2) to promote the maintenance and improvement of worker motivation and to enlist community interest in increasing productivity and reducing waste;

(3) to promote the more effective use of labor and management personnel in the interest of increased productivity;

(4) to promote sound wage and price policies in the public interest, and to seek to accomplish that objective within a climate of cooperation and understanding between labor, management, and the public, and within a framework of peaceful labor-management relations and free and responsible collective bargaining;

(5) to promote policies designed to insure that United States products are competitive in domestic and world markets;

(6) to develop programs to deal with the social and economic problems of employees adversely affected by automation or other technological change or the relocation of industries.

(c)(1) It shall be the duty and function of the Commission, in order to achieve the objectives set forth in subsection (b) of this section, to encourage and assist in the organization and the work of labor-management-public committees and similar groups on a plant, community, regional, and industry basis. Such assistance shall include aid—

(A) in the development of apprenticeship, training, retraining, and other programs for employee and management education for development of greater upgraded and more diversified skills;

(B) in the formulation of programs designed to reduce waste and absenteeism and to improve employee safety and health;

(C) in the revision of building codes and other local ordinances and laws, in order to keep them continuously responsive to current economic conditions;

(D) in planning for provision of adequate transportation for employees;

(E) in the exploration of means to expand exports of the products of United States industry;

(F) in the development, initiation, and expansion of employee incentive compensation, profit-sharing and stockownership systems and other production incentive programs;

(G) in the dissemination of technical information and other material to publicize its work and objectives;

(H) to encourage studies of techniques and programs similar to those in paragraphs (A) to (G) of this subsection, as they are applied in foreign countries; and

(I) in the dissemination of information and analyses concerning the economic opportunities and outlook in various regions and communities, and of information on industrial techniques designed for the increase of productivity.

(2) The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year an annual report of its previous year's activities under this Act.

(3) The Commission shall perform such other functions, consistent with the foregoing, as it determines to be appropriate and necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in subsection (b) of this section.

(d)(1) In exercising its duties and functions under this Act—

(A) the Commission may consult with such representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, organizations, and individuals as it deems advisable to insure the participation of such interested parties;

(B) the Commission shall, to the extent possible, use the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as the President may direct as well as of private agencies and professional experts in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided;

(C) the Commission shall coordinate such services and facilities referred to in subsection (B) above in order to supply technical and administrative assistance to labor-management-public committees and similar groups referred to in subsection (c)(1);

(D) the Commission shall establish the regional offices and such local offices as it deems necessary;

(E) the Commission shall hold regional and industrywide conferences to formulate ideas and programs for the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in subsection (C);

(F) the Commission may formulate model programs to ameliorate the effects of unemployment caused by technological progress;

(G) the Commission may furnish assistance to parties in collective bargaining entering into collective bargaining agreements; and

(H) the Commission may review collective bargaining agreements already in effect or those being negotiated to ascertain their effects on productivity; and it may have the power to make recommendations with respect to the agreements made or about to be made in specific industries.

(2) The Commission may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs which it deems desirable or for its general activities.

(e)(1) The Executive Director of the Commission shall be the principal executive officer of the Commission in carrying out the objectives, functions, duties and powers of the Commission described in subsections (b) through (d) of this section.

(2) The Executive Director of the Commission, with the approval of the Chairman of the Commission, is authorized (A) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and prescribe their functions and duties, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and (B) to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section during the period ending April 30, 1973.

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title and agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
H. REUSS,
F. J. ST GERMAIN,
JOSEPH G. MINISH,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
J. WILLIAM STANTON,
GARRY BROWN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
ALAN CRANSTON,
JOHN TOWER,
BOB PACKWOOD,
W. V. ROTH, JR.,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2891) to amend and extend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment.

The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for clarifying, clerical, and conforming changes, the differences are noted below.

The Senate version of the bill contained a statement of Congressional findings. The House bill contained a similar provision except that it contained a reference regarding the need to stabilize Federal taxes and expenditures and a statement relating to a balanced budget. The House receded to the Senate provision.

The House bill authorized the President to stabilize Federal expenditures and finance charges in connection with the extension of credit. There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill. The House receded to the Senate.

The House bill authorized the President to stabilize prices, wages, rents and salaries at levels not less than those prevailing May 25, 1970 or at such other levels as the President deemed appropriate to achieve appropriate economic growth and to carry out the purposes of the Title. The Senate bill contained similar authority except that prices, wages, salaries or rents could be stabilized below those prevailing May 25, 1970, when necessary to eliminate windfall profits. The conferees accepted the Senate provision with an amendment providing that prices, wages, salaries or rents could be stabilized below levels prevailing on May 25, 1970, when otherwise required to carry out the purposes of this Title.

The House bill gave the President discretionary authority to issue orders and regulations providing for adjustments and exceptions to the price and wage controls to prevent gross inequities. The Senate bill required the President to provide for such adjustments. The conferees agreed to the Senate provision.

The Senate bill required that stabilization orders or regulations must be consistent with the standards issued by the President under Section 203(b). No comparable was included in the House bill. The conferees accepted the Senate provision.

The House bill provided that wage controls will not apply to individuals whose wages are substandard or to the working poor. The Senate bill contained similar language except that the term "working poor" was not included. Moreover, the Senate bill defined substandard earnings to mean no less than those prescribed as the poverty level by the Office of Management and Budget. The conferees agreed to the House provision.

The House bill required the President to stabilize interest rates and finance charges whenever the price and wage control authority was invoked with respect to a significant segment of the economy, unless the President issued a determination together with his reasons that such regulations or orders are not necessary to maintain such rates and charges at levels consonant with economic growth. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conferees agreed to the House provision.

The House bill contained a provision exempting certain pension and other retirement plans which qualify for special tax treatment under the Internal Revenue Code. The Senate bill made no reference to retirement plans which qualify for special tax treatment under the Internal Revenue Code, and instead provided that the terms "wages" and "salaries" do not include contributions by any employer pursuant to a compensation adjustment (affecting less than 1,000 employees) for any pension, profit-sharing, annuity, savings, insurance, or health plan, unless the President determines that the contributions made by any such employer are unreasonably inconsistent with the standards issued by the President to serve as guides for determining appropriate levels of wages and salaries. The Conference agreed upon a compromise between the two provisions which would exempt employer contributions to pension, profit-sharing, or annuity and savings plans, which meet the requirements of Sections 401(a), 404(a)(2), or 403(b), of the Internal Code; to a group insurance plan; or to a disability or health insurance plan.

It is the intention of the Managers that employer contributions, as defined in subsection 203(f), shall not as a general rule be defined as "wages" and "salaries" for the purposes of the stabilization guidelines established under the authority of this title. The Managers believe that the general wage

and salary guidelines might otherwise discourage the establishment of new plans and the liberalization of existing plans covering various fringe benefits.

The Senate bill contained a provision that nothing in this title would prevent increases in wages or extensions in coverage pursuant to future amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, executive agency pay, and certain employee incentive programs. The House bill contained no such provision. The conferees accepted the Senate provision.

The Senate bill contained a provision exempting the press and related media from the authority to control prices and wages. The house bill contained no such provision. The Senate receded to the House.

The House bill provided that the President shall take no action under the title which directly or indirectly impairs or detracts from the protections guaranteed by the First Amendment. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The House conferees receded to the Senate.

The House bill contained a provision prohibiting exceptions concerning the control of rents. The Senate version of the bill contained no such provision. The Conferees accepted the House provision with an amendment making it clear that an exception from the stabilization program could not be made solely on the basis that the rents were regulated by State or political subdivisions thereof.

The Senate bill required, with certain exceptions, Senate confirmation of members of the boards, commissions and similar entities established by the President to carry out the purposes of this Act. The House bill contained no such provisions. The Conferees agreed to accept the Senate provisions.

The House bill contained a provision that legal authority would be placed in the chairmen of the boards, commissions or similar entities but required such chairmen to act only in accordance with the majority vote of the members. The Senate bill contained a similar provision but did not require a majority vote of the members. The Conferees accepted the House provision.

The House bill contained a provision authorizing the use of agency funds for the performance of functions under the Act. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The House receded.

The House bill contained a provision authorizing the use of confidential information by other executive departments, agencies and other establishments of the Federal Government for use in matters officially before them. The Senate bill did not contain such a provision. The House receded to the Senate.

The Senate bill contained a provision requiring a statement that there had been consultation with affected parties in the formulation of regulations issued under this Act or that such consultation was impracticable. The House bill contained no such provision. The Senate receded from its provision.

The House bill required the President to establish local protest boards throughout the United States. The Senate bill contained a provision which required each agency authorized to issue regulations and orders to establish procedures which make available to any person the opportunity to seek interpretations, exceptions and exemptions in connection with such regulations and orders issued. The Conferees agreed to accept the Senate provision. The Conferees did agree, however, that individuals should have every opportunity to have information and interpretations given to them at the local level.

The Senate bill required the President to conduct formal hearings with respect to a change or proposed change in wages, salaries, prices, rents, interest rates or corporate dividends. The House bill contained no such a provision. The House agreed to accept the Senate provision with an amendment which would require hearings only on matters that are of such importance so as to have a significant effect on the economy.

The House bill required the President to establish a board to study, evaluate and report quarterly to the Congress on the relationship between excess profits, the stabilization of the economy and the creation of new jobs. The Senate bill contained a provision which required the President to include a section in the Economic Report describing the actions taken under this Act and to transmit quarterly reports to the Congress describing such actions taken under the Act. The Conferees amended the Senate version to require that the Economic Report and quarterly reports contain sections concerning the relationship between excess profits, the stabilization of the economy and the creation of new jobs but did not require the establishment of a separate board for making such reports as was provided in the House bill.

The Senate bill contained a section providing that regulations issued under the Act shall, insofar as practicable, be designed to encourage labor-management cooperation for the purpose of achieving increased productivity. It also provided for consultation with the Executive Director of the National Commission on Productivity when appropriate in the formulation of such policies and regulations. No similar provision was contained in the House bill. The Conference Report contains the Senate Language.

The House bill authorized consumers to bring suits to recover three times the amount of the transaction from anyone willfully violating the price control regulations. The Senate bill contained a similar provision, but authorized suits for damages three times the amount of the overcharge. The conferees agreed to the Senate provision.

The House bill provided that in the case of an overcharge which is not willful, no action for an overcharge may be brought unless the plaintiff has first presented a claim for a refund and has not received repayment from the seller within ninety days. The House bill also provided that the term "willful" shall have the same meaning as in the case of criminal willfulness. The Senate bill contained a comparable provision except that it applied to violations whether or not willful and required repayment within a resonable period of time as opposed to ninety days. The Conferees accepted the House provisions.

The Conferees adopted the Senate provisions relating to the judicial procedures applicable to the administration of this Act. The Senate provisions in significant part were:

(1) exclusive jurisdiction of cases arising under this Act shall lie in the United States district courts, and such cases shall not be subject to any limitation with respect to amount in controversy;

(2) permits other courts of competent jurisdiction to determine issues relating to the Act when such issues are raised by way of defense, other than a defense based on the constitutionality of the Act or the validity of action taken by any agency under the Act;

(3) creates a Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all appeals arising under the Act, and over all constitutional questions involving the Act or the validity of any regulation or order issued thereunder;

(4) the district court must certify all constitutional questions arising under the Act or questions involving the validity of any regulation or order issued thereunder; the injunctive authority of the district court is limited to enjoining temporarily or permanently the application of a particular regulation or order to a person who is a party to litigation before it; and

(5) the grounds requisite for invalidating a regulation or order are those listed in 5 USC 706(2).

The House bill differed from the Senate bill in this regard principally in that it gave no jurisdiction to any courts other than those in the federal system; it gave no injunctive authority to the district courts; and it restricted the scope of judicial review to only "excessive authority" and "arbitrary and capricious" criteria for regulations and, in the case of an order, to "excessive authority" and "not supported by substantial evidence" criteria. The Conferees felt that the Senate provisions would facilitate efficient and equitable administration of the Act.

The House bill authorized the appointment of up to 20 supergrade positions without respect to the Civil Service laws. The Senate bill authorized 40 such positions. The conferees accepted the House provision.

The Senate bill stated that it is the sense of Congress that small business enterprises should be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of the title. The Small Business Administration is directed to provide small business enterprises with information on the stabilization program. The Senate bill also provided that small business enterprises should be exempted from the stabilization program where feasible. No comparable provisions were contained in the House bill. The conferees agreed to the Senate provisions.

The House bill provided that no company or other entity constituting a public benefit corporation charged by law or contract with the responsibility to operate a mass transportation facility shall increase any fare without first obtaining approval from the President. No comparable provision was contained in the Senate bill. The conferees agreed to the House provision with an amendment specifying that mass transportation companies regulated by a rate making authority would not be covered.

The Senate and House bills each contained provisions regarding the payment of wage increases contracted prior to August 15, 1971 and falling due between that date and November 13, 1971.

The Senate bill provided that such retroactive pay would be permitted if the President determined that the increase is not unreasonably inconsistent with the standards for wage and salary increases issued under the program. The House bill required such retroactive payments if the President determined that prices have been advanced, productivity increased, taxes have been raised, appropriations have been made or funds have otherwise been raised or provided in order to cover such increases. The House bill also extended this provision to wage increases falling due after Nov. 13, 1971.

The conferees agreed to both the Senate and House provisions with respect to retroactive pay. The conferees intended to require retroactive and deferred pay under either the House provisions or the Senate provisions, whichever provision would authorize such payments to be made. The conferees also intended that the provisions relating to employment contracts also apply to wage increases which were scheduled to be paid as a result of an agreement or an established practice but which were not allowed to go into effect because of the 90-day freeze or subsequent controls issued under the authority of this title.

The Senate bill contained a provision which authorizes comparability adjustments in the rates of pay of each Federal pay system covered by the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970, to be placed into effect on the first day of the first pay period that begins on or after January 1, 1972, notwithstanding the provisions of the alternative pay plan submitted by the President to the Congress on August 31, 1971. The amount of such increases may not exceed the 5.5 percent ceiling established as a guideline by the Pay

Board. The House bill contained no such provision. The conferees adopted the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

It is intended that the comparability adjustments be made not only in the "statutory pay systems", as that term is defined under 5 U.S.C. 5301(c), to include the General Schedule, the Foreign Service, and the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, but also in all other Federal pay systems covered by the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970.

The other pay systems are those under which rates of pay are fixed by administrative action under 5 U.S.C. 5307, which includes all such employees in the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Branches (except employees whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives) and employees of the government of the District of Columbia. In addition, it includes certain employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and employees of County Committees established under 16 U.S.C. 590h(b).

Comparability adjustments also are authorized under sections 4 and 5 of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 for employees whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives. The January, 1972, adjustment authorized by the provisions of this section will apply also to these employees.

In addition to comparability adjustments in rates of pay, the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 also authorizes comparable adjustments in minimum and maximum rates of pay, and in monetary limitations on, or monetary allowances for, pay applicable to certain classes of employees. It is intended that such limitations and allowances also be adjusted under the authority of this section.

The provision in the Conference Report requires that the comparability adjustments in pay, and the adjustments in monetary limitations or allowances, be placed into effect on the first day of the first pay period that begins on or after January 1, 1972. It is intended that this effective date will apply to all employees who are entitled to receive comparability adjustments under this legislation, including legislative employees covered by sections 4 and 5 of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970.

Both bills contained a section establishing a National Productivity Commission to develop a National Productivity Policy. The House bill authorized $10 million to be appropriated to carry out the work of the commission. The Senate bill authorized the commission to be financed through funds appropriated pursuant to the overall stabilization program. The conferees accepted the House provision with the proviso that the funds appropriated shall not exceed $10 million.

The title of the House bill stated that it was "An Act to Extend and Amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, As Amended, and for Other Purposes". The title of the Senate bill read as follows: "An Act to Extend and Amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970". The conferees accepted the House title.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR SULLIVAN,
H. REUSS,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
JOSEPH G. MINISH,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
J. WILLIAM STANTON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
ALAN CRANSTON,
JOHN TOWER,
BOB PACKWOOD,
W. V. ROTH, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PROJECT CHANGE

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, formal education, as we all know, is a dynamic, highly fluid approach to the acquisition of knowledge. Yesterday's materials and methods are outmoded today, just as today's materials and techniques will be insufficient tomorrow.

In the spirit of education as an adventure, and a challenge in knowledge. Project Change is pioneering developments in the field of early childhood education. Marked by careful experiment and accurate projection, the program is aimed at a better quality education for our youngest educational population.

I would like to enter into the RECORD an article from the State University of New York News which appeared in the October 18 issue. It explains in greater detail, the history and purpose of Project Change.

ONE HUNDRED FORTY-SIX THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY DOLLAR GRANT FUNDS CORTLAND'S PROJECT CHANGE

Project Change, an early childhood education project at the College at Cortland, has been refunded for the 1971–72 academic year with a $146,280 grant from the U.S. Office of Education. It is the largest single grant for an educational project ever received at Cortland, according to President Richard C. Jones.

The grant has been awarded under terms of the Educational Professional Development Act through the Research Foundation of State University of New York. Through similar arrangements, Project Change was funded initially last summer with a $29,809 grant.

A program to develop and implement a team training program for professionals and paraprofessionals in early childhood education, Project Change at the same time seeks to develop, implement and evaluate a "model" learning environment for children three to eight years old that will better serve the needs of the area, including those of rural disadvantaged youngsters.

Project Change utilizes the facilities of the Education Division at the college, including the Campus-Laboratory School which has 425 pupils enrolled in an ungraded program for children 3 to 11 years old. The Campus School functions as one of several "learning laboratories" where teachers can translate theory and research into teaching experiences with young children.

Dr. Thomas Lickona, director of Project Change, explains that one of the primary objectives of the program is to get public school people interacting with the college in objectively evaluating teaching methods and early childhood curricula. He points out that Project Change is interested in getting new ideas and proposals into the hands of public school teachers for their consideration.

A significant step for Project Change was the selection of 10 preschool and elementary teachers from the Central New York area to participate in the Project as candidates for a master's degree with a specialization in early childhood education. The ten teachers, each receiving a federal stipend, have obtained leaves of absences from their respective schools for 1971–72 and will be trained with paraprofessionals as teaching teams.

As an integral part of this training program, the 10 will return to their schools where they will share their experiences with other teachers and begin to implement new programs.

Dr. Lickona believes that Project Change should live up to its name. "Programs should be constantly changing to keep pace with the new knowledge and information that educators have derived from research, studies and observation," he said. "Project Change is designed to bring people together to foster change, to create new approaches and to evaluate results. The whole program is designed to be self-renewing with heavy emphasis on pupil feedback before, during and after a course. The major beneficiaries in this undertaking will be the children."

A number of new courses have been devised for the master's degree candidates beginning the Project Change program this year. They are designed to examine such areas as individual differences in the classroom, environmental systems and their effect on learning ability, comparisons of different learning approaches in early childhood education, and teacher strategies in developing a total educational environment by working with other teachers, parents and administrators.

As part of the course in teacher strategies, Project Change will schedule regular teacher-administrator seminars at the College which will bring teachers and their principals and Project Change staff together to talk about how things look from different sides of the fence.

The focus of Project Change is a nine-county region in Central New York. Public school officials are cooperating with the Project from these counties: Broome, Cayuga, Chenango, Cortland, Madison, Onondaga, Seneca, Tioga and Tompkins. Also participating in the launching of the program last year were officials from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Finger Lakes Regional Planning Commission, and a number of other community agencies.

H.R. 12208—CABINET COMMITTEE FOR ASIAN AMERICAN AFFAIRS

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a myth in our country regarding the welfare and the well-being of Asian Americans. The myth perpetuates the idea that Asian Americans are not subjected to bigotry and prejudice, that they have fully realized the American dream, and that there is no need to be concerned for their welfare.

While it is true that Asian Americans have surmounted legal, economic, political, educational, and social barriers, the facts indicate that, in all too many instances, the remnants of prejudice and bigotry still pervade our society and that the Federal Government should be aware of the problems confronting the Asian American community.

HISTORIC VIEW

Thanks largely to the efforts of Chairman HOLIFIELD and Congressman MATSUNAGA, many Americans were made aware of the tragic history of the incarceration of the Japanese Americans during World War II. We have done much to repudiate the over 500 Federal, State, and local laws and ordinances directed against Japanese-Americans in 1941. We have done much to repudiate the philosophy which allowed the evacuation of 110,000 Japanese-Americans and allowed their imprisonment in refugee camps.

But, what do we know about the prejudice that occurred after the war? What do we know about the effect of imprisonment on Japanese-American culture?

We know that as a percentage of the population, more Japanese-Americans served in combat in World War II than any other American nationality. But despite their heroic efforts in defense of their adopted country, hatred still existed.

They returned to their homes and farms to find that they had been confiscated.

They returned, not to a well-deserved hero's welcome, but rather to find that Japanese-American names had been stricken from community-sponsored plaques and monuments that were placed to honor American war dead.

They returned to find that camp life had broken down the heretofore greatest strength of the Japanese-American group—family unity.

They found that family discipline, the keystone of Japanese-American social control, was eliminated by the communal living imposed by evacuation.

The culminating effect of evacuation was the devastation of Japanese-American family life and social control.

History has not only been unjust to the Japanese-American, but it has also unjustly treated other Asian American groups.

THE FILIPINO

Filipinos were brought to America in order to meet an acute need for cheap farm labor and, like his Asian brothers—the Japanese and Chinese—he was subjected to exploitation.

In the late 1920's, as the depression approached and the competition for jobs increased, an anti-Filipino feeling developed which resulted in riots against the Filipino in Watsonville, Exeter, and Tulare, Calif.; in Yakima, Wash. According to the Filipino-American position paper, in Los Angeles, the chamber of commerce described Filipinos as the "most worthless, unscrupulous, shiftless, diseased semibarbarian that ever came to our shores." Again, according to the paper, in San Francisco, a judge called Filipinos "savages who were taking the jobs and women from decent white boys."

This prejudice has carried over until today.

THE KOREAN

The ability and ingenuity of Korean immigrants was never realized due to educational, cultural, and language barriers. The resource brought to this country by Korean-Americans has never been tapped to its full potential.

THE CHINESE

Like other Asian Americans, the Chinese who came to America have met problems that have resulted in their exclusion from all the rights and benefits of American citizens.

Today, due partly to the historic conditions, and partly to the recent influx of Asians to America, the Asian American communities are plagued by problems approaching crisis proportions.

THE AGED

Elderly Asian Americans perhaps face the most severe problems in the community.

According to the recent White House Conference on Aging, "elderly Asian Americans are suffering from unprecedented problems that are devastating the lives of these aged people."

Because of the language barrier and the lack of bilingual staff in social services agencies, the elder Asian American is not acquainted with the available benefits such as social security, old-age assistance, health care, housing, and recreation.

When we realize that the suicide rate among Asian American elderly in certain areas is three times the national average, when we realize that studies show that 34 percent of Asian American elderly have never had a medical or dental examination, it should be obvious that the problems facing Asian American aged are, according to the White House Conference, "over-whelming to the point that it is impossible for Asian American aged to look only to their families for help."

The problems of the aged are particularly acute with the Filipino American. The median age of the Filipino American is 40.9 years, compared to 26.6 for whites.

But, what is the Federal Government doing in the Asian American community to relieve this problem?

Between 1969–71, grants to communities to aid the aged totaled $32 million. According to the White House Conference, "of this $32 million, not $1 was given to Asian American communities for their aged problems." The reason for this lack of assistance goes back to the myth that Asian Americans do not need Federal help. Again, according to the conference, the reasons for the lack of Federal help. "according to government officials, Asian Americans don't have problems."

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that elderly Asian Americans have unique problems, problems unlike those encountered by other groups, problems that must be solved by Federal action.

YOUTH

As in all countries, the hope of the future rests with the younger generation. Yet, in the Asian American community, the young are not receiving the special attention that should be accorded the leaders of the future.

Like other communities, the Asian American community has been wracked by drugs. Last year, in one section of Los Angeles alone, at least a dozen deaths of Asian American youth were attributed to the overdose of drugs.

In order to meet the needs of rising expectations, Asian American children must receive a quality education—an education designed to bring the Asian American economic and social success.

This has not been the case in the past.

According to a 1965 study by the California Department of Industrial Relations, median school years completed by Filipino Americans was 8.7 years.

Perhaps the reason for this alarming drop-out rate is the language barrier. Obviously, it is difficult, if not impossible, to compete if the language is not understood.

The New York City Chinatown Planning Council estimates that 90 percent of new arrivals to the United States do not understand spoken English. And, in San Francisco Chinatown, over 70 percent of the new population lack a knowledge of English.

In Pasadena, Calif., 15 percent of the Japanese-Americans in the school system identify Japanese as their first language.

But, the myth that Asian Americans "do not have problems" persists. Programs are not aimed at helping Asian Americans. Research has not been conducted to determine the depth of these problems.

In fact, from 1969 to 1971, HEW authorized $30.7 million in research and demonstration grants to minority communities for child welfare, rehabilitation, and special health projects, but none of these grants were made available to Asian American communities.

No doubt, the Asian American has been discouraged and frustrated by the lack of Government empathy. They see Federal programs helping other minorities, but they are neglected. They see that special college programs, designed for minorities from disadvantaged areas, are not available to Asian Americans.

While last year only five Filipino Americans from the Seattle area graduated from the three local universities, the Government continues to turn its back on the needs of the Asian American student largely due to the myth that "all Asian Americans students do well in school and, thus, do not need Government help."

It is particularly disturbing when we realize the Emergency Desegregation Act, as recomended by the administration in 1970, by definition, excluded Asian American communities from the benefits of this act—despite the fact that schools in Asian American communities are in desperate need of Federal assistance.

Fortunately, the Congress corrected this oversight, and allowed Federal funds to aid the schools in the Asian American community.

EMPLOYMENT

Contrary to public opinion, the Asian American, like other minority groups, experiences prejudice in the job market.

The 1965 study by the California Department of Industrial Relations found that the Filipino American at $2,925 had the lowest annual income of any ethnic group in the State.

For those who are eminently well-qualified, for those who have overcome

the barriers to quality education, advancement is stifled even by the Federal Government.

Over 21,000 Asian Americans work for the Federal Government. This represents 0.81 percent of the Federal work force, but for the higher grades, the Asian American is excluded.

Only 0.12 percent of the GS–15 to GS–18 Federal workers are Asian American.

Out of 1,652 GS–18 and GS–18 positions, only four are Asian American.

In the Postal Field Service, only one Asian American is as high as a level 16.

In the total wage system, out of a total of 543,912 employees, only two Asian Americans earn over $18,000 a year and none earns as much as $22,000.

Mr. Speaker, this lack of advancement in the public sector no doubt carries over in the private sector of the economy, but there is a noticeable lack of available information on job hiring procedures.

CONCLUSION

Only Federal action, with its inherent nationwide approach can begin to investigate, isolate, and correct the inequities and problems relating to the Asian American population.

In order to correct the inequities that face the Asian American, in order to focus Federal attention on the special needs and problems in the Asian American community, Congressman MATSUNAGA and I are today introducing a bill H.R. 12208, which would create a meaningful and effective Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs.

The draft of this legislation was submitted by the Japanese American Citizens League after their discussions with other Asian American groups.

The bill, H.R. 12208, includes such far-reaching provisions as authority to issue cease and desist orders to those practicing discriminatory action against Asian Americans, subpena powers, regional offices, authority to conduct intensive surveys to determine Asian American community needs, a high level staff, and the authority to investigate and act on charges of discriminatory actions on the part of the various Federal departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the counsel and guidance that I have received from Mike Masaoka, and Dave Ushio has been especially helpful. Also, I would like to thank the Reverend Peter Kwon of the Korean American Social, Health, and Education Society of Southern California for his research on the problems confronting Korean Americans.

In the Filipino American community, the efforts, the experience and the recommendations of Frederic A. Cordova, Peter M. Jamero, A. Barretto Ogilvie, Robert N. Santos, Silvistre Tangalin, Andres B. Tangalin, and Dale Tiffany are especially appreciated.

GRAIN TRADING AND H.R. 1163

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House action late last Wednesday night to pass H.R. 1163 to bolster the sagging grain markets by creating a strategic grain reserve and increasing the loan rates by 25 percent was a good positive step but the bill so far has not cleared the Senate Agriculture Committee. Senator JORDAN of North Carolina will call up the bill tomorrow in his subcommittee and hopefully will report it favorably.

Grain farmers need relief now in the marketplace, and it was our intention and our hopes to complete passage prior to adjournment this year. Every day that passes with low grain prices further aggravates a poor farm economy and causes additional losses for farmers who must sell their grain in order to make payments on their indebtedness or pay their bills before the end of the year.

If the Senate would act promptly to pass the bill and the President sign the bill, we would improve the income for producers for sales on their 1971 crop by close to $1½ billion. A portion of this crop has already been sold or the total increase for American grain farmers for the crop would exceed $2 billion. Of course the 1972 crop would have the full benefit of the stronger price structure worth $2 billion over the current values of their crops. The margin will still be narrow because the improvement in grain prices will still leave the market at below 1970's crop prices for corn and grain sorghum and moderately higher for wheat. All in all the average floor prices for all grains would be at a level which would not cause any increase in food costs but which would help the grain farmers.

Thursday, December 9 when the grain future's trading markets opened, corn, wheat and other grains showed substantial strength and advances. An increase in grain markets is appreciated by almost everyone but traders who speculate, gambling on the short side that prices will decline. On that day, December 9, there were 106 million bushels of wheat on open contracts, 263 million bushels of corn on open contracts and a small amount of oats and grain sorghum on open contract. For speculators who are trading in these contracts and selling short without actually owning the grain, anything that would bolster the grain markets would be bad news for them. These particular traders would probably view passage of H.R. 1163 as bad news and contrary to their interests since they have gambled on the side of poor and declining grain market.

The Commodity Exchange Authority supervises trading of grains on boards of trade and grain exchanges and requires that trading of any large volume and speculative interests of any large volume be reported to them daily. This information is confidential but section 12, title 7 of the United States Code requires the Commodity Exchange Authority to provide information to the appropriate committees of Congress when called for. The House Agriculture Committee should ask the Commodity Exchange Authority to provide the data to the committee concerning the open contracts for wheat, corn and grain sorghum for the past week to determine who in the grain trade may have unusual interest in the legislation which would affect grain prices.

MILLS PRESIDENTIAL BID WELL RECEIVED IN COLORADO-WYOMING

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Ways and Means Chairman WILBUR MILLS was a featured star of the well attended function in Pueblo and in Denver in behalf of my colleague FRANK EVANS and the Democratic Party of Colorado.

On Saturday, December 11, Chairman MILLS came to my State of Wyoming for a press conference regarding his Presidential bid, and a fruitful meeting with the Democratic Party members of my State.

That evening at Cheyenne's famous Hitching Post WILBUR MILLS was the honored speaker at a banquet attended by more than 560 persons, an outstanding turnout for any political affair in any State, let alone for the State of Wyoming so justly famous for its high altitudes but low multitudes.

WILBUR MILLS fielded numerous questions for well over 45 minutes on a wide range of relevant issues on which next year's presidential election will be based

Even the usually reserved elements of our Democratic Party, our progressive and labor leaders of Western States, came away from these meetings with a newly discovered appreciation of the WILBUR MILLS appeal to the people of America.

Said several of Wyoming's outstanding leaders:

I am favorably reassessing this great man and the impact he can have on a victorious Democratic ticket next year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what Chairman WILBUR MILLS' intentions may be regarding those States with Democratic presidential primaries, but I do know that in States such as in Colorado and Wyoming where delegate selection will be left to the people of the party, WILBUR MILLS is making great strides.

His calm, judicious, knowledgeable strength appeals to the people of the party. I believe his trip to the Rocky Mountain States of Colorado and Wyoming this weekend will assure WILBUR MILLS delegate support in those States and in the remaining eight States of the Rocky Mountain region.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted by the House I was absent on official business during rollcall No. 372 on H.R. 10729. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PRAYER VIGIL FOR OUR POW'S

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have been inspired and gratified by the concern of

the American people in the plight of our men in prisoner of war camps.

The deep sincerity is evidenced, for instance, by the First Church of the Open Bible in Ottumwa, Iowa, and Minister William R. Chilcote. In that church there is a series of services on Friday evenings, and continuing through the night with emphasis on prayer that our men will be released.

The spirit of this church and these services can be an example for all, especially in the season when we glorify the Prince of Peace.

CABINET DRAFTS CABLE POLICY FOR NIXON

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, this week's edition of Television Digest carries an article entitled "Cabinet Drafts Cable Policy for Nixon" which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. The article summarizes the "near-final version" of the options the Cabinet-level cable TV committee will recommend to President Nixon concerning a new national cable television policy.

I would hope that the Cabinet-level committee will report the final version of their report as soon as possible. If the Congress holds hearings on the cable question in the early part of 1972, we must certainly have all the alternatives in front of us. The article follows:

CABINET DRAFTS CABLE POLICY FOR NIXON

Cabinet-level cable TV committee is prepared to recommend to President Nixon new national policy falling between FCC's proposals and a strictly common-carrier structure. Intensely awaited report, coming soon after OTP mediated "short-term" cable compromise and while FCC is putting compromise into rules, will have powerful impact on direction cable communications will take in next 10 years.

Though Cabinet committee report isn't quite final, Television Digest reports herewith a summary of near-final version. Four options have been prepared for Nixon's consideration, and unless there's drastic change before presentation—and none is anticipated—Option III will be recommended. Texts of summaries of each option, with committee's lists of advantages & disadvantages of each, are printed below.

Central feature of Option III is restriction or outright separation of ownership & control of cable systems from program suppliers. Judgment of committee is that this separation reduces concentration of media-content control and therefore reduces need for govt. content regulation.

As you'll note from summaries below, committee believes Option I (FCC proposals) leads to media concentration & excessive govt. regulation. Option II (common-carrier ownership, with channel lessees licensed by FCC) is thought to curb innovation in industry and add unnecessarily detailed regulation. Option IV (minimum regulation, comparable with print media) is regarded as threatening viability of broadcasters and leading to antitrust problems.

While majority of committee favors Option III, it's understood that Herbert Klein, Nixon's Communications Dir., believes policy is still too tough on broadcasters. Commerce Secy. Maurice Stans takes opposite view, wants virtually all wraps off cable. These positions aren't surprising, in light of officials' "constituencies"—Klein's broadcasters and Stans' manufacturers, distributors & retailers.

It's believed committee recommendations will go to Nixon in Jan. Presumably, President will then urge Congress to adopt legislation implementing policy. At about same time, FCC's final rules should be available—and also will be weighed by Congress. Thus, you can anticipate some crucial hearings by Commerce Committees, by Judiciary Committees (copyright), perhaps others. Congress certainly won't lack for advice. Latest private-sector recommendation comes from Sloan Commission on Cable Communications.

(FCC began discussion of rules last week, with briefing by members of Cable TV Bureau [CTB]. Broadcasters charged, meanwhile, that they'd been given to understand that rules would be drafted by Commission staffers not in CTB. Some broadcasters claim that proposed rules violate compromise. For example, they say, proposals would allow "cherry-picking" & "leapfrogging" in smaller markets, in violation of agreement; would give no protection when 2 news feeds or time-zone problems are involved; would include cable viewers in 2% "significant viewing formula, instead of off-air viewers only; would permit cable systems to ignore exclusivity while they have waiver petitions pending, etc.)

Members of Cabinet committee: OTP Dir. Clay T. Whitehead, chmn.; Stans; Klein; HUD Secy. Romney; HEW Secy. Richardson; White House aides Leonard Garment & Robert Finch. Herewith is summary of options to be presented to Nixon:

OPTION I

"Summary: Accept the present integrated control of content and distribution functions, characteristic of the broadcast, as the basis for cable TV development. Expand present regulatory controls on program content, service standards, and rates as a means of ensuring balanced programming, equitable treatment, and increased public services despite increased concentration of medium & message control with multi-channel cables.

"Advantages: Does not require the Administration to take on the effort & political risks associated with restructuring an industry through legislation. Attractive to many public interest groups. Allows cable TV to develop more rapidy than it has in the past.

"Disadvantages: Leads to much greater concentration of media control & detailed FCC content regulation than exists in the broadcast industry today. May actually slow the development of broadband services in smaller communities, due to inflexible public service obligations (free channels, excess capacity, 2-way capability). Threatens the continued vigor of the program creation industry by undermining its copyright protection and bringing it into the sphere of regulated industries. Threatens the economic viability of broadcast stations in smaller markets, without offering to replace the services they presently provide for rural viewers. Locks the CATV industry into a mold which will be very difficult to change later."

OPTION II

"Summary: Require complete separation of program supply & distribution functions as in the telephone industry; impose full public utility/common carrier regulation on the distribution function along the lines of telephone regulation, with substantial state control, and broadcast-type regulation & licensing of programmers (channel lessees) under FCC jurisdiction.

"Advantages: Allow the market to determine the level & rate of cable development. Creates incentives for specialized & localized program creation, and decreases the power of centralized national media. May foreclose exercise of monopoly power by local cable systems. Public utility regulation a comfortable concept to many who feel that public utility commissions do a good job.

"Disadvantages: May stifle innovation & progress in the industry. Introduces detailed regulation into an area which might be moderately well policed by competition."

OPTION III

"Summary: Restrict the ownership & control of multi-channel distribution systems by entities engaged in programming or other use of such facilities, in order to avoid excessive concentration of media control. Require nondiscriminatory access to the distribution channels to ensure First Amendment privileges, subject only to established statutes governing libel, obscenity, etc. Regulate none of the programming supply functions, and only those aspects of the distribution function where competition is unworkable.

"Advantages: Avoids the problems of private control & government regulation of mass media content which we now face in broadcasting. Allows the market to determine the level & rate of cable development. Creates incentives for specialized & localized program creation, and decreases the power of centralized national media. Creates opportunity for Presidential leadership in developing an innovative policy approach to a new communication medium, that avoids the need for heavy government regulation.

"Disadvantages: Not as bold a step as, for instance, a Presidential commitment to a wired nation. May produce more opportunities for expression of extreme or unpopular views. May inhibit somewhat the realization of monopoly profits which might otherwise attract more investment capital and encourage more rapid development of cable TV. May be difficult for many to accept due to its substantial departure from conventional regulatory practices."

OPTION IV

"Summary: Place no restrictions on the organization & development of the cable industry except those statutory restrictions which now govern copyright liability, antitrust considerations, and content (libel, obscenity, etc.).

"Advantages: Consistent with free enterprise economic philosophy. May result in more rapid cable development than other options. Keeps out of the regulatory sphere a new industry which need not be regulated.

"Disadvantages: Threatens continued availability of TV service and existing broadcast industry more than other options. Allows vertical integration, and thus possible First Amendment difficulties in content area, and severe antitrust difficulties in economics area. Doesn't recognize the right of subscribers to have service, or right of programmers to have access to the system."

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS CRITICIZES MANNER IN WHICH THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT HAS OPERATED ITS STABILIZATION PROGRAMS IN LAOS

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and the public an extremely revealing investigative report issued by the Committee on Government Operations which is based on hearings and studies by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee under my chairmanship. Copies of the report on U.S. Economic Assistance for Laos (House Rept. No. 92–718) are available from the subcommittee office—phone 53741.

In the report, we sharply criticized

the manner in which the Agency for International Development has operated its stabilization programs in Laos. We describe numerous cases of waste, inefficiency, and corruption and conclude that U.S. Government programs designed to stabilize the Laotian economy over the past 15 years have been basically uneconomical and have promoted fraud and corruption.

It is sad to say that our aid program for Laos has improved little, if at all, over the past 15 years. When we remove all the fancy veneer, the Foreign Exchange Operations Fund for Laos—which we created—is nothing more than a cash giveaway program chargeable to the American taxpayers. We have provided the Laotians some $125 million through FEOF but there has been absolutely no control over this vast expenditure of the taxpayers' money. Economy and efficiency have been casually tossed aside in an effort to balance the Laotian national budget, while the United States sinks deeper into debt and our own domestic economy flounders.

Just last month, a run on FEOF resulted in the United States contributing another $4 million to the Fund—$2 million of which is from appropriations yet to be enacted by this Congress. Gentlemen, we have absolutely no assurances that the very dollars which we are providing to FEOF are not directly supporting the Communists. Through FEOF, dollar exchange is available to anyone—Communist and non-Communist alike—for any purpose including capital flight and procurement of nonessential luxury goods from any source—including Communist countries.

We have purposely shown many classic examples of the waste in AID's stabilization programs in Laos. It is high time that we publicized AID's waste and inefficiency. I am quite certain that a half dozen expert investigators could show us many more AID programs which are just as wasteful as the Laos program. Over the years, unfortunately, we have barely scratched the surface on uncovering the waste and inefficiency in our foreign operations simply because we have not had the congressional investigators to do the job. It is little wonder that our foreign operations are conducted in this scandalous manner. A few dollars well invested would save us millions by elimination of this waste and inefficiency.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must make every effort to bring our overseas operations under control.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION DOES NOT HAVE CONTRACTS WITH ANY MINTS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1971, my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island Mr. ST GERMAIN, made the statement, which appears on page 44311 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the effect that he hopes that the authorizing and appropriating committees which handle the ARBC matters are going to look into the subject of "some very lucrative coinage contracts going out to certain mints in this country, and there are some pretty heavy profits involved. Mr. ST GERMAIN further states that he hopes that "if this be the case that the taxpayers will be repaid for the sums that have been spent for this before these fat profits are made by certain mints in this country."

I want to state that Mr. ST GERMAIN is in error. The ARBC has no contracts with any mints in this country and no mint is producing anything for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

Therefore, there are no taxpayer dollars involved and there are no taxpayer dollars that will, therefore, have to be repaid.

I believe that what has confused Mr. ST GERMAIN is the fact that some State bicentennial commissions, including the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission, have contracted with a private mint to produce sets of commemorative medals for the State bicentennial commissions. These medals have been sold to the general public and the bulk of the profits have accrued to the various State bicentennial commissions.

However, even in these transactions, taxpayer dollars were not involved. Rather, the State bicentennial commissions have actually saved taxpayer dollars by using the profits from the sale of the commemorative medals to run their commissions; otherwise, the necessary funds would have necessitated appropriations from the various State legislatures.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WILLIAMS-STEIGER ACT, A 6-MONTH REPORT, APRIL 28, 1971, TO OCTOBER 31, 1971

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor has just issued a unique report—a 6-month analysis of the progress that has been made under the new job safety law—the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act.

As we approach the first anniversary of this legislation, it is particularly important to review the quite remarkable efforts of the men and women in both the Labor Department and in the DHEW who have undertaken the important tasks given them by the Congress.

This report comes on the initiative of the Department of Labor which is itself unusual.

I am proud of the record of those responsible for implementing this new act. It is, of course, too early to be able to answer how effective the act will be in reducing accidents and deaths in the workplace. But it is fair to say that the initial standards, compliance officers, citations, and organization have built a solid foundation for the future.

There remains much to be done, and any law of this scope causes some problems for all concerned.

One of the complaints I have heard relates to the extensive recordkeeping requirements. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, during our hearings it became apparent that the records available to us were not as accurate or complete as they should be. Thus, an integral part of the Williams-Steiger Act is the requirement for up-to-date, complete data on workplace injuries and accidents. In the future our hope is that with more complete information we will better be able to judge the progress being made under the act.

Another controversy revolves around the role of the States. Clearly it was the intent of the Congress that the States play an important role in cooperating with the Federal Government. The Department of Labor's guidelines for State plans accurately reflect the congressional intent that a State have an opportunity to develop a State plan which allows for innovation while assuring that all protections and rights will be at least as effective as those outlined in the statute. I believe it is crucial to use the resources and talents available in many States under approved plans. Only in this way can we assure the additional resources that are required to effectively and fully combat injuries and deaths on the job.

I urge my colleagues to read this 6-month report. It represents the beginning of an act which has had and will have a profound impact on the workplace environment and reflects a record which I hope will make possible further support for and confidence in the implementation of this new act.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 10, 1971.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: As a result of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, P.L. 91-596, the Department of Labor created the Occupational Safety and Health Administration on April 28. After six months of effort, I feel that this is an appropriate time to briefly tell you what has been done to improve job safety and health. A more detailed report is enclosed together with copies of the most significant materials that have been developed.

The first tasks were to issue occupational safety and health standards and to create an organization to administer and enforce the Act. The initial standards package was published in the May 29 Federal Register. For general industry, this includes established Federal standards and some national consensus standards. A ninety-day familiarization period ending August 27 was built into these to give industry a chance to make necessary changes before the standards became effective. In addition, established standards for the maritime and construction industries have been adopted under the Act. In creating the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) we have concentrated on recruiting and training the compliance staff with a field organization of ten regions and forty-eight area offices; working with employers and employees to inform them about the Act and to encourage voluntary compliance; emphasizing occupational safety and health programs in five target industries with high injury frequency rates; and improving Federal agency programs. Through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a new, nationwide injury and illness reporting system is being implemented.

Through October 9, 300 inspections have been made, covering establishments employing more than 1.5 million workers. Stress is

placed on investigating fatalities and catastrophes, on responding to employee complaints, and on inspecting the five target industries. In addition, we are inspecting a broad cross-section of all industries and size establishments to attain the maximum impact.

Enforcement actions have disclosed 19,578 violations with penalties proposed amounting to $361,692. One hundred and thirty citations have been contested with the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission through the end of October .

As required by the Act, we are working closely with the States to aid and encourage them to develop their own occupational safety and health programs which are "at least as effective as" the Federal efforts. All fifty States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have indicated an interest in developing operating plans under the Act. To aid in planning, grants totaling $4.7 million have been made to forty-six States so far. Eight States are also performing inspections in the target industries for us. We now estimate that about half of the States will submit approvable plans before the end of fiscal year 1973.

Because the Act is general in nature, the Department recognizes the extreme importance of coordinating its efforts with those of other Federal agencies to avoid duplication. In particular, we are working closely with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to ensure that there is a unified Federal program effort.

In short, we have come a long way and have laid the groundwork for real improvement in safety and health on the job. There remains much to be done, but we in the Department believe a responsible start has been made. If you have any questions, we will be pleased to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

JIM HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WILLIAMS-STEIGER ACT

Six-Month Report

I. ESTABLISH THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION TO ADMINISTER AND IMPLEMENT THE WILLIAMS-STEIGER ACT

The Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act was signed into law by President Nixon at the U.S. Department of Labor on December 29, 1970. The next four months were spent in task force development to implement the Act. On April 28, 1971, the Secretary announced the establishment of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

OSHA is a decentralized organization with a field network of 10 regional offices, 48 area offices, and three maritime district offices. Two-thirds of OSHA's manpower is located in the field with the proportion in the field expected to increase. This table shows the OSHA field staff.

	On board November 1	Ceiling, fiscal year 1972
Tota field staff	500	763
Compliance safety and health officers	313	500
Industrial hygienists	23	52
State liaison personnel	17	33
Administrative, technical, and clerical staff	147	178

The organization of the National Office consists of program operations which include standards development, compliance operations, State programs, and training and education, and the administrative support offices of program management support, management data systems, and information. The total staff in the National Office as of November 1, 1971, is 290, with a ceiling of 337 positions for FY 1972. OSHA is currently recruiting to fill up to its authorized ceiling.

The Regional Administrators have direct responsibility for operations in multistate regions reporting to the Office of the Assistant Secretary. Each regional office has staff units for compliance operations, State programs, technical support, and administrative services.

OSHA is establishing workgroups with other Federal agencies to develop administrative agreements and to determine areas of overlap in authority in order to avoid duplication of effort and to achieve coordination.

On July 26, 1971, the appointment of the members of the National Advisory Committee on Occupational Safety and Health was confirmed. The Committee is to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on all matters relating to job safety and health. The Advisory Committee has an important role to perform in bringing continuing public attention and interest to bear on the Act and its programs.

II. DEVELOP AND PROMULGATE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS

Occupational safety and health standards are derived from three sources: established Federal standards, national consensus standards, and new standards developed under procedures explained in Section 6(b) of the Act. All occupational safety and health standards administered under the Williams-Steiger Act have one thing in common—they are and will continue to be the product of intensive research into how to make the American workplace safe and healthful.

On May 29, 1971, OSHA issued the initial standards package. This package incorporated, (1) standards promulgated under the Construction Safety Act on April 24, 1971, (2) maritime standards from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, (3) established Federal standards from the Walsh-Healey Act, and (4) national consensus standards developed by the American Nation Standards Institute and by the National Fire Protection Association.

When the initial standards package was promulgated, employers not previously covered by existing statutes such as Walsh-Healey were given 90 days to familiarize themselves with the standards, and to take action to correct existing safety and health hazards. At the termination of the familiarization period on August 27, most standards were effective. Appropriate additional time periods for compliance have been provided when the standards require major changes.

The Act provides for temporary and permanent variance from standards, as well as variances necessitated for reasons of national security. Procedural rules governing applications for variances, tolerances, and exemptions were published in the Federal Register on June 30, 1971. OSHA has received 93 applications for processing.

The following activities are in process for the continuation of standards development during the remainder of the current fiscal year:

(1) Developing and promulgating by the end of FY 1972, a completely updated document containing all the current occupational safety and health standards, amendments, revisions, and changes.

(2) Preparing a subject index and standards information retrieval system, including assembling, translating, and compiling materials from technologically-advanced foreign Nations.

(3) Reviewing and promulgating, where appropriate, any new or revised national consensus standards.

(4) Working on new standards development with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, other Federal agencies, private industry, universities, and ad hoc advisory committees. For example, roll-over protective standards for construction vehicles were proposed in the Federal Register on October 29, 1971. In the issuance of standards, OSHA is concerned with the economic impact of safety and health standards on employers and the community, and is working toward the assessment of the standards already promulgated as well as devising a methodology for projecting the total impact of proposed standards.

III. ENFORCE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS

August 27, 1971, marked the end of the familiarization with the initial standards package and the real beginning of the compliance program. However, enforcement activity had been underway prior to this date in case of fatalities and catastrophes, in response to valid complaints, and in establishments previously covered by Federal statutes including the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation, Construction Safety, Walsh-Healey, Service Contract, and Arts and Humanities Acts. Citations were issued where appropriate.

A priority list was developed as a guide in making inspections from the total list of some 4.1 million covered establishments. ing catastrophes and fatalities. Second, are ing catastrophies and fatalities. Second, are valid complaints by employees. Third, are the target industries. And fourth, to establish our presence on as broad a basis as possible, a random cross-section of establishments of all types and sizes in all sections of the country.

The Target Industry Program was developed to focus on selected industries which have experienced very high injury frequency rates. All five of the target industries have frequency rates at least double the national average of 14.8, and together employ more than 1.5 million employees. They are:

Roofing and sheet metal which has the highest frequency rate in construction—43 disabling injuries per million man-hours worked.

Meat and meat products which has a rate of 38.5.

Lumber and wood products which has a rate of 36.1.

Miscellaneous transportation equipment, meaning primarily manufacturers of mobile homes, campers, and snowmobiles—its rate is 37.6.

And last in this listing but with the highest injury frequency rate is marine cargo handling, or longshoring, with a rate of 69.9.

Before announcing the Target Industry Program, OSHA officials met in Washington with key trade associations and employee representatives in each of the industries. Each industry was asked to organize its own particular approach to reducing its injury rate as quickly as possible. The National Safety Council is working closely with OSHA and has assigned expert staff members to work with each target industry.

During this year OSHA intends to inspect virtually all of the larger establishments in these five industries (more than 20 employees), and selected small target firms. OSHA contracted with eight States, under the provisions of Section 7(c)(1), for approximately 4,300 target industry inspections. The States under contract are California, Florida, Illinois, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington.

Much thought and effort has been devoted to developing a fair and effective compliance program, stressing what to look for during an inspection and how to determine violations and penalties. Final regulations on inspections, citations, and assessment of penalties were published in the Federal Register on September 4, 1971. To provide the compliance safety and health officers with guidelines for making inspections in the field, a compliance operations manual was developed and issued April 28. A completely revised and more detailed edition of the manual was published November 15 to become effective December 13, 1971. The manual provides basic policy, operational, and administrative in-

structions for implementation of the field compliance operations program to ensure uniform action in fulfilling the requirements of the Act. Special arrangements were made to ensure that all OSHA personnel received the new manual within three days of issuance.

In the six months of OSHA's operation ending October 31, a total of 9,300 inspections were made, covering establishments employing more than 1.5 million workers. These inspections led to issuance of 5,636 citations alleging violations of standards. Penalties proposed total $361,692. Of the establishments investigated 1,842 or about 20 percent were found to be in compliance. An additional 20 percent only had violations of a de minimis nature not requiring a citation. OSHA has received 686 complaints from employees or their representatives alleging violations. All valid complaints have been acted upon or responded to.

During the course of field inspections, compliance officers and the industrial hygiene staff will be using various types of equipment to measure ambient noise levels, the presence of dust, radiation, etc. Objective analyses of air samples and toxicity levels of material collected at the job-site will also be necessary to ensure a uniform compliance program. Through the facilities of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, certification and calibration of OSHA field equipment is being accomplished at Cincinnati, while laboratory analyses of collected samples is performed at Salt Lake City. Ultimately both of these facilities will handle calibration and sample analysis.

The Solicitor of Labor provides legal support to OSHA for legal interpretations on new compliance and standards issues and for the initial and precedent-setting litigation actions which will arise as a result of compliance activity. There are 39 attorneys on board in the field to assist OSHA in its compliance effort throughout the country.

The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commissionn is a quasi-judicial body which bears and reviews cases of alleged violations contested by employers or employees. The Commission published its rules of procedure in the Federal Register on August 31, 1971. One hundred and thirty citations have been contested by employers through the end of October.

ADVISE AND ASSIST EMPLOYERS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHERS

Training and education efforts are of the utmost importance because of the newness of the Williams-Steiger Act's requirements. Initially, the Department is concentrating on the training and retraining of OSHA personnel; on developing materials to train State personnel , and on training instructors in the private sector who can pass on their skills to supervisors and employees in industry. To assist in these efforts, a training institute is being created and will open in Chicago in January. Thi facility will be manned both by full-time OSHA personnel and by specialists on a contractual basis from universities and industry.

Specific training efforts completed include: (1) working with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health on long-range manpower needs for safety and health professionals and para-professionals, on curriculum development, and on evaluation of training grant applications from colleges and universities; (2) training 320 Federal compliance safety and health officers and 68 State compliance personnel for inspections in the target industries under Section 7(c)(1); (3) at the request of OSHA, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health conducted four one-week courses to provide OSHA compliance officers with a basic understanding of occupational health hazards and how to identify and evaluate these hazards; (4) developing a cadre of 830 construction safety instructors with a projected multiplier effect of reaching 12,000 people; (5) designing a new course for training compliance officers together with add-on courses for those specializing in maritime or construction ; (6) one-day orientation courses in 31 cities conducted by regional and area office personnel to acquaint employee representatives with the Act; and (7) working within the Department to ensure that contracts for manpower training include appropriate clauses to provide for safe and healthful conditions.

As part of OSHA's technical assistance and voluntary compliance programs, a number of projects are underway. These include developing a new inspection survey guide for use by employers and employees; aiding small businesses by cooperating in evaluating loan applications to the Small Business Administration; and, under a contract of the National Safety Council, designing accounting procedures for employers to measure the costs and benefits of safety and health programs. One example of the efforts to gain voluntary compliance is the assistance extended to the National Association of Manufacturers in their sponsorship of a closed-circuit videotaped television broadcast on June 10 explaining the Act. More than 10,000 business representatives in 27 cities viewed the program, the largest audience ever for a presentation of this kind.

OSHA is seeking to inform everyone affected by the Act and its requirements. Television and radio public service announcements, for which the networks and stations contribute free air time, are being broadcast. In addition to 25 radio spots, three television spots started on the air during September with six more television spots to be ready in December. In addition, television slides with live narration were sent to 700 stations, and initial reports indicate that the slides are being used in 44 of the 50 States. The official bi-monthly magazine of OSHA, "Safety Standards", has been upgraded, and circulation has more than doubled in the last three months. Tests are being run to measure the effectiveness of various methods of communicating with and motivating employers and employees to take action to improve on-the-job safety and health. Little valid research has been done in this field, although motivational factors are highly important in preventing accidents.

V. AID AND ENCOURAGE THE STATES TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH PROGRAMS

As provided in Section 18 of the Act, a major effort has been made to encourage the States to assume full responsibility for administering and enforcing occupational safety and health standards "at least as effective as" the Federal. The outlook for State participation appears excellent. As of the end of October, all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have given preliminary indication of their interest in developing an operating plan under Section 18(b) for the development of standards and their enforcement. It is expected that about half of the States will submit plans by December 1972, thus avoiding preemption of their safety and health programs.

Prior to the submission and approval of operating plans, agreements have been reached with 47 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam allowing them to continue developing and enforcing their own standards. Ohio, New Mexico, South Dakota, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories have not entered into Section 18(h) agreements. With the exception of Ohio, most of these jurisdictions did not feel they had adequate standards and/or an adequate safety and health compliance program to warrant an interim agreement. Ohio does not intend to participate in the program immediately, but has indicated its intention to develop an acceptable program at some time in the future.

To assist States in identifying their needs and developing safety and health programs which will meet the criteria of being "at least as effective as" the Federal efforts, 46 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have planning grants under Section 23(a) of the Act. As yet, Nevada, Ohio, South Dakota, Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Trust Territories have not applied for 23(a) grants. At the end of October, a total of $4,704,131 had been awarded to States for these grants. During the remainder of this fiscal year, approximately $3.7 million in additional funds is available for planning, demonstration, and operational grants.

Given that the present level of planning effort continues, OSHA expects to have a minimum of ten 18(b) plans approved, either on a developmental or fully operational basis, by the end of the fiscal year. It is intended to fund all approved plans at the full 50 percent level outhorized. In order to facilitate State planning efforts, rules for the development of these plans were published in the Federal Register October 29. Procedures for evaluating developmental plans are presently being formulated.

VI. COLLECT AND DISSEMINATE, IN COORDINATION WITH THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STATISTICS

The Department, in consultation with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has devised a new, nationwide statistical reporting system to provide comprehensive data on occupational injuries and illnesses. Regulations for the recording and reporting by employers of occupational injuries and illnesses were published in the Federal Register July 2, 1971. The recordkeeping forms and instructions were mailed to 4.5 million employers during July, and 600,000 farm employers in August. In addition to this initial mailing, approximately 15 million copies of various forms have been distributed to the public. Each employer must keep a log of reportable injuries and illnesses on a calendar year basis, plus an annual summary. Reports are compiled and the data is promulgated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This new recordkeeping system will provide, for the first time, a reliable national profile of occupational fatalities, injuries, and illnesses. This improved reporting system is likely to show more injuries and illnesses despite any real improvements that are made in occupational safety and health. The records will be used for developing information on the causes of occupational injuries and illnesses and for directing efforts to those industries and areas with the greatest problems. A representative sample of 200,000 establishments will form the basis of the reporting system. This statistical input will also help shape the Department's compliance program and will provide the basis for determining the effectiveness of the program. In addition, within OSHA, management information and technical information retrieval systems are being developed, particularly the collection, tabulation, and analysis of inspection activities.

The Act also creates a grants program for the States to develop systems for the collection of information concerning the nature and frequency of occupational injuries and illnesses. Under section 23(a)(3)(A), the Bureau of Labor Statistics, working with OSHA, has made 48 planning grants totaling $850,000 to assist the States in developing such a statistical system.

VII. DEVELOP AND CARRY OUT, IN COORDINATION WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH RESEARCH

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's responsibilities under the Williams-Steiger Act are being carried out by the newly formed National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

(NIOSH). NIOSH is responsible for most occupational safety and health research, evaluation of hazards, toxicity determinations and manpower training and development. NIOSH is also undertaking special industry-wide studies of chronic or low-level exposure to hazardous substances as well as research into psychological, motivational, and behavioral factors involved in occupational safety and health problems. In June NIOSH published a list of more than 8,000 toxic substances which serves as a guide for research needed in setting new standards and for OSHA and industry safety and health programs.

Through cooperative efforts, OSHA and NIOSH are developing research priorities for occupational safety and health. These are essential to the standards development program. Grants from NIOSH have enabled dozens of research projects to get underway. A recent list shows that approximately $2.5 million is being spent in research grants—56 projects in 12 different fields. The grants will finance research on these projects; bysinosis, asbestosis, coal, engineering, noise, respiratory diseases, physiology and ergonomics, toxicology nad pathology, and physical and chemical analysis. In addition, NIOSH is now working on a dozen new standards criteria, including asbestos, carbon monoxide, coal tar pitch volatiles cotton dust, petroleum naphtha and mineral spirits, oil mists, heat stress, lead, carbon tetrachloride, benzene, coal dust, and noise. Sixty percent of the complaints received by OSHA have been concerned with allegations of health hazards. In connection with occupational health, OSHA is presently in the final stages of developing a broad new effort in this area. It is expected that this new program will be announced before the end of the year.

VIII. IMPROVE THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SAFETY PROGRAM

As the Nation's largest employer, the Federal Government has a special obligation to set an example for safe and healthful employment. Section 19 of the Williams-Steiger Act places greater responsibility on Federal agencies to establish and maintain an effective and comprehensive occupational safety and health program which is consistent with the standards promulgated for private industry. Executive Order 11612 was issued on July 28, 1971, to specify the requirements of the program in Federal departments and agencies and established a Federal Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health. Four steps have been set for improving Federal safety and health programs. First, new systems for recording and reporting Federal agency occupational accidents have been developed. Second, methods are being devised for evaluating agency programs, including requiring agencies to report on what steps they are taking to meet the applicable standards. Third, special campaigns such as "ZERO IN on Federal Safety" are being worked on to give incentive and impetus to the Federal programs. These replace the Mission SAFETY–70 program which ended in December 1970. And, fourth, OSHA is working on a model occupational safety and health program for use by agencies.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—NUMBER OF SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED 1971 THROUGH OCTOBER

Month	Inspections by industry				Employees in establishments inspected	Accident investigations	Complain investigations
	Total	General industry	Construction	Maritime			
Total	7,918	4,301	553	3064	1,571,506	703	679
June [1]	1,067	344	8	715	134,213	26	42
July	1,184	644	48	492	302,762	129	101
August	1,557	801	62	694	266,345	175	105
September	1,825	1,138	68	619	341,853	192	120
October	2,285	1,374	367	544	526,333	181	311

[1] June figures include activities carried from Apr. 28, 1971 to June 30, 1971.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—VIOLATION INFORMATION 1971 THROUGH OCTOBER

Month	Violations disclosed [1]	Citations issued					Proposed penalties	Establishments penalized
		Total	Nonserious	Imminent danger	Willful and repeated	Serious		
Total	19,578	5,636	5,321	NA	NA	310	$361,692	2,584
June [2]	879	328	315	NA	NA	13	12,317	15
July	1,546	238	157	NA	NA	81	38,400	51
August	3,522	262	213	NA	NA	49	32,116	68
September	5,225	1,331	1,265	NA	NA	66	84,513	430
October	8,406	3,447	3,371	2	3	101	194,346	20,020

[1] Includes nonserious, serious, and imminent danger violations.

[2] June figures include activities carried from Apr. 28–June 30, 1971.

OSHA RULES AND REGULATIONS PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER

CFR part number	FR date	Description
29 CFR 1901	Apr. 13, 1971	Procedures for State agreements.
29 CFR 1901.4	July 13, 1971	Notice of availability for inspection—18 State agreements.
29 CFR 1902	Oct. 29, 1971	State plans for the development and enforcement of State standards.
29 CFR 1903	Sept. 4, 1971	Inspections citations, and proposed penalties.
29 CFR 1904	July 2, 1971	Recording and reporting occupational injuries and illnesses.
	Nov. 12, 1971	Use of data processing equipment; additional time for completing forms; posting of annual summary (proposed).
	Nov. 25, 1971	Proposed statistical reporting program.
29 CFR 1905	June 30, 1971	Rules of practice for variances, limitations, variations, tolerances, and exemptions.
29 CFR 1906	July 27, 1971	Administration witnesses and documents in private litigation (proposal).
29 CFR 1911	Sept. 1, 1971	Procedures for promulgating, modifying or revoking OSH standards.
29 CFR 1950	May 14, 1971	Development and planning grants for occupational safety and health.

OSHA STANDARDS PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER

29 CFR 1504	May 28, 1971	S. & H. regulations for longshoring (amendments re cranes and containerized cargo).
29 CFR 1518	Apr. 17, 1971 [1]	S. & H. regulations for construction.
	May 4, 1971	(Amendment re delayed effective date for light residential construction—to Aug. 15, 1971).
	May 25, 1971	(Miscellaneous corrections.)
	Aug. 17, 1971	(Amendments re variances, etc.)
	Oct. 29, 1971	(Proposed rulemaking re ROPS, etc.)
29 CFR 1910	May 29, 1971 [1]	OSH standards. (Initial standards package).
	Aug. 13, 1971	(Amendments re effective dates, etc.)
	Sept. 9, 1971	(Amendment re applicability of established Federal standards.)
29 CFR 1518 and 1910.	Aug. 14, 1971	(Amendment re delayed effective date for light residential construction.)
	Sept. 28, 1971	(Proposed rulemaking.)
	Oct. 1, 1971	(Clarification of proposed rules in 36FR 19083–19089, Sept. 28, 1971.)
29 CFR 4, 505, 1516, and 41 CFR 50–204.	May 29, 1971 [2]	Amendments to PCAS, SCA, etc. re OSHA.
29 CFR 505, 1516 and 41 CFR 50–204.	Aug. 20, 1971	Amendments to PCA, SCA, etc. re OSHA.
41 CFR 50–210	Oct. 28, 1971	Amendments to PCA re recordkeeping rules in 29 CFR 1904.
41 CFR 14–7.6	Nov. 25, 1971	Fixed price construction contracts.

OSHA NOTICES PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER

----------	Sept. 9, 1971	American Iron & Steel Institute and United Steelworkers of America—petitions for commencement of rule-making proceedings and related relief.
29 CFR 1905.11	Sept. 17, 1971	Boeing Co.—notice of application for variance and interim order; grant of interim order (construction standard 29 CFR 1518.352(c)(1) and OSHA standard 29 CFR 1910.12).
29 CFR 1910	Oct. 20, 1971	Cushman Motors—proposed temporary suspension of 29 CFR 1910.178(a) (2) and (3) (filed as proposed rulemaking).

OSHA-RELATED MATERIAL PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER

----------	May 12, 1971	Establishment of OSHA—mission and functions.
----------	June 30, 1971	Establishment of NIOSH—mission and functions.
----------	July 23, 1971	NIOSH—availability of toxic substances list.
----------	July 28, 1971	Executive order—OSHA programs for Federal employees.
29 CFR 2200	Aug. 31, 1971	Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission rules of procedure.
----------	Oct. 28, 1971	Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission disclosure of information.

[1] Part II.

[2] Part I.

HON. LESLIE CUTLER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a warm and dear friend, former Senator Leslie Cutler of Needham, within my 10th Congressional District in Massachusetts, passed away November 27, and it was with deep sadness that I attended the memorial services in her memory at the First Parish Unitarian in Needham. Senator Cutler was a remarkable woman, gracious, kind, and dedicated to public service, and it will be long before one with her special gifts and unique involvement in public life emerges. Her quiet and unassuming dignity, and her profound intellect, especially impressed me. To have known Senator Leslie Cutler was a rewarding friendship I shall cherish as one of the warmest of my congressional service. Her notable career exemplifies the finest attributes of an elected official. The remarks of former U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall concerning Senator Cutler say much:

She was a woman who knew what was best for us and for our personal well-being. She was a longtime friend of mine. I attended her wedding back in 1913. As a member of the State Senate, she was of great influence in trying to assist people who were incapable of taking care of themselves—in hospitals and in all ways that the state could help. Her fellow senators had a great respect for her petinacity and her conscientiousness and her courage.

Every pressing social need that we face today was foreseen by Senator Cutler. She was a prime mover in the advance made in Massachusetts in public health, mental health, in improved penal and juvenile facilities and rehabilitation centers, in education, and in the care of the handicapped.

A moving tribute was accorded her memory in the Boston Herald-Traveler of November 29, which I include in my remarks:

TWENTY YEARS A STATE SENATOR—LESLIE CUTLER DIES AT 81

Retired state Sen. Leslie (Bradley) Cutler, 81, of 1010 South St., Needham, died Saturday night at home.

Mrs. Cutler retired in 1968 after serving 44 consecutive years in public office, the last 20 in the state Senate. She also had been a Needham selectman, a member of the town's board of health for 41 years and had served 10 years in the state House of Representatives.

Despite an extremely active political career, Mrs. Cutler brought up four sons and a daughter, all of whom served in the armed forces during World War II.

Born in Boston and educated in the city schools, she was graduated in 1911 from Radcliffe College and later studied biology and public health at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

An early activist in the women's suffragette movement, Mrs. Cutler became Needham's first woman select-man in 1924—and the second in the commonwealth—by getting out the women voters after having been defeated the year before.

Two years later, she won election to what was to become a long career in the town's board of health and, in 1939, won her first term in the legislature.

Throughout her career, Mrs. Cutler was a militant crusader in the fields of mental and public health as well as for welfare, penal reform, juvenile needs, education and aviation.

Upon her retirement, the then Senate President Maurice Donahue said of her, "Sen. Cutler was undoubtedly many, many years ahead of her time in the areas of public health and mental health.

"The contributions she made in these areas will be bearing fruit for 100 years to come. She really helped those who couldn't help themselves. And, in spite of the fact she was a woman, she was a fierce competitor in debate and always played fair."

As chairman of a special legislative commission on mental health, Sen. Cutler successfully fought for passage of a bill establishing community mental health centers.

She was also chairman of a commission which reorganized the state Department of Correction in the late 1950s. Mrs. Cutler was a long-time foe of capital punishment.

Interested in aviation since she took flying lessons in 1942, Mrs. Cutler was a leader in the battle that made Logan International Airport a major terminal.

"I stood up in the Senate and kept screaming for money for the airport," she recalled later.

A tall, imposing woman with a commanding, though raspy, voice and a driving capacity for work, Mrs. Cutler was always a vigorous crusader for causes she espoused.

Among privileges she won for women was the right earned after a 20-year legislative battle for them to serve on juries. That measure was passed in 1949, a year after her election to the Senate.

"That was a far-reaching victory," she recalled later, "but I'm really proudest of my accomplishments in public and mental health. A lot of health legislation has gone on the books because I've been around."

Among other accomplishments, it was a commission headed by Mrs. Cutler that exposed the fact that many patients in Bridgewater State Hospital had been held illegally there for decades.

Her other activities included service during World War II as state director of WAC recruiting for the Massachusetts wing of the Civil Air Patrol. She had been a member of the patrol since 1942.

Mrs. Cutler served from 1959 to 1961 as a member of President Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. She had been president of the Needham Community Council for 28 years, was a 40-year member and former president of the Boston branch of the NAACP, and had been a vice president of Action for Boston Community Development.

The seemingly-tireless woman was also a founder of the Needham YMCA, of Freedom House and of the state's first council on aging.

She was a former president of War Mothers of America, a director of the Needham Chapter, American Red Cross and a member of the Needham Republican Town Committee, the Massachusetts and American Public Health Associations, the National Order of Women Legislators and the Aeronautics Assn. of Boston.

Membership in other organizations included the Norfolk County Republican Club, the Norfolk County Selectmen's Assn., the New Century Club of Needham, Needham Grange 357 and the Order of Eastern Star.

She leaves three sons: Robert B. of Manchester, Roger W. Jr. of Brookline and Eric of Westwood; an adopted son, Joseph C. Bradley of Santa Barbara, Calif.; a daughter, Mrs. Abagail Ann Lewis of Ipswich; 15 grandchildren, and 13 great grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held at noon tomorrow in First Parish Church, Needham.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. 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. The United States has consistently been a world leader in the production of eggs. According to the Department of Agriculture, total U.S. egg production in 1968 was over 69 million eggs.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DAVID PACKARD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government loses one of its most effective, capable, and loyal public servants with the retirement of Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard. Mr. Packard has earned the respect and admiration

of everyone with whom he has come in contact. His contribution to the operation of the Department of Defense has been outstanding.

Mr. Packard has been particularly effective in modernizing and updating procurement policies of the Department of Defense. He has encouraged policies which will insure that the Defense Establishment buys proven items of military hardware rather than newly born concepts. The "fly before buy" policy is largely due to two factors. The first factor is the experience which Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird had as a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the House Appropriations Committee. The second factor is the great experience Mr. Packard has in the fields of engineering and production.

Many years after Mr. Packard's retirement, the taxpayers of the United States will still have reason to be grateful to him, because of the money which will be saved as a result of the policies he has been instrumental in bringing about.

I am sure that all of the personnel of the Department of Defense are grateful to Mr. Packard and will miss him. This can also be said of the Members of Congress who have been most intimately acquainted with him and his work. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Packard has my deep thanks for the great contributions he has made to the defense of the country, and my best wishes to him and to his wife, Lou, for everything good in the future.

Since all of Mr. Packard's background may not be known to the Members of Congress, I am including a short résumé of his impressive accomplishments:

DAVID PACKARD, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

David Packard was nominated as Deputy Secretary of Defense by President Richard Nixon on January 20, 1969, and confirmed by the United States Senate on January 23, 1969. He was administered oath of office by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird at a Pentagon ceremony on January 24, 1969.

Prior to assuming his new position, Mr. Packard was Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Hewlett-Packard Company of Palo Alto, California.

Mr. Packard was born in Pueblo, Colorado, on September 7, 1912, and attended public schools there, graduating from Centennial High School in 1930. He entered Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, that year, graduating from the University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1934. He then began post graduate study at the University of Colorado, subsequently entered business and then returned to Stanford University, receiving his Electrical Engineering degree from Stanford in 1939.

That same year, Mr. Packard and William R. Hewlett formed a company in partnership to design and manufacture electronic measurement instrumentation. The firm was incorporated in 1947 and Mr. Packard was elected President. He later was elected Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer in 1964. The company became an international organization with 17 manufacturing plants and more than 13,000 employees, producing more than 2,000 different test instruments and devices. It is a world leader in design and manufacture of electronic, biomedical and analytical equipment.

At Stanford University, Mr. Packard received letters in football and basketball, served as president of his college social fraternity, Alpha Delta Phi, and held membership in Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Beta Pi and Sigma Xi. Continuing his interest in social and community activities during his years in private business, he has been a member and past Vice Chairman of the Business Council, member of the Chase Manhattan Bank International Advisory Committee, Co-Chairman of the Stanford Mid-Peninsula Urban Coalition, Fellow in the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers and a member of the Board of Trustees of Colorado College, as well as Stanford University. Mr. Packard also served as President of the Board of Trustees of Stanford from 1958 to 1960.

Mr. Packard also has served as a director of several business organizations including Crocker Citizens National Bank, General Dynamics Corporation, Stanford Research Institute, United States Steel Corporation, California State Chamber of Commerce, Committee for Economic Development, National Merit Scholarship Corporation, Universities Research Association, and San Francisco Bay Area Council. He also was a member of the advisory board of the Hoover Institute at Stanford and a member of the Committee for Support of American Universities.

Mr. Packard is the recipient of a number of awards including a silver anniversary All-America Award from Sports Illustrated Magazine in 1958; the American Way of Life Award in 1963, presented annually by the Pueblo Sertoma Club to a Coloradoan who has achieved national recognition for his public service; the Herbert Hoover Medal in 1966, the highest honor awarded by the Stanford University Alumni Association; Peninsula Manufacturers' Association "Man of the Year for 1968," February, 1969; American Management Association "Gantt Medal Award," February, 1970; American Ordnance Association "Crozier" Gold Medal, April, 1970.

He was elected to the National Academy of Engineering in April, 1971, for advanced development of electronic test instruments contributing to effective design of modern electronic systems. This is the highest professional distinction that can be conferred on an American engineer. He holds honorary degrees of Doctor of Science from Colorado College, 1964; Doctor of Laws from the University of California, 1966, and Doctor of Laws from Catholic University, 1970.

Mr. Packard was married April 8, 1938, to the former Lucile Salter of San Francisco and they have four children—David Woodley, Nancy (Mrs. Robin Burnett), Susan (Mrs. Franklin M. Orr, Jr.) and Julie.

RECOGNITION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a renowned national association of businessmen, concerned with the promotion of environmental improvement, has bestowed its highest form of recognition upon a business firm located in my district.

The American Association of Nurserymen's 19th annual awards program has appropriately received the acclamation of our Nation's First Lady. The official White House ceremonies strongly reaffirmed the importance of this event's purpose and the appropriate national concern.

The Atlanta general manager of Avon Products, Inc., Mr. Robert S. Brandon, accepted a certificate of merit award for the landscape design and property development of his company's newest facility, situated just north of Atlanta. He received the personal congratulations of Mrs. Richard Nixon.

Avon's landscape architectural consultant is Edward L. Daughterty, and the landscape firm is Hickory Hill, both of Atlanta. The landscaping enhances its 72-acre wooded site with a natural elegance, combining spacious lawns, colorful planting, fountained pools, sculptures, lighting, and building features to achieve its award-winning effect.

The Avon branch, with approximately 455 employees, distributes products to the thousands of independent Avon representatives in seven Southeastern States.

Avon is the world's largest manufacturer and distributor of a diversified line of cosmetics and grooming aids for all the family. Its products are sold through independent sales representatives directly to the customers in their homes throughout the United States, and 16 other countries.

Avon Products, Inc. is a world leader in the cosmetics business, providing high quality products and personalized service through independent Avon representatives, living and working among their neighbors.

This award serves as just one example of Avon's desire to preserve and beautify our physical surroundings, while fostering economic growth and earning opportunities within each and every community in which it has a corporate residence.

THE ALASKA PIPELINE AND OUR MARINE RESOURCES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, probably the greatest environmental danger involved in the trans-Alaska pipeline proposal is the potentially massive and catastrophic consequences a tanker spill could have on marine life, the fishing industry, and Alaskan and Canadian beaches. The proposed Alaska pipeline, as you know, would run from Alaska's North Slope to the southern Alaskan city of Valdez, where the oil would then be shipped by tanker to west coast ports and possibly other destinations.

Concern over the very grave ecological risks which this tanker traffic would pose has prompted both the Canadian Government and Alaskan fishermen to become outspoken in their opposition to the Alaska pipeline route proposal. One of the groups that has been most concerned and active is a relatively small band of about 500 fishermen in Cordova, Alaska, who have raised the incredible amount of $60,000 to finance a court suit against the pipeline and to help publicize their views and concerns on this issue.

Today, I include in the RECORD a report written by three of the Cordova fishermen's representatives—Del Goeres, Ross Mullins, and Knude Johnson—summarizing their position. Their report is concise, well-written, and highly informative, and I urge my colleagues to read it:

PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND—AN ECOSYSTEM IN JEOPARDY

Since late 1969 the representatives of the Cordova District Fisheries Union have been attempting to focus public and administrative attention on the very serious resource conflicts that will arise if a massive oil shipping terminal is located at Valdez, Alaska, as is presently proposed. The Union representatives speak for over 500 commercial fishermen that work in the Prince William Sound area, harvesting the varied and abundant marine resources in a now pollution free environment.

To date, little attention has been given to the CDFU's concern, either by the State of Alaska, the Federal government, or the oil industry. As a result of recent discussions in Washington, D.C., and in Alaska with various agency staff members (NOAA, DOT, EPA, CEQ, ADF&G), it has been determined that little new data on marine resource problems and conflicts will be available when the Department of Interior soon releases its final impact statement.

Since the quantity of materials on which Interior will be basing the final statement are extremely voluminous (bulk of 800 lbs. and 20' high), and as the time available for marine systems and resource analysis has been only ten months at this writing, it is not unlikely that the quantity of input by industry will overwhelm the quality of impact analysis. (That is approximately the time since mid-January 1971, when Interior made public a draft report which concluded that Alaskan oil is so important to the nation that a pipeline to the Alaskan coast should be built even at the cost of inevitable damage to the environment. On page 145 of that document the relationship of the proposed development on the marine environment was analyzed. "Oil loading operations at Valdez and the large volume of oil transport through Prince William Sound, the Gulf of Alaska and other waters enroute to West Coast and foreign ports would result in biologically significant losses of oil to the marine mammals of the sound, and the biologically productive littoral and intertidal zones of Prince William Sound would be vulnerable to chronic low level oil pollution and to the effects of major spills, although effects of the latter should be minimized by the rigorous pollution control measures to be required by the operator." At the time of the first draft report it seems unlikely that Interior recognized the entire marine system as falling within its sphere of impact analysis responsibility, as outlined by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The preceding is mentioned to indicate the limited amount of time that, to date has, been available for any meaningful studies to be conducted for marine impact analysis.

The documents' bulk are due mainly to the extensive engineering and design materials submitted by the Alyeska Pipeline Company, rather than by original research on what the effects of oil will be on the fisheries and more subtly, on the food web that supports the fisheries.

With the social and economic impact on the fishermen and their families that live and work in Prince William Sound, and on the Community of Cordova which is presently 100% dependent on a viable fishery resource, it is necessary to determine in quantitative terms what the likely effects will be to the marine resources, given the most adverse case analysis. To meet this responsibility under NEPA, the CDFU feels that it is not sufficient for Interior only to determine that there will be some environmental damage to the marine resources. The CDFU feels that adequate studies must be funded and time allowed for competent fishery biologists to determine what, in fact, the effect of oil is likely to be on the valuable fishery resources.

What is the fate of salmon eggs that are quietly developing in the intertidal gravels for seven months each year and the fate of the millions of tiny fingerlings as they enter the feeding cycles in the estuarine environment where oil contamination is likely to be found? It is clear that up to 20% of all salmon that return annually to Prince William Sound spawn in the Valley Arm area where the terminus would be located. The 1971 season just past found nearly 10 million salmon returning to Prince William Sound—a not insignificant number—the renewal of which can continue forever if the environment is not overstressed by industrial intrusion. The CDFU has learned that there will be legal discharge of oil into Valdez Dam from the ballast treatment facilities at the terminus of over 12 barrels each day. No one at present knows what the fate of this oil will be, nor what effects it will have on the marine environment or the cumulative effect of many years operation. This does not take into account the accidental discharge at the loading facilities which occurs at all oil ports. Nor does it consider the effect of a massive spill which, statistically, is certainly a possibility under the adverse Alaskan weather conditions.

Will the Department of Interior clearly indicate what the effects of the proposed intrusion will be? We think not. Recently while talking with a NOAA scientist whose field of expertise is phytoplanktons and marine food chains, the CDFU was told that it is "scientifically indefensible to consider locating a massive oil terminus in such a biologically rich area as Prince William Sound." Will these attitudes be reflected in Interior's final impact statement? We think not.

These questions have been repeatedly asked by the CDFU over the past year to Interior—NOAA, ADF&G et al., and not once have satisfactory answers been forthcoming. These answers are not available simply because no one knows what the answers are. In fact, the questions themselves cause some embarrassment.

Most independent experts clearly state that delivery of arctic oil to the market areas can best be accomplished by an overland pipeline system through Canada. It would be extremely unwise to subject the marine west coast to increased oil tanker traffic. Little attention has been focused on the problem of marine oil spills in the tanker lines between Alaska and the West Coast ports, probably because the responsibilities for prevention and for assessing liability are scattered among many federal agencies, the oil industry, and the shipping industry. According to McCaull (1969) (from Weeden & Klein 1971), an average of one unit of oil is spilled at sea or in port through tanker mishaps for every 1000 units carried. The spills would not be daily, but infrequent and massive, probably more infrequent, but also much more massive, as the vessels increase in size. Thus, the need for full evaluation of the Canadian route increases in importance.

When the Interior Department was recently asked if any independent studies of the Canadian route had been contracted for, they said "no." This is most unfortunate, since the Canadians are trying to intervene in the existing lawsuits brought against Interior in order to prevent issuance of a permit for the proposed route.

A Canadian route seems attractive from a number of viewpoints. First, it would eliminate the threat of oil pollution on the Pacific West Coast—a threat that is unlikely to be resolved in the near future.

Second, a natural gas pipeline is expected to be constructed through Canada to carry the gas produced as a result of oil extraction. This gas cannot be economically shipped by tanker, as it would require liquification, and the volume available makes this unattractive. The question then is, if a gas line with its necessary permits etc., is, in fact, to be built in Canada, would it not be prudent to combine the work forces and channel all the artic fossil fuel reserves through a single Canadian-Alaskan corridor?

Third, Walter Levy and Associates, under contract to the State of Alaska as consultants for oil and gas marketing information, informed the Alaska legislature that Market District V (the West Coast) can absorb only 1,200,000 barrels of oil per day by 1980, and that the surplus would most likely find its way to the Midwest via pipeline. Levy went on to say that if the reserves in the Alaskan Arctic are significantly increased in the future, then a pipeline through Canada to the Midwest would probably be built anyway. There has been considerable speculation that a certain amount of Alaskan oil will be exported to Japan and that this necessitates a coastal terminus. Of course, what would happen to the well-promoted energy crisis then? It is a fact that 26 Japanese companies under the name "North Slope Oil Co." formed to participate in North Slope exploration and future oil lease sales.

Finally, the potential reserves of Alaska and Canada staggers the imagination. Estimates of 200 billion barrels are frequently mentioned by knowledgeable observers. Work is continuing in Canada at this moment on hot oil pipeline studies. At least one economist, Charles J. Cicchetti, is trying to encourage the Nixon Administration to take a serious look at the Canadian route as an alternative to the trans-Alaska route. Cicchetti is an economist with "Resources for the Future," a foundation financial "think tank" with no economic interest involved in the outcome. Some of Cicchetti's conclusions are:

(1) The West Coast is not likely to be able to absorb nearly as much of Alaska's oil as the oil companies and the Interior Department are projecting, which will create either a surplus or a need to export a portion of the oil to Japan or elsewhere.

(2) If Alaskan oil were delivered to the Midwest through a Canadian pipeline it would command a higher price, which would generate greater long-range benefits for the State of Alaska.

(3) The Canadian line would be longer and require two to three years more to build, thereby postponing the marketing of Alaskan oil and deferring financial benefits to the State of Alaska and the oil companies.

Cicchetti recognized that there is strong pressure from both the State and industry for approval of the trans-Alaskan route for this reason—it promises quicker economic returns. This is probably the central point and the reason why a permit will likely be approved in the near future, as planned. It is the environment and all of us that live and work with her that will be the losers.

CRUCIAL ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY ISSUES: CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY AND PANAMA CANAL MODERNIZATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on November 29, 1971, the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries started comprehensive hearings in depth on Isthmian Canal policy questions under the chairmanship of my able and distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

The witnesses during the first week of these hearings were from the executive branch of our Government; during the

second week, from the Congress. Senator STROM THURMOND from South Carolina, a leading authority on canal problems in the Senate, and I testified on December 6. Our two statements together clarify much of the confusion that has been generated about the interoceanic canal question and focuses attention on the two great issues. They are: First, retention by the United States of its undiluted sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and second, the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Canal. The "hardy perennial" known as the sea level canal was revealed not only as irrelevant but also as extravagant, environmentally dangerous, and diplomatically hazardous.

The Canal Zone is constitutionally acquired domain of the United States forming part of the coast line of our country. Its protection is just as much a part of national defense as the protection of the Chesapeake Bay or the mouth of the Mississippi River, for it is the gateway to the Pacific.

As to those who contend that the Panama Canal is obsolete, the transit in fiscal year 1970 of 14,829 ocean going vessels making an average of 40.6 per day certainly refutes their arguments. However, the canal is approaching saturation of capacity.

The plan most widely supported by independent canal experts is the Terminal Lake—Third Locks proposal that was developed in the canal organization as the result of World War II experience and which is provided for in identical bills introduced by Senator THURMOND and myself. But I do not believe that the people of our country would ever approve the expenditure of large sums at Panama until the sovereignty issue is settled. They do not wish a Suez situation on the Isthmus.

As the two indicated prepared statements and certain papers attached to my own should be of interest to all concerned with the interoceanic canal problem and the Nation at large, I quote them as parts of my remarks:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee. I have been interested in the Panama Canal and history of the Isthmus for many years. Because of my studies, I appreciate the magnitude of the problems involved in the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation and defense of this strategic waterway.

Today, the Canal is in the middle of another turning point that combines not only a conflict over site, but also over the question of type. The consideration of these matters is greatly complicated by unwarranted assaults against the United States and its sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Our first consideration concerns the extremely important question of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone. We must remember that this territory is constitutionally acquired domain of the United States with exclusive and essential sovereign rights, power and authority granted to the U.S. as a perpetual estate by Panama. The United States paid Panama for this grant. In addition to this grant of sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the U.S. also obtained the title to all privately owned land and property in the Zone by private purchase from individual property owners. This acquisition is the most costly territorial acquisition in the history of our country. The title of the U.S. to the Panama Canal was also recognized by Columbia, which was the sovereign of the Isthmus before the Panamanian Revolution of 1903.

In 1967 the Presidents of the United States and Panama announced the completion of negotiations of three new canal treaties. As reports on the negotiations were forthcoming, I became increasingly alarmed. I became convinced during my studies of these proposals that continued U.S. control depended on maintaining our sovereignty in the Canal Zone and modernizing the present facilities.

Mr. Chairman, these new treaties would have surrendered U.S. control and ownership of the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal, as well as any new Canal, which might be built. The Canal Zone would be nationalized by Panama under these treaties and the Canal itself would become internationalized under a bi-national canal authority.

Such treaties were totally unacceptable to the House of Representatives and the Senate. The reaction, in the U.S. and in Panama, was so hostile that those treaties were never signed nor submitted to the Senate.

Because of the earlier feelings, it is discouraging to see that negotiations are once again underway with Panama, even though the present government is a revolutionary regime with little prospect of stability and with no procedures for ratifying a new treaty. It is further disheartening that the State Department openly acknowledges that the basis for negotiations is the surrender of U.S. sovereignty and the giving up of our jurisdiction throughout most of the Zone. The main point of negotiation is still to be the issue of duration of the new treaty. That is to say, how long before we give up all our rights in the Canal?

It is ridiculous to maintain that the U.S. can keep control of the Canal and the capacity to defend it if we ever give up our sovereign rights. I believe that if a new treaty is necessary—and I am not convinced of that—then as a minimum we must maintain our sovereignty in the Zone. We must maintain U.S. citizens in the policy-making and strategic areas of the Canal operation. We cannot believe that we can control the Canal nor keep it running if we allow foreign nationals to be in substantial control of the decision-making and highly technical posts connected with the operation of the Canal.

Mr. Chairman, it is possible that certain disagreements can be solved through negotiations with the Republic of Panama, but we can never agree to a treaty which does not allow us to have the physical and actual capacity of keeping the Canal secure. This is the reason that the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is the key issue which must never be compromised.

After its authorization under P.L. 88-609, the Interoceanic Canal Study Commission compiled a report that took over 5 years and $21 million to complete. The report recommends the construction of a sea-level canal about 10 miles west of the existing canal, completely on Panamanian territory, and at an initially estimated cost of $2,880,000,000. Besides, this recommendation hinges upon the surrender to Panama by the U.S. without the slightest reimbursement of its treaty-based sovereignty over the U.S. owned Canal Zone and its important and valuable installations. Such surrender is unrealistic and unthinkable.

The investment of the taxpayers of our country through June 30, 1968, was more than $5 billion. The project as recommended by the Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, would require a new treaty with Panama. Further, recognized scientists overwhelmingly oppose any such project because of environmental and ecological implications. For these and many other reasons, the sea-level project is being vigorously opposed by many knowledgeable and objective Canal experts.

Mr. Chairman, modernization was begun on the existing canal in 1940 by what was known as the Third Locks Project. Experience during World War II enabled more thorough studies from operational and navigational aspects. Out of these studies the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan was developed. This plan would make possible uninterrupted navigation from the Atlantic locks to the Pacific locks. It would enable the maximum utilization of all work that has so far been accomplished. Major modernization of the Canal amounts to more than $171 million, all of which would be lost to our taxpayers if any sea-level canal was constructed.

The Terminal Lake Proposal is authorized under existing treaty provisions. It does not require new negotiation nor further indemnification to Panama. It protects against biological catastrophe and avoids the danger of disastrous slides. It can be constructed at a relatively low cost and would fully preserve the economic interests of the Panamanian people. These major considerations of the Terminal Lake Proposal cannot be ignored.

The Panama Canal is not obsolete, but is quickly approaching the capacity saturation point. The needed capacity and improvements can be secured by the means of additional and adequate locks along with more water for lockages and maintenance of channel depths.

Mr. Chairman, the second major consideration is a Constitutional one. The Constitution of the United States vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress and not in the treaty-making power delegated to the President and the Senate. The negotiations of the 1967 proposed canal treaties ignored this Constitutional provision which was observed in the 1955 treaty calling for the transfer of valuable railroad property to Panama—and continue to ignore it on the current negotiations. The House of Representatives is jealously guarding its prerogatives, and is alert to the indicated Constitutional requirement. This we can see by the large number of Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions that have been introduced in the House opposing any surrender in Panama. The Canal Zone and Canal are a territorial possession and property of the United States and so they must remain until Congress decrees otherwise.

The situation in the Isthmus represents a great challenge to the United States and its leaders. The only reasonable course of action for our government to follow is to continue to maintain sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the implementation of the Terminal Lake solution for the modernization of the Canal. Representative Daniel Flood and I have introduced identical measures, which would authorize the completion of construction of the Third Locks Project adapted to include the principals of the Terminal Lake Plan.

Mr. Chairman, this program will benefit Panama and the entire Western Hemisphere as well as U.S. shipping. It will terminate the long conflict and enable planners to concentrate on establishing the best canal for shipping transit with the fewest complications. If the Panama Canal is to remain in continued operation and grow in efficiency, then it must remain under the sovereignty and control of the United States.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE DANIEL J. FLOOD

Mr. Chairman, as a witness before this submittee on two previous occasions, first, on June 17, 1955, in the successful effort to save the Panama Railroad from liquidation and, second, on June 4, 1964, in opposition to the

enactment of Public Law 88–109 authorizing the study of the long predetermined objective for a sea level canal, I am glad to be with you again to discuss far more vital aspects of the Isthmian subject. Because the status, the United States in control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal is under attack and is destined to receive much attention in the future, I shall address my testimony largely to the historical foundations of United States Isthmian canal policy and the supremely important matter of retaining our undiluted sovereignty over the indispensable protective frame of the Panama Canal known as the Canal Zone.

BASIS FOR DEEP INTERESTS IN INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEMS

For many years I have been studying Panama Canal history and problems and made numerous addresses in and out of the Congress on this complex matter. The deeper that I have delved into it the more I have been impressed with the vision and wisdom of those great leaders, who, in the early part of the century, formulated our Isthmian Canal policies. They were Rear Admiral John G. Walker, John Bassett Moore, Secretary of State John Hay, Secretary of War William Howard Taft, John F. Stevens, George W. Goethals, and above all, President Theodore Roosevelt.

Because many of my colleagues and others have asked me what is the explanation for my long time interest in interoceanic canal problems, I wish to say that during my boyhood in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, ex-President Roosevelt used to be an occasional guest in my home. He spent many hours describing how the Canal Zone was acquired and his problems in launching the construction of the Panama Canal, which he viewed as comparable in geo-political significance with the Louisiana Purchase. Thus he became my youthful ideal and created a lifetime interest on my part in Isthmian Canal policy questions for which I have always been grateful.

CANAL ZONE AND PANAMA CANAL INSEPARABLE

The Panama Canal enterprise consists of two inseparable parts: (1) the Canal itself, and (2) its absolutely necessary protective frame of the Canal Zone territory. The two great canal issues now before the nation are: (1) the transcedent key issue of retaining United States undiluted sovereignty over the Canal Zone and (2) the important project of modernizing the existing Panama Canal by the construction of a third set of larger locks for larger vessels adapted to include the principles of the strongly supported Terminal Lake Plan, which was developed in the Panama Canal organization as the result of World War II experience. All other issues, however important, are irrelevant and should not be allowed to confuse or further delay proper consideration of the two pertinent ones.

Unfortunately, the handling of the two principle issues has been greatly complicated by radical Panamian attacks on U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the exhumation of the corpse of the old controversy over types of canal—high level lake-lock versus sea level tidal lock. Because of the prime importance of the question of sovereignty, a knowledge of the history of its evolution is essential for reaching wise decisions.

EXCLUSIVE U.S. CONTROL IN PERPETUITY BASED ON HISTORY

The present status of the Canal Zone territory traces back to the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty between the United States and Great Britain that ended half a century of conflict over canal routes. In line with that agreement, the United States made the long range commitment to construct and operate an Isthmian canal under its exclusive control in accordance with the rules set forth in the 1888 Convention of Constantinople for the operation of the Suez Canal.

At the same time that the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was being negotiated, our government was conducting a major investigation by an Isthmian Canal Commission for Exploration with Rear Admiral Walker, one of our ablest naval officers of his time, as president. In the supplementary report of that commission on January 18, 1902, recommending the construction of the Panama Canal, it made the following highly significant recommendation that merits study:

"The grant (for an Isthmian Canal) must not be for a term of years, but in perpetuity, and a strip of territory from ocean to ocean of sufficient width must be placed under the control of the United States. In this strip the United States must have the right to enforce police regulations, preserve order, protect property rights, and exercise such other powers as are appropriate and necessary." (Sen. Doc. No. 123, 57th Congress, 1st Session, p. 9.)

* * * * *

In the resulting convention of November 18, 1903, following the Panama Resolution of November 3, Panama granted to the United States in perpetuity the "use, occupation and control" of the Canal Zone territory for the "construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection" of the Panama Canal with full "sovereign rights' power and authority" within the Zone to the "entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." This was the indispensable agreement under which the United States undertook the great task of completing the construction of the Panama Canal and its subsequent operation and defense, which is binding on the United States as fully as on Panama. (Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, Articles II and III, quoted in *Foreign Relations*, 1904, pp. 543–51.)

The terms of this treaty were not accidental. Our leaders at that time had studied the history of the Isthmus and understood the problems that would be involved in such undertaking in a land of frightful disease and endemic revolution. They realized that the United States could not accept responsibility without complete authority as best stated in Article III of the 1903 Treaty. Just as the provisions of this treaty bind the United States in perpetuity to maintain, operate and defend the canal, they are likewise binding on Panama to recognize their validity. Moreover, except for the prompt recognition by the United States of the independence of the Province of Panama following the Panama Revolution of November 3, 1903, the Republic of Panama could never have survived and the Panama Canal would never have been constructed. (For additional information see Earl Harding, *The Untold Story of Panama*, New York: Athene Press, 1954.)

UNITED STATES ACQUIRED OWNERSHIP OF ALL PRIVATELY OWNED LAND AND PROPERTY IN THE ZONE

In addition to the grant of full sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone, the United States obtained title by purchase of all privately owned land and property in the territory from individual property owners, making the Canal Zone the most costly territorial acquisition in the history of the United States (Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress, p. 361.)

These purchases included all works of the French Panama Canal Company and all the stock of the Panama Railroad Company, the latter then a New York Corporation.

EXCLUSIVE U.S. CONTROL OVER CANAL ZONE RECOGNIZED BY PANAMA, 1904

When was exclusive control by the United States over the Canal Zone recognized by Panama? This was done on May 25, 1904, in a note by Secretary of Government Tomas Arias, which stated: "The Government of the Republic of Panama considers that upon the exchange of ratification of the treaty for opening an interoceanic canal across the Isthmus of Panama its jurisdiction ceased over the Zone. . ." That exchange occurred on February 26, 1904, in Washington.

SECRETARY HAY CLARIFIES SOVEREIGNTY QUESTION, 1904

The ink was hardly dry in the 1903 Treaty when Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama Jose D. de Obaldia, in a note to Secretary of State Hay on August 11, 1904, raised the sovereignty issue. (*Foreign Relations*, 1904, pp. 598–607.) In reply to the Panamanian Government's contention that the works "construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection" of the canal as used in the treaty constituted a "limitation on the grant," Secretary Hay, on October 24, 1904, wrote a comprehensive reply that is still classic. (Ibid., pp. 613–30.)

In this reply Secretary Hay explained that the words, "for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal" were not intended as a "limitation on grant" but were a "declaration of the inducement prompting the Republic of Panama to make the grant." (Ibid., p. 614.) He then asserted that the "great object sought to be accomplished by the treaty is to enable the United States to construct the canal by the expenditure of public funds of the United States—funds created by the collection of taxes. . ." (Ibid., p. 616.) Though Secretary Hay in this note did refer to Panama as the "titular sovereign of the Canal Zone," he declared that such sovereign is "mediatized by its own acts, solemnly and publicly proclaimed by treaty stipulations, induced by a desire to make possible the completion of a great work which will confer inestimable benefit on the people of the Isthmus and the nations of the world." He also stated that it was difficult to conceive of a country contemplating the abandonement of such a "high and honorable position, in order to engage in an endeavor to secure what at best is a 'barren scepter'." (Ibid., p. 615.)

In addition, the evidence is conclusive that under no circumstances would the United States have assumed the grave responsibility maintaining, operating, sanitating and protecting the Panama Canal in an area notorius for tropical disease and endless turmoil under a weak and helpless emergent government except for the grant of full sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Canal.

SECRETARY OF WAR TAFT EXPRESSES HIS VIEWS ON CANAL SOVEREIGNTY, 1905–06

When discussing the question of United States power on the Isthmus on January 12, 1905, in a report to President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of War Taft made the following statement:

"The truth is that while we have all the attributes of sovereignty necessary in the construction, maintenance, and protection of the Canal, the very form in which these attributes are conferred in the treaty seems to preserve the titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the Republic of Panama, and as we have conceded to us complete judicial and police power and control over the Zone and the two ports at the end of the canal, I can see no reason for creating a resentment on the part of the people of the Isthmus by quarreling over that which is dear to them but which to us is of no real moment whatever." (Quoted in Hearings before Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals, 1907, Vol. III, p. 2399.) This statement referred to Panamanian claims of being the token sovereign of the Canal Zone.

Again on April 18, 1906, when commenting on Article III of the 1903 Treaty in testimony before a Senate Committee, Secretary Taft stated:

"It is peculiar in not conferring sovereignty directly upon the United States, but in giving to the United States the power which

it would have if it were sovereign. This gives rise to the obvious implication that a mere titular sovereignty is reserved in the Panamanian Government. Now, I agree that to the Anglo-Saxton mind a titular sovereignty is like . . . a barren ideality, but to the Spanish or Latin mind, poetic and sentimental, enjoying the intellectual refinements, and dwelling much on names and forms, it is by no means unimportant." (Hearings before Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals, April 18, 1906, Vol. III, p. 2527.)

These were courteous efforts by Secretary Taft to sooth the sensibilities of our Panamanian friends but never with the thought or purpose of surrendering the actual, necessary and exclusive sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over both the Canal and its indispensable protective frame of the Canal Zone. The term "titular sovereignty" means nothing more than a reversionary interest on the part of Panama in the sole event the United States should abandon the Panama Canal as in the case of the execution of a reversionary deed of property in Anglo-Saxon countries. Hence, there can never be any reversion of the Canal Zone to Panama unless our country abandons the canal enterprise, which includes the Zone.

Unfortunately, many writers have quoted Secretary Taft out of context and this practice has led to much public confusion as to precisely what he said and meant. Some of this confusion is not accidental especially on the part of certain officials of our government who through motives of appeasement have pursued a weak and unrealistic course.

PRESIDENT-ELECT TAFT EMPHASIZES NECESSITY FOR FULL U.S. CANAL CONTROL, 1909

After Secretary Taft's election as President, Panama Canal construction was well underway. In an address on the work at New Orleans on February 9, 1909, the President-elect made the following remarks:

"Because under the treaty with Panama we are entitled to exercise all the sovereignty [in the Canal Zone] and all the rights of sovereignty that we would exercise if we were sovereign, and Panama is excluded from exercising any rights to the contrary of those conceded to us . . . that is a ticklish argument, but I do not care whether it is or not. We are there. We have the right to govern that strip, and we are going to govern it. And without the right to govern the strip, and without the power to make the laws in that strip bend, all of them, to the construction of the Canal, we would not have been within 2 or 3 or 4 years, hardly, of where we are in the construction." (Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress, p. 52.)

Those unqualified words of President-elect Taft are even more applicable today than in 1909, for the Panama Canal has become one of the greatest maritime crossroads in the world with an estimated transit total in 1971 of 15,500 vessels, which is an average of 42.6 per day. (Hearings before Sub Committee of Committee on Appropriations for 1972, Pt. 2. p. 312.)

PRESIDENT TAFT OUTLINES U.S. POLICY ON CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY AND JURISDICTION, 1910

Again as President of the United States on November 16, 1910, while attending a banquet given by the President of Panama, Mr. Taft made this significant statement:

"We are here to construct, maintain, operate, and defend a world Canal, which runs through the heart of your country, and you have given us the necessary sovereignty and jurisdiction over the part of your country occupied by that canal to enable us to do this effectively." (*Canal Record*, Vol. IV, (Nov. 23, 1910), p. 100.)

This was not an excercise in banquet comradery but an unchallenged statement of policy as to the Panama Canal enterprise by the President of the United States, which policy is now being bitterly assailed by an unconstitutional government in Panama founded by force and violence and which might be superseded at any time by a Constitutional government that would reverse the policy of the revolutionary regime.

Again on December 5, 1912, pursuant to the Panama Canal Act of 1912 and in conformity with treaty provisions, President Taft in an Executive order declared that—

"All land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, protection and sanitation of the Panama Canal." (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1971, Vol. 17, p. 206.)

There are greater needs for this area now than there were at that time. In fact the Canal Zone Territory should be extended by the purchase of the entire watershed of the Chagres River that provides the summit level water supply as was once recommended by General Clarence Edwards when he was in command of U.S. Forces on the Isthmus.

SECRETARY OF STATE HUGHES DEFENDS U.S. SOVEREIGNTY OVER CANAL ZONE, 1923

In early 1923 the Panama Government attempted to reopen negotiations for a new canal treaty (*Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1923, Vol. II, pp. 638–48). Secretary of State Hughes studied the history of our relations with Panama, called in the Panamanian Minister and, with a refreshing degree of candor, stated that the U.S. Government "could not and would not enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone under Article III of the Treaty of 1903 as if it were the sovereign of the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama." To this he added that, "it was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American Administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the Treaty of 1903." (*Ibid.* p. 684.)

That forthrightness on the part of Secretary Hughes met with the situation for many years. The present Secretary of State should speak out with like candor in defense of our just and indispensable authority over the Canal Zone. The argument made that the United States does not need all the Canal Zone territory to protect the Canal is unrealistic because any part of it might be needed in time of war to create defenses and to deploy the protective forces for the Canal and Panama itself.

During the construction of the Canal the State Department did not control policy as regards the Canal Zone, and construction went forward effectively and expeditiously. After the completion of the Canal the State Department got its nose into the tent and finally its body. Ever since it has muddled our Isthmian policy by weakness, timidity and vacillation, rendering some of the consequent problems almost beyond solution.

HULL-ALFARO TREATY—1936–1939 STARTED OUR GREAT GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

Because of the economic support of the Panama Canal, the full effects of the Great Depression of 1929 were not felt in Panama until 1932 when they stimulated agitations for a new treaty. With the change of administrations in the United States in 1933 our government weakened as to the earlier official positions taken by President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretaries Hay and Hughes, and negotiated the Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936 with Panama.

Because of a strong opposition in the Senate it was not ratified until 1939 just before the start of World War II. In this treaty, the United States made important concessions to Panama, which included the construction of a Trans-Isthmian highway in Panama extending through the Canal Zone to Colon, giving Panama jurisdiction over that highway in the Zone, renunciation of the right of eminent domain in the Republic of Panama for Canal purposes, and surrender of U.S. authority to maintain public order in the cities of Panama and Colon and adjacent areas. In a realistic sense this treaty was the start of our great giveaway programs, causing serious difficulties in obtaining military bases in Panama for defending the Panama Canal in World War II and creating dangerous precedents. A positive result of the treaty, however, was that Panama recognized that the word "maintenance' 'in Article I of the treaty allowed "expansion and new construction" when undertaken in accordance with the treaty, that is, for the maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the existing Canal.

It was under this authority that the Congress enacted legislation for the Third Locks Project soon afterward and on which more than $76,000,000 was expended before it was suspended in May 1942 because of more urgent war requirements. The useful work accomplished on this project included huge lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores for the proposed larger locks, which could be used for the modernization of the existing canal; and for which a new treaty would be unnecessary.

CHAPIN-FÁBREGA TREATY FURTHER WEAKENS JURIDICAL STRUCTURE, 1955

By 1953 agitations were well underway in Panama for the Chapin-Fábrega Treaty, which without adequate understanding or debate, was ratified in 1955. This treaty gave further concessions to Panama, including provisions for the construction by the United States of a free bridge across the Canal at Balboa to supersede the Thatcher Ferry, relinquishment of the right to enforce health and sanitation ordinances in the cities of Panama and Colón, and the cession to Panama without any compensation whatever of the terminal yards and passenger stations of the Panama Railroad. The last was a clear violation of the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of 1914–22 with Colombia, which gives that country important rights in the use of both the Panama Canal and the Railroad.

The 1955 Treaty completed the withdrawal of the United States from Panama to the boundaries of the Canal Zone but did not alter the basic sovereignty and perpetuity provisions of the 1903 Treaty as regards United States exclusive sovereign control in perpetuity of the Canal enterprise, which includes the Zone.

SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES DEFENDS U.S. POSITION AT PANAMA, 1956

Following the nationalization by Egypt in 1956 of the Suez Canal, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, whose connections with the Panama Canal dated back to World War I, issued an order that no officer of the U.S. Foreign Service, in conversation, speaking or writing, was to equate the status of the Panama Canal with that of the Suez Canal, and that violators would be disciplined (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 19, p. 25974). That order was the last strong statement by a Secretary of State as regards U.S. sovereignty, over the Canal Zone. Secretary Dulles' successors, less conscious of the realities involved, gradually weakened and the aggressiveness of Panamanian radicals correspondingly increased. No high official of our government spoke out as they should have done. Thus matters took their retrogressive course.

U.S. FORMAL RECOGNITION OF PANAMA TITULAR SOVEREIGNTY LEADS TO HEAVIER DEMANDS, 1958

On May 2, 1958, there was an organized mob invasion into the Canal Zone called Operation Sovereignty. Red led Panamanian

University students planted 72 Panama flags at various spots in the Zone, including some squarely in front of the Canal Administration Building. Instead of acting promptly to arrest and punish the trespassers, our responsible authorities naively ignored the incidents as youthful pranks. Instead of pranks they were probes of our government's will power to stand up for the just and indispensable rights of the United States at Panama.

Soon afterward, during a July 12–16 visitation in the Canal Zone by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., told him that flying the Panama flag in the Zone would promote cooperation. That was a very suave statement.

Following the riots of November 3, 1959, which required the use of the U.S. Army to protect the Canal Zone from mob invasion. Under Secretary of State Livingston T. Merchant visited the Isthmus and, under instructions, publicly announced that the United States recognized Panama's titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone but, quite significantly, did not define that term.

As predicted by me in the Congress at the time that disingenuous action did not beguile Panamanian radicals but simply whetted their appetites for more concessions.

U.S. CONGRESS OPPOSES SURRENDERS AT PANAMA, 1960

Reactions in the Congress were quickly forthcoming. On February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 382 to 12, apposed the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone in a House Concurrent Resolution but, unfortunately, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations did not act. As a follow up to the resolution, the House, on February 9, unanimously adopted the Gross Amendment to the 1961 Department of Commerce Appropriations Bill prohibiting the use of any funds under that appropriation for the formal display of the flag of Panama in the Zone. The Senate accepted this amendment and it became law.

As early as April 30, 1960, I predicted in an address in the House that soon after the Congress adjourned there would be an order from the President based upon the recommendation of the State Department, authorizing the display of the Panama flag in the Zone.

Later, on June 23, 1960, I addressed the House, stressing the problems that would follow as the result of the hoisting of the Panama flag in the Zone territory and warning the Congress that elements in the State Department were planning to authorize it. Next, on June 30, I wrote Secretary of State Christian A. Herter apprising him of these facts, urging him to clean out the responsible elements in his department, and warning him that should the Panama flag be displayed in the Canal Zone under his authorization members of the House would press for his impeachment. His reply was evasive. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (86th Cong., 2d Sess.), vol. 106, pt. 14, p. 18872.)

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER STRIKES U.S. FLAG IN CANAL ZONE, SEPTEMBER 17, 1960

Just as predicted, on September 17, 1960, soon after adjournment of the Congress, President Eisenhower, without Congressional sanction and using emergency funds from the Department of State, in a mistaken gesture of friendship, naively authorized the formal display of the Panama Flag in one place in the Canal Zone at Shaler's Triangle as "visual evidence" of Panama's titular sovereignty over the Zone but did not define the terms, which, as already pointed out, is of purely reversionary character. Also as predicted, Panamanians took this display not as evidence of titular sovereignty, but as an official admission by the United States of its recognition of Panama's full sovereignty over the Zone Territory. (G. Bernard Noble, *Christian A. Herter*, New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1970, p. 209.)

To avoid confusion the word sovereignty means the state or quality of having supreme power of dominion. Could there be any better status for the Panama Canal and Canal Zone than that under the full sovereign control of the United States with the avoidance of all problems of extra territoriality? For such sovereignty there can be only one flag and that is the flag of the United States.

PANAMANIAN MOBS ASSAULT CANAL ZONE JANUARY 1964

Did the 1960 display by President Eisenhower appease Panamanian radicals? It did not but simply served to open a Pandora Box of more unrealistic and impossible demands. The Panama flag display was extended by President Eisenhower's successors, President Kennedy and Johnson. They culminated in a massive Red led mob invasion of the Canal Zone during January 9–12, 1964, again requiring the use of our armed forces to protect the lives of our citizens and the Canal itself. In retaliation, Panama broke diplomatic relations with the United States and brought charges against the United States of "aggression" against Panama.

Here I would like to stress that not one United States soldier left the Canal Zone but simply defended the lives of our citizens and the Canal with the result that there was no interruption of transit despite the magnitude of the disorders. This was the highest tribute to the wisdom of our policy of having United States citizens in security positions, and having a protective strip framing the Canal.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ACCEDES TO RADICAL PANAMANIAN DEMANDS, 1964

After President Johnson had an opportunity to get the necessary facts about the Panamanian mob attack, on January 14, 1964, he took a strong initial stand for exercising United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone stating that our country had a "recognized treaty obligation to operate the Canal efficiently and securely, and (that) we intend to honor that obligation in the interest of all who depend upon it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (88th Cong., 2d Sess.), vol. 110, pt. 1, p. 426.) For this candor he was widely commended at home and abroad despite the position taken by the United States in 1956 in opposition to the British-French reoccupation of the Suez Canal.

Unfortunately, after this initial policy statement he apparently fell into the clutches of Department of State miners and sappers and reversed his original position. Consequently, on December 18, 1964, after restoration of normal relations with Panama, President Johnson announced that the U.S. Government had completed an intensive policy review with respect to the present and future of the Panama Canal and that he had reached two decisions:

First, to press forward with Panama and other interested governments for a sea level canal; and second, to negotiate an entirely new canal treaty for the existing Panama Canal.

Legislation to authorize an investigation of the feasibility of a canal of sea level design was obtained—Public Law 88–609, approved September 22, 1964. Robert B. Anderson was assigned to head that study. Later, Mr. Anderson was appointed as chief U.S. Negotiator for the proposed treaty negotiations, thus holding two positions at the same time.

NEW CANAL TREATIES PROPOSED, 1967

On June 26, 1967, President Johnson and President Marco A. Robles of Panama jointly announced that agreement had been reached on three proposed new canal treaties as follows:

The first covering the operation of the present canal would have (1) abrogated the Treaty of 1903, (2) recognized Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone, (3) made Panama an active partner in the management and defense of the Canal, (4) increased toll royalties to Panama, and (5) eventually given to Panama exclusive possession in 1999 if no new canal were constructed at U.S. expense or soon after opening of a sea level canal but not later than 2009 if a new canal were built.

The second treaty for a canal of sea level design would have given the United States an option for 20 years after ratification to start construction, 15 more years for construction and a majority membership in the canal authority for 60 years after opening or until 2067, whichever was earlier. Additional agreements to fix the specific conditions for its combinations would have to be negotiated when the United States should decide to execute its option.

The third treaty for defense would have provisions for the continued use of military bases by U.S. Forces in Panama for 5 years beyond the termination date of the proposed treaty for the operation of the existing canal. If a new canal in Panama were constructed the military base rights treaty would have to be extended for the duration of the treaty for the new canal. (Background of U.S. Decision to Resume Panama Canal Treaty Negotiations, Office of Interoceanic Canal Negotiations, State Department, 1971.)

PROPOSED 1967 TREATIES OPPOSED IN BOTH PANAMA AND THE UNITED STATES

Although President Johnson did make a press release outlining the general aims of the treaties, the governments of both the United States and Panama withheld publication of the proposed treaties apparently with the hope that they would be ratified by our Senate without adequate debate.

Ferreted out through the journalistic iniative of the *Chicago Tribune* and published in that paper, and later quoted in addresses to the U.S. Senate by Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina in the *Congressional Records* of July 17, 21 and 27, 1967, they aroused a storm of protests in both Panama and the United States as well as in Great Britain and Japan, which are large users of the Panama Canal. So strong were these protests that the proposed 1967 treaties were never signed.

SEA LEVEL REOMMENDATION HINGES ON SURRENDER OF CANAL ZONE, 1970

On December 1, 1970, the Anderson panel submitted voluminous report recommending the construction of a new canal of so-called sea level design entirely in Panamanian territory about 10 miles west of the existing canal at an initially estimated cost of $2,888,000,000 to be borne by United States taxpayers. This figure did not include the cost of the rights of way or of the inevitable indemnity to Panama.

Meantime, in line with Isthmian revolutionary history, the Constitutional government of Panama was overthrown on October 11, 1968, after only 10 days in office, by a military coup and a provisional Revolutionary Government established. This eliminated the Panama National Assembly and converted its spacious building into government offices. Eventually, the revolutionary government, after declaring the discredited 1967 treaties unacceptable, sought to negotiate new ones and our government acceded, with the designation of the same Robert B. Anderson as Chief U.S. Negotiator.

Here it should be explained that the construction of a canal of sea level design at Panama for many years has been an undisclosed objective of a small professional engineering-industrial group, including manufacturers of heavy earth moving machinery. The recommendation of the 1970 Anderson Report for a sea level canal hinges upon the surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Moreover, the holding of the position of Chief U.S. Negotiator by the same person who headed the negotiations for the discred-

ited 1967 treaties and the sea level study creates a serious conflict of interest to which the Congress should be fully alert.

One of the great purposes of United States policy of exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone was the avoidance of the never ending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extra-territorial rights. To speak so bluntly as the gravity of the situation at Panama demands, the State Department in recent years has been dominated by those who timidly accept as valid every major claim of Panamanian radicals for the surrender by the United States of its sovereignty over the canal enterprise and its transfer to Panama. Such action would undoubtedly result in the immediate dominance of the Isthmus including the Canal Zone by Soviet powers against which Panama could not cope.

LONG RANGE PANAMANIAN AIMS

Lest there be some doubt as to the long range aims of the Panama Government as to its objectives, on April 29, 1958, Ambassador Ricardo M. Arias of Panama, in a major address at the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University, made this significant revelation:

"The foreign policy of my country during the past 50 years has been to exert every effort in order to obtain at least for Panama, conditions similar to those granted to Colombia in January 1903." (Ho. Doc. 474, 89th Congress, p. 23.)

The blackmailing and demogogic revolutionary government of Panama would have the world forget the history of that country: the Panama Revolution under the guaranty of the United States, the reasons for the 1903 Treaty under which the United States constructed and has subsequently operated and defended the Panama Canal, the transformation of Panama from a cesspool of disease and penury into a relatively healthy land of comparative prosperity, and the vast sums provided by our government for canal purposes. The net total of these sums including defense, as of June 30, 1968, was more than $5,000,000,000, all provided by the taxpayers of the United States.

All the facts just enumerated, Mr. Chairman, the present government of Panama would remove from the memory of mankind. The United States can well stand on the record that it has made at Panama in dealing with all of these matters and trust to history for vindication.

Manifestly, Panama cannot eat its cake and have it also. After the United States built the canal and successfully operated it for more than half a century, a fly by night and sanguinary revolutionary government would have our country neglect its duty to its taxpayers and surrender the indispensably necessary protective frame of the Canal to Panama and thus enable that country to expropriate the canal itself and drive us from the Isthmus. The present Revolutionary Government of Panama has been motivated by a complete disregard of historical verities and its policy of truculence and impossible claims has undoubtedly been induced by Soviet assurances, for Soviet experts are already in Panama. This always happens prior to the establishment of diplomatic relations.

WHY NOT SURRENDER TO COLOMBIA RATHER THAN PANAMA?

In response to the officialdom in our government who seem determined to destroy the 1903 Treaty and surrender our just rights, power and authority at Panama, why should not such surrender be made to Colombia, which until November 3, 1903, was the sovereign of the Isthmus instead of Panama?

Any surrender of the Canal Zone and Canal is unthinkable; but if any surrender should be made it should be to Colombia, of which Panama was once a province, and not to Panama.

SEA LEVEL CANAL—A POLITICAL MOVE

In the light of what has taken place it is interesting to note that Colonel John P. Sheffey, former Executive Director of the recent sea level studies and now of the Office of Interoceanic Canal Negotiations in the Department of State, made the following revealing statements before a gathering of marine scientists on March 4, 1971, at the Smithsonian Institution:

1. "That the canal investigation under Public Law 88-609 calling for consideration of the long range Canal program originated with the State Department following the 1964 riots as a means for improving treaty relationships with Panama.

2. That President Nixon had accepted the final 1964 Johnson canal treaty policy.

3. That the main purpose of the sea level proposal was to obtain "better treaty relationships" with Panama.

4. That if such relationships are not obtained the project is not warranted.

5. That the sea level proposal is not justified economically and that it "may never be constructed."

6. That because of opposition in both the United States and Panama the 1967 draft treaties would not be the basis for future negotiations.

7. That the sea level proposal was recognized as "ecologically dangerous."

8. That a decision to construct one would be a "political" decision.

Could there be more shocking admissions concerning a subject of such vast importance to the entire world than those just enumerated? (*Congressional Record*, March 24, 1971, p. 7839.)

PRESIDENT NIXON ADOPTS THE FINAL JOHNSON POLICY

The latest information on the canal treaty situation is that President Nixon, on the advice of the same appeasement officials in the State Department who advised President Johnson and whom President Nixon in his 1968 campaign had avowed to replace, has established objectives similar to those of his predecessor as modified by events since 1967. This information is that the "renewal of violence in Panama, possibly more extensive than experienced in 1964, might be unavoidable if the treaty objectives considered by the Panamanian people to be reasonable and just are not substantially achieved." This is complete blackmail on the part of the Panama Government, which today is unconstitutional under Panamanian requirements.

Though averring that the United States has "no intention of yielding control and defense of the Canal to the threat of violence," the State Department view is that it is in United States interest to demonstrate again as in 1967 our "willingness to make adjustments" which do not significantly weaken our rights to control and defend the canal and that it would be difficult for the United States to "justify itself in world forums" in the event it is again forced to "commit" its armed forces against "Panamanian incursion into the Canal Zone." (Background . . . , 1971, op. cit.) Could there be any more obvious double talk? The United States did not commit its Armed Forces against anybody.

Such statements of policy, Mr. Chairman, are an expression of willingness to surrender in advance. What could be more pusillanimous or unrealistic than this State Department pronouncement! No wonder the eyes of the world are watching us at Panama, for upon what we do there could well depend the freedom or the slavery of the world. Shabby sentimentality has no place in the consideration of the problems of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Instead of surrendering the Canal Zone to Panama it ought to be extended so as to include the entire drainage area of the Chagres River basin as was first recommended by General Clarence R. Edwards, the Commanding General of U.S. troops on the Isthmus, as the result of World War I experience.

PANAMA NEGOTIATORS DEMAND FULL SOVEREIGNTY OVER CANAL ZONE

In public statement by the Panamanian negotiators just prior to their departure for the United States on June 29, 1971, they said that they would demand full sovereignty over the Canal Zone or that there would be no treaty and that in event of failure to get such sovereignty they would return to Panama and explain matters to their people. In view of the anti-United States frenzy into which the people of that country have been whipped, this constitutes an open threat of violence comparable to that of January 9-12, 1964, which required the use of our Armed Forces to protect the lives of our citizens and the canal itself. Certainly there are few better examples of how appeasement begets blackmail than in the conduct during recent years of our policies at Panama. It must be borne in mind that those who made these threats overthrew by force and violence the Constitutional Government of Panama and are maintaining themselves in power by the same means. Why make treaties with the present Revolutionary Government which would in all likelihood be repudiated when Panama returns to a Constitutional government just as the present government repudiated the proposed 1967 treaties.

The greater part of the turmoil and bitterness that has evolved in Panama has been because Panamanian radicals and demagogs have failed to diagnose realistically the premises on which they base their policies and actions. Unfortunately, through continued insistence Panamanian policies now prevailing are not realistic.

Timidity and vacillation on the part of our State Department have served to induce extravagant claims and demands by Panama that have resulted in brain washing our accredited officials who have never emphasized the genesis of Panama and the Canal.

Panama is not a great power and can never be one. It is a small and weak country—the result of a Caesarian operation that was successful because the United States as a great power supported it. While Panama's frequently mentioned geographic position is an asset it is also a great liability because predatory powers covet it. The actual confrontation now occurring is not between the United States and Panama but between the United States and the U.S.S.R. The Soviet takeover of Cuba had, and still has, for its purpose the control of the Panama Canal.

Moreover, Panama at present does not have any Constitutional way to ratify treaties because the Revolutionary Government has abolished the National Assembly of Panama, which is the treaty ratifying agency of the Panamanian Government.

U.S. CONSTITUTION PROTECTS CANAL ZONE

Here I would emphasize the importance of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, that vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress, which of course, includes the House of Representatives. This places a high degree of responsibility on the subcommittee, for as in the case of the 1967 proposed treaties and, so far as can be ascertained, at the present time, this wise Constitutional provision is being ignored by our treaty negotiators.

An examination of court decisions will disclose that the Constitutionality of this provision has been upheld many times. One example of our government complying with it was in the 1955 Treaty in which the conveyance of lands and property of the United States to Panama was "subject to the enactment of legislation by the Congress." (Chapin-Fábrega Treaty of January 25, 1955, Article V.)

PANAMA CANAL IS PART OF THE U.S. COAST LINE

As foreseen by the formulators of our major Isthmian Canal policies of site, type, and control, the Panama Canal is a part of the coast line of the United States. Its protection is just as vital to national defense as the protection of Delaware Bay or San Francisco Harbor.

General plans for the major increase of capacity and operational improvements of the existing canal have been developed and are covered in pending legislation but cannot proceed until the sovereignty issue is clarified and our undiluted control and ownership of the canal and the Canal Zone fully understood and recognized, for the Canal can no more be separated from the Zone than boilers from a steam power plant.

The very moment that we surrender sovereignty over the Zone to Panama as presently planned, Soviet power will take over the Republic of Panama as it did Cuba. In fact, as previously stated, Soviet experts have already arrived in Panama and are advisng the University, social security organizations, and labor offices of the Panamanian Government.

Thus, also as previously indicated, the issue is not United States control of the Canal Zone versus Panamanian but continued U.S. sovereignty versus U.S.S.R. domination.

DANGERS OF SURRENDERS

Before any surrender to Panama of sovereignty over the Canal Zone there are many questions that must be answered satisfactorily, among them the following:

Where would Panamanian political leaders flee for asylum to escape assassination such as has frequently occurred for many years?

How could the lives of our citzens and the Canal itself be defended against mob violence without the protective frame of the Canal Zone under the control of the United States?

How could the Canal be efficiently maintained and operated unless the undiluted control of the Zone with all its tremendous facilities remains with the United States?

How could the constant conflicts and recriminations that always feature extra-territoriality be avoided in the event of surrender of Canal Zone sovereignty?

How could the Panama Canal be modernized without further extortions through further treaty negotiations?

Why jeopardize our present treaty rights to modernize the existing canal by "expansion and new construction" by abrogating the workable 1903 Treaty?

Why should the United States abandon policies successfully tested in the operation of the existing canal based on provisions of a workable Treaty for a mere option for a new canal sea level design that even its advocates admit may never be constructed?

Why does the State Department ignore the marine ecological angle involved in constructing a salt water channel between the oceans, which recognized scientists predict would result in infecting the Atlantic with the poisonous Pacific sea snake and the predatory Crown of Thorns starfish that would have international repercussions?

Is not the Republic of Panama a small and weak country whose independence is assured only so long as the United States remains on the Isthmus?

Is not all the talk by the Revolutionary Government of Panama about the dignity of the fatherland false and demagogic?

Why has it whipped the people of Panama into a frenzy of great expectations which when not realized may result in violence?

What would be the legal complications of spending more than six decades of United States jurisdiction and the Canal Zone Code that has been enacted by the Congress?

Would not such surrender be in violation of the 1950 Panama Canal Reorganization Act (Pub. Law 841, 81st Congress) that placed the canal on a self-sustaining basis?

Would not the surrender of the Canal Zone arouse controversy with Great Britain as violative of the 1901 Hay-Pauncefort Treaty and other large maritime nations that have accepted that treaty?

Would not surrender of the Canal Zone to Panama violate the right of Colombia under the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of 1914–22 in the Panama Canal and Railroad?

In view of terms of the 1903 Treaty ceding sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the United States how can it be legally surrendered except by the abandonment of the Panama Canal?

Would not such surrender revive the claim of Colombia not only to the Canal Zone and Canal but also to the entire Isthmus?

Should such surrender be made why not make it to Colombia rather than Panama?

What reason except a determination to acquire the Panama Canal has motivated the U.S.S.R. in the takeover of Cuba, the building of bases there, and operating submarines off both coasts of Latin America?

Instead of surrendering the Canal Zone to Panama why not extend it to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River?

Would not the cession of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama facilitate the expropriation of the Canal as occurred in Egypt after the surrender of the Suez Canal Zone?

Would not such expropriation be supported by the full might of Soviet power?

Then who would operate and control this great artery of marine transportation and world strategy?

Can you think of a worse blow against the United States short of nuclear attack than the loss of the Panama Canal?

Would not cession of the Canal Zone constitute a precedent for other nations, emboldened by such surrender to Panama, to challenge our right to Alaska, the Gadsden Purchase, the vast Southwest, Florida and the Louisiana Purchase?

The historic canal policy of the United States is for an American canal, on American soil, for the American people and world shipping as provided by law; and that is the policy that should be followed without any dilution.

PRESENT TASKS BEFORE THE CONGRESS

The present task before the House of Representatives is the transcendent one of clarification and reaffirmation of our sovereign control of the Panama Canal enterprise. The resolutions now pending reflect the views of our best informed Congressional leaders and especially qualified citizens from various parts of the nation. Their adoption will serve notice in the world, especially Soviet rulers, that the United States has the will to meet its treaty obligations at Panama and that it will continue to do so and thus serve to regain the public image that our great country has lost through weak and timid policies in recent years, particularly in Latin America. It will open the way for the next great step by the Congress in the evolution of our Isthmian Canal policy—the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal. These two steps together, sovereignty reaffirmation and modernization, should meet the canal situation for many years into the future.

The urgently needed modernization would be provided by H.R. 712 now before this Sub-Committee and an identical measure, S. 734, now before the Senate Committee on Armed Services. The plan embodied in these bills calls for the major operational improvement and increase of capacity of the existing Panama Canal, which, most importantly, can be accomplished without negotiating a new treaty with Panama. The plan would simply complete the authorized but suspended Third Locks Project adapted to the principles of the Terminal Lake solution, which would supply the best operational canal at least cost.

Mr. Chairman, in order that measures now pending in the Congress may be readily available to those reading my statement I wish to include the full texts of H. Res. 540 and H.R. 712 as parts of my remarks and to urge prompt action thereon. It should be noted that H. Res. 540 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and that its Sub-Committee on Inter-American Affairs held hearings on it on September 22–23, 1971.

In addition, I wish to include a thoughtful article on Panama Canal in the November 1971 issue of *Natural History* entitled, "The Sea Snakes Are Coming," by Dr. William A. Dunson of Pennsylvania State University, which discusses the biological hazards of the currently proposed sea level canal at Panama; also the 1971 Memorial to the Congress by the Committee for Continued Control of the Panama Canal and a newstory from the November 28 issue of the Baltimore Sun by Richard O'Mara.

H. RES. 540

Whereas it is the policy of the House of Representatives and the desire of the people of the United States that the United States maintain its indispensable sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between the United States and Great Britain, the United States adopted the principles of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 as the rules for the operation, regulation, and management of said canal; and

Whereas by the terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between the Republic of Panama and the United States, the Republic of Panama granted full sovereign rights, power, and authority in perpetuity to the United States over the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority; and

Whereas under the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between Republic of Colombia and the United States, the Republic of Colombia recognized that the title to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad is vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States and the United States granted important rights in the use of the Panama Canal and Railroad to Colombia; and

Whereas from 1904 through June 30, 1968, the United States has made an aggregate net investment in said canal, including defense, of over $5,000,000,000; and

Whereas said investment or any part thereof could never be recovered in the event of Panamanian seizure, United States abandonment of the canal enterprise, or under any other circumstances; and

Whereas, under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, the power to dispose of territory or other property of the United States is specifically vested in the Congress; and

Whereas 70 per centum of Panama Canal traffic either originates or terminates in United States ports; and

Whereas said canal is of vital strategic importance and imperative to the hemispheric defense and to the security of the United States as well as of Panama itself; and

Whereas, during the preceding administration, the United States conducted negotiations with the Republic of Panama which resulted in proposed treaties under the terms of which the United States would relinquish its control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal with the gift of both to Panama; and

Whereas the present revolutionary Govern-

ment of Panama seeks to renew negotiations with the United States looking toward a similar treaty or treaties; and

Whereas the December 1, 1970, report by the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission revives the entire canal situation, including surrender of the Canal Zone to Panama and operation of the Panama Canal by an international organization not subject to laws of the United States.

Whereas the recommendations of said commission would place the United States in a position of heavy responsibility without requisite authority and invite a takeover by Soviet power of the isthmus as occurred in Cuba, other Latin American countries, and at the Suez Canal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over said Canal Zone and Panama Canal and that the United States Government should in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights, jurisdiction, territory, or property to any other sovereign nation or to any international organization, which rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction are indispensably necessary for the protection and security of the entire Western Hemisphere including the canal and Panama.

H.R. 712

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of not less than one hundred and forty feet by not less than one thousand two hundred feet by not less than forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks capacity at Gatun, raise the summit water level to its optimum height of approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at an estimated total cost not to exceed $850,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Governor of the Canal Zone may act and exercise his authority as President of the Panama Canal Company and may utilize the services and facilities of that company.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations there in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of $200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Services or the President of the Panama Canal Company, or both, shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 13. Any provision of the Act of August 11, 1939 (54 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), or of any other statute, inconsistent with any provision of this Act is superseded, for the purposes of this Act, to the extent of such inconsistency.

PANAMA CANAL: SOVEREIGNTY AND MODERNIZATION

Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States: The undersigned, who have studied various aspects of inter-oceanic canal

history and problems, wish to express their views:

1) The report of the interoceanic canal inquiry, authorized under Public Law 88–609, headed by Robert B. Anderson, recommending construction of a new canal of so-called sea level design in the Republic of Panama, was submitted to the President on December 1, 1970. The proposed canal, *initially* estimated to cost $2,880,000,000 exclusive of the costs of right of way and inevitable indemnity to Panama, would be 10 miles West of the existing Canal. This recommendation, which hinges upon the surrender to Panama by the United States of all sovereign control over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone, has rendered the entire canal situation so acute and confused as to require rigorous clarification.

2) A new angle developed in the course of the sea level inquiry is that of the Panama biota (fauna and flora), on which subject, a symposium of recognized scientists was held on March 4, 1971 at the Smithsonian Institution. That gathering was overwhelmingly opposed to any sea level project because of the biological dangers to marine life incident to the removal of the fresh water barrier between the Oceans, now provided by the Gatun Lake, including in such dangers the infestation of the Carribbean Sea and Atlantic Ocean with the poisonous yellow-bellied Pacific sea snake (Pelamis platurus).

3) The construction by the United States of the Panama Canal (1904–1914) was the greatest industrial enterprise in history. Undertaken as a long-range commitment by the United States, in fulfillment of solemn treaty obligations (Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901) as a "mandate for civilization" in an area notorious as the pest hole of the world and as a land of endemic revolution, endless intrigue and governmental instability (Flood, "Panama: Land of Endemic Revolution . . . ") CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 115, pt. 17, pp. 22845–22848, the task was accomplished in spite of physical and health conditions that seemed insuperable. Its subsequent management and operation on terms of "entire equality" with tolls that are "just and equitable" have won the praise of the world, particularly countries that use the Canal.

4) Full sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over the Canal Zone territory and Canal were acquired by treaty grant in perpetuity from Panama (Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903). In addition to the indemnity paid by the United States to Panama for the necessary sovereignty and jurisdiction, all privately owned land and property in the Zone were purchased by the United States from individual owners; and Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus before Panama's independence, has recognized the title to the Panama Canal and Railroad as vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States (Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of 1914–22). The cost of acquiring the Canal Zone, as of March 31, 1964, totalled $144,568,571, making it the most expensive territorial extension in the history of the United States. Because of the vast protective obligations of the United States, the perpetuity provisions in the 1903 treaty assure that Panama will remain a free and independent country in perpetuity, for these provisions bind the United States as well as Panama.

5) The gross total investment of our country in the Panama Canal enterprise, including its defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1968, was $6,368,009,000; recoveries during the same period were $1,359,931,421, making a total net investment by the taxpayers of the United States of more than $5,000,000,000; which, if converted into 1971 dollars, would be far greater. Except for the grant by Panama of full sovereign powers over the Zone territory, our Government would never have assumed the grave responsibilities involved in the construction of the Canal and its later operation, maintenance, sanitation, protection and defense.

6) In 1939, prior to the start of World War II, the Congress authorized, at a cost not to exceed $277,000,000, the construction of a third set of locks known as the Third Locks Project, then hailed as "the largest single current engineering work in the world." This Project was suspended in May 1942 because of more urgent war needs, and the total expenditures thereon were $76,357,405, mostly on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, which are still usable. Fortunately, no excavation was started at Pedro Miguel. The program for the enlargement of Gaillard Cut started in 1959, with correlated channel improvements, was completed in 1970 at a cost of $95,000,000. These two works together represent an expenditure of more than $171,000,000 toward the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal.

7) As the result of canal operations in the crucial period of World War II, there was developed in the Panama Canal organization the first comprehensive proposal for the major operational improvement and increase of capacity of the Canal as derived from actual marine experience, known as the Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan. This conception included provisions for the following:

(1) Elimination of the bottleneck Pedro Miguel Locks.

(2) Consolidation of all Pacific Locks South of Miraflores.

(3) Raising the Gatun Lake water level to its optimum height (about 92').

(4) Construction of one set of larger locks.

(5) Creation at the Pacific end of the Canal of a summit-level terminal lake anchorage for use as a traffic reservoir to correspond with the layout at the Atlantic end, which would improve marine operations by eliminating lockage surges in Gaillard Cut, mitigate the effect of fog on Canal capacity, reduce transit time, diminishing the number of accidents, and simplify the management of the Canal.

8) Competent, experienced engineers have officially reported that all "engineering considerations which are associated with the plan are favorable to it." Moreover, such a solution:

(1) Enables the maximum utilization of all work so far accomplished on the Panama Canal, including that on the suspended Third Locks Project.

(2) Avoids the danger of disastrous slides.

(3) Provides the best operational canal practicable of achievement with the certainty of success.

(4) Preserves and increases the existing economy of Panama.

(5) Avoids inevitable Panamanian demands for damages that would be involved in the proposed sea level project.

(6) Averts the danger of a potential biological catastrophe with international repercussions that recognized scientists fear might be caused by constructing a salt water channel between the Oceans.

(7) Can be constructed at "comparatively low cost" without the necessity for negotiating a new canal treaty with Panama.

(9) All of these facts are elemental considerations from both U.S. national and international viewpoints and cannot be ignored, especially the diplomatic and treaty aspects. In connection with the latter, it should be noted that the original Third Locks Project, being only a modification of the existing Canal, and wholly within the Canal Zone, did not require a new treaty with Panama. Nor, as previously stated, would the Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan require a new treaty. These are paramount factors in the overall equation.

10) In contrast, the persistently advocated and strenuously propagandized Sea-Level Project at Panama, initially estimated in 1970 to cost $2,880,000,000, exclusive of the costs of the right of way and indemnity to Panama, has long been a "hardy perennial," according to former Governor of the Panama Canal, Jay J. Morrow. It seems that no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such proposal within practicable limits of cost and time is demonstrated, there will always be someone to argue for it; and this, despite the economic, engineering, operational, environmental and navigational superiority of the Terminal Lake solution. Moreover, any sea-level project, whether in the U.S. Canal Zone territory or elsewhere, will require a new treaty or treaties with the countries involved in order to fix the specific conditions for its construction; and this would involve a huge indemnity and a greatly increased annuity that would have to be added to the cost of construction and reflected in tolls, *or* be wholly borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

11) Starting with the 1936–39 Treaty with Panama, there has been a sustained erosion of United States rights, powers and authority on the Isthmus, culminating in the completion, in 1967, of negotiations for three proposed new canal treaties that would:

(1) Surrender United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama;

(2) Make that weak, technologically primitive and unstable country a senior partner in the management and defense of the Canal;

(3) Ultimately give to Panama not only the existing Canal, but also any new one constructed in Panama to replace it, all without any compensation whatever and all in derogation of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution. This Clause vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the entire Congress (House *and* Senate) and not in the treaty-making power of our Government (President and Senate)—a Constitutional provision observed in the 1955 Treaty with Panama.

12) It is clear from the conduct of our Panama Canal policy over many years that policy-making elements within the Department of State, in direct violation of the indicated Constitutional provision, have been, and are yet, engaged in efforts which will have the effect of diluting or even repudiating entirely the sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States with respect to the Canal and of dissipating the vast investment of the United States in the Panama Canal project. Such actions would eventually and inevitably permit the domination of this strategic waterway by a potentially hostile power that now indirectly controls the Suez Canal. That canal, under such domination, ceased to operate in 1967 with vast consequences of evil to world trade.

13) Extensive debates in the Congress over the past decade have clarified and narrowed the key canal issues to the following:

(1) Retention by the United States of its undiluted and indispensable sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone territory and Canal as provided by existing treaties;

(2) The *major* modernization of the existing Panama Canal as provided for in the Terminal Lake Proposal.

Unfortunately, these efforts have been complicated by the agitation of Panamanian extremists, aided and abetted by irresponsible elements in the United States, aiming at ceding to Panama complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone and, eventually, the ownership of the existing Canal and any future canal in the Zone or in Panama that might be built by the United States to replace it.

14) In the 1st Session of the 92nd Congress identical bills were introduced in both House and Senate to provide for the *major* increase of capacity and operational improvement of the *existing* Panama Canal by modifying the authorized Third Locks Project to embody the principles of the previously mentioned Terminal Lake solution,

which competent authorities consider would supply the best operational canal practicable of achievement, and at least cost without treaty involvement.

15) Starting on January 26, 1971 many Members of Congress have sponsored resolutions expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal enterprise, including the Canal Zone, and not surrender any of its powers to any other nation or to any international organization in derogation of present treaty provisions.

16) The Panama Canal is a priceless asset of the United States, essential for interoceanic commerce and Hemispheric security. The recent efforts to wrest its control from the United States trace back to the 1917 Communist Revolution and conform to long range Soviet policy of gaining domination over key water routes as in Cuba, which flanks the Atlantic approach to the Panama Canal, and as was accomplished in the case of the Suez Canal, which the Soviet Union now wishes opened in connection with its naval buildup in the Eastern Mediterranean and Indian Ocean. Thus, the real issue at Panama, dramatized by the Communist take over of strategically located Cuba and Chile, is not United States control versus Panamanian but United States control versus Soviet control. This is the issue that should be debated in the Congress, especially in the Senate. Panama is a small, weak country occupying a strategic geographical position that is the objective of predatory power, requiring the presence of the United States on the Isthmus in the interest of Hemispheric security and international order.

(17) In view of all the foregoing, the undersigned urge prompt action as follows:

(1) Adoption by the House of Representatives of pending Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions and,

(2) Enactment by the Congress of pending measures for the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal.

To these ends, we respectfully urge that hearings be promptly held on the indicated measures and that Congressional policy thereon be determined for early prosecution of the vital work of modernizing the Panama Canal, now approaching saturation capacity.

Dr. Karl Brandt, Palo Alto, Calif., Economist, Hoover Institute, Sanford, CA. Former Chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Comdr. Homer Brett, Jr., Chevy Case, Md. Former Intelligence Officer, Caribbean Area.

Hon. Ellis O. Briggs, Hanover, N.H., U.S. Ambassador retired and Author.

Dr. John C. Briggs, Tampa, Florida, Professor of Biology, University of South Florida, Tampa.

William B. Collier, Santa Barbara, Calif., Business Executive with Engineering and Naval Experience.

Lt. Gen. Pedro Adel Valle, Annapolis, Maryland, Intelligence Analyst, Former Commanding General, 1st Marine Div.

Herman H. Dinsmore, New York, N.Y. Former Associate Foreign Editor, New York Times, Editorialist.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Alexandria, Va,. Professor of Economics, Georgetown University.

Dr. Donald M. Dozer, Sta. Barbara, Calif., Historian, University of Calif., Sta. Barbara, Authority on Latin America.

Lt. Gen. Ira C. Baker, Washington, D.C., former Commander-in-Chief, Allied Air Forces, Mediterranean, Analysis and Commentator on National Security Questions.

K. V. Hoffman, Richmond, Va., editor and author.

Dr. Walter D. Jacobs, College Park, Md., Professor of Government and Politics, University of Maryland.

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, McLean, Va., engineer and author.

Edwin J. B. Lewis, Washington, D.C., Professor of Accounting, George Washington University, past president, Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C.

Dr. Leonard B. Loeb, Berkely, Calif., Professor of Physics Emeritus, University of California.

William Loeb, Manchester, N.H., publisher and author.

Lt. Col. Matthews P. McKeon, Springfield, Va., intelligence analyst, editor and publisher.

Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Tulsa, Okla., consulting geologist, formerly head of Department of Geology, University of Pennsylvania.

Richard B. O'Keefe, Fairfax, Va., Asst. Professor, George Mason College, University of Virginia, research consultant on Panama Canal, The American Legion.

Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, Owings Mills, Md., aviation exectuive.

V. Adm. T. G. W. Settle, Washington, D.C., former commander, Amphibious Forces, Pacific.

Jon P. Speller, New York, N.Y., author and editor.

Harold Lord Varney, New York, N Y., president, Committee on Pan American Policy, New York, authority on Latin American policy, editor.

Capt. Franz O. Willenbucher, Bethesda, Md., lawyer and executive.

Dr. Francis G. Wilson, Washington, D.C., Professor of Political Science Emeritus, University of Illinois, author and editor.

[From Natural History, November 1971]

THE SEA SNAKES ARE COMING

(By William A. Dunson)

"As we sailed along we saw multitudes of grampuses every day; also water-snakes of divers colours. Both the Spaniards and Indians are very fearful of these snakes, believing there is no cure for their bitings." Basil Ringrose, 1679, in *The Buccaneers of America,* by John Esquemeling.

The accuracy of this early description by an English pirate of the yellow-bellied sea snake, *Pelamis platurus,* off the coast of Ecuador could not be greatly improved upon today. This venomous member of the sea snake family is found in great numbers along the Pacific coasts of Mexico and Central and South America, between Baja California and Ecuador. The extreme variation in coloration ("divers colours") of the serpent is most unusual, and we have no more access to an antivenin for its poison than Ringrose had in 1679.

Our appalling ignorance of this remarkable snake's habits has recently been forcibly brought home by a renewal of interest in construction of a sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, which for economic and military reasons recommended construction of a sea-level canal in Panama, gave little consideration to the possibly deleterious effect of intermingling organisms from the two oceans. Other scientists, however, reflecting our increased ecological knowledge, have shown more awareness of the problems. A National Academy of Sciences committee reported that "great danger would result from building a sea-level canal. . . ." The Pacific yellow-bellied sea snake came to center stage in this debate because it is one of the species that no one would like to see ushered into the Atlantic Ocean by our engineering follies. Another undesirable Pacific immigrant could be the crown-of-thorns starfish, which consumes coral.

To estimate the likelihood of the yellow-bellied sea snake passing through a sea-level canal, we must understand the habits of this marine reptile. It has traditionally been considered a pelagic "blue-water" species that only rarely came close to land. But in a recent cruise of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography research vessel *Alpha Helix* between San Diego and Panama, we often observed this sea snake present within a few miles of shore, and we caught some individuals within a few hundred feet of land. Another striking finding of our recent studies is that the yellow-bellied sea snake drifts passively with surface ocean currents and is sometimes swept onto coastal beaches, where it dies in the sun.

Sea snakes represent the end result of millions of years of specialization for life under very stringent conditions. For a reptile, the ocean is anything but an environmental featherbed. Its high concentration of salts (about 3.5 percent sodium chloride) makes it difficult for reptiles to retain water in their bodies, yet keep the salt concentration low. The total salt concentration of the body fluids of vertebrates is usually only about one-third that of sea water. Marine mammals keep a low blood-salt level by excreting concentrated urine, but the reptilian kidney is very weak and completely unable to produce urine more concentrated than blood. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that all marine reptiles have salt-excreting glands.

The kinds of salt glands developed reveal the divergent evolutionary paths taken by the ancestors of marine reptiles. In turtles, salty "tears" are secreted by a gland behind the eye. In the marine iguana, a large gland in the nose secretes a fluid that is sneezed out the nostrils. In the sea snakes, I have recently discovered a third type of gland, which is located under the tongue, that secretes salt into the mouth.

Sea snakes are closely related to cobras and kraits, and like them, have fixed fangs and a potent venom. As a family, they are widely distributed, being found between the latitudes of South Africa and Japan in the western Pacific and Indian Oceans, eastward to a zone between Mexico and Ecuador.

There are no sea snakes in the Atlantic Ocean, the Mediterranean Sea, or the Red Sea. The Atlantic only narrowly escaped being a home for these successful reptiles, which apparently migrated to the New World sometime after the Central American land bridge rose out of the sea for the last time, about four million year ago. Occasionally, sea snakes are found just inside the South Atlantic at Cape Town, but these individuals are as rare and out of place as the doomed sea turtles swept to the British Isles by the Gulf Stream.

Thus, sea snakes are only rarely found outside the tropical zone or the transition zone between the tropics and the temperate zone. I believe that even the most widespread form, the yellow-bellied sea snake, can breed only if the water temperature is above 68° F. Because it is able to feed at the surface and to float with ocean currents, this particular snake has by far the greatest range of any sea snake. Other kinds, such as *Laticauda,* the banded sea snakes, are much more restricted in range.

The greatest number of all sea snakes is found in the Indo-Australian area, the snakes' ancestral home. The Straits of Malacca, between the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra, harbors as many as 27 different kinds. Unfortunately, we still know very little about how so many species are able to live in the same area without competing with one another.

The bits of information we do have about the life history and ecology of sea snakes reveal many interesting adaptations. Being air breathers, these snakes must surface. The flattened tail and laterally compressed body make them efficient divers, although most remain in relatively shallow water. Because

many species feed on eels and other bottom-dwelling fish, they cannot venture into water too deep for their feeding dives. George Pickwell, an expert on sea snakes, has observed *Laticauda* trap small fish in rock crevices with the folds of its body and then grasp the fish with its mouth. I have watched a sea snake in a small aquarium use coils of its body to immobilize a fish against the side of the tank before seizing it and swallowing it. This feeding response may explain how the sea snakes can catch fish that could easily outswim them in open water. Shrimp and prawns have been found in the stomachs of certain sea snakes; they must have been caught while they were buried in bottom sand or mud.

The yellow-bellied sea snake, however, is entirely a surface feeder. This snake floats at the surface, perhaps simulating a stick, and fish are attracted to it as to any floating object. The snakes have been observed many times with a group of small fish faithfully swimming underneath; with a swift sideways strike the snake has a meal.

Respiration in sea snakes is interesting because they are reportedly capable of staying submerged for anywhere from two to eight hours. Their metabolism is much slower than that of mammals like ourselves, but this only partially explains dives of this duration. The sea snake's lung is greatly enlarged, extending all the way to the base of the tail. As in other snakes, the left lung is small, while the right lung is highly developed. Even the trachea, the windpipe connecting with the lung, has been modified to provide an area for exchange of gases. Certain areas of the lung in the rear of the body may serve no respiratory function but may instead act as a hydrostatic organ. In this way the snake might be able to regulate its bouyancy. Sea snakes may also have an increased tolerance for anoxia, or lack of oxygen, allowing them to pay off an "oxygen debt" after they return to the surface.

However these snakes tolerate submersion, they certainly feel at home in the water. Some sea snakes in the Philippines, which feed only on bottom-dwelling eels, have been observed diving down out of sight in clear water of a maximum depth of 500 feet. We do not know how they avoid the effects of great pressure at these depths. Types of sea snakes that must dive to the bottom for their food are confined mainly to waters within the 100-fathom line. Thus they may not be capable of diving to depths greater than 600 feet.

Sea snakes differ greatly in their breeding habits. At breeding time, certain kinds, such as *Laticauda*, mass near islands in the tropical Pacific. In the Philippine Islands there is a commercial fishery based on the islets where the snakes congregate. In a single year on Gato Islet, as many as 100,000 snakes are killed for their skins. Others are taken alive, spitted on pointed bamboo sticks, and then roasted or smoked before being eaten. Shore-breeding sea snakes lay their eggs in crevices or in caves and leave them to hatch, but the yellow-bellied sea snake never comes ashore, even at breeding time. Mating takes place at sea and the young are born alive in the water.

Several attempts have been made to define the breeding season of sea snakes, but it is by no means certain that reproduction is limited to a particular time of year. In areas with a pronounced rainy, or monsoon, season, it is quite likely that reproduction is timed to occur when the snakes return in numbers to the coast at the beginning of the storms.

It is then that fishermen pulling in their nets encounter them along the coasts and estuaries of Southeast Asia. The snakes may move into river mouths where the salinity is quite low and on occasion continue up the rivers. In one case a sea snake was caught in a fresh-water lake (Grand Lac) in Cambodia after having ascended the Mekong River.

Temperature is a major factor in the distribution of sea snakes, and they are found primarily in the tropical areas of the world. In fact, the yellow-bellied sea snake is rarely found where the average temperature of the sea surface drops below 68° F. for even one month. This applies even to such equatorial regions as the Galápagos Islands or the Peruvian coast where the sea is relatively cool because of the influence of the cold Peru current coming up from the South Pole. Off the warmer Ecuadorian coast about four hundred miles away, sea snakes are numerous.

Cold surface waters keep the yellow-bellied sea snake out of the Atlantic Ocean. Migrants from the warm waters of the Indian Ocean are sometimes carried as far as Cape Town on the southwestern tip of Africa, but they soon die if they drift any farther. Cool waters would also prevent the yellow-bellied sea snake from invading the Mediterranean Sea, even if it could cross the barrier posed by the warm, salty waters of the Red Sea.

This snake tolerates heat no better than it does cold. I first suspected that the yellow-bellied sea snake was sensitive to high temperatures when I put some in a small bucket in the open sun at Acapulco and they quickly died. In the laboratory we found that the upper lethal limit was indeed low, about 91° F. Since the surface temperature of the tropical seas where these snakes live is as high as 88° F., I began to wonder how these snakes could live at the surface in the hot sun. The answer appears to be that the snakes dive into the cooler water below. Off the coast of Panama, we found that some snakes were cooler than the surface water that surrounded them. If the purpose of diving is only to escape the hot rays of the sun, then shallow dives would be effective because even an inch of water would partially protect the snakes.

This hypothesis, regulation of temperature by diving, is supported by the observations of a Mexican fisherman I met. He was familiar with yellow-bellied sea snakes and confidently predicted that the best time to find them was during rains. We did find snakes on sunny days, but on calm, cloudy days with intermittent showers, they were very numerous about five miles off the Mexican coast at Acapulco. According to my hypothesis, the snakes would not have to dive on rainy days when solar radiation is less intense; therefore more of them should be visible at the surface.

The sun is not the sea snake's only enemy on the surface of the sea. There are potential predators both above and below. When not floating among the tree trunks and assorted debris of the land, the yellow-bellied sea snake is very conspicuous. The startlingly marked tail is especially noticeable, so much so that you might think that the snake wants to be seen. Some experiments carried out by Ira Rubinoff of the Smithsonian Marine Laboratory in Panama indicate that this may, in fact, be so. In the eastern Pacific the sea snake has no known enemies. Even such voracious Pacific predatory fish as snaphers will refuse to nibble at the snake unless it is completely camouflaged inside a piece of squid, and then they reject the morsel as soon as they taste it. The reason for their aversion becomes obvious when the snakes are offered to Atlantic predatory fish, which have never encountered a sea snake before. These fish will eat the snakes, but in about one out of twelve meals they will be bitten by the snake and die. Thus it seems that there has been a selection pressure against those Pacific fish with a taste for sea snakes. They do not live long enough to reproduce themselves. Since both sight and taste appear to be involved in the recognition of the snake by Pacific fish, the coloration might be considered a warning to all concerned: "Don't tread on me or attempt to eat me."

However, even the most deadly animals usually have an Achilles' heel, enabling at least one predator to feed on them. In this case we suspect that some of the most famous snake eaters, the birds, feed occasionally on sea snakes. There have been isolated reports of eagles and seabirds eating sea snakes. Sea snakes have also been taken from the stomachs of Philippine moray eels.

As Rubinoff has pointed out, studies of predation on sea snakes are relevant to the possible movement of the yellow-bellied sea snake into the Atlantic Ocean through the proposed sea-level canal. If the snakes were to work their way into the Atlantic through the canal, as seems likely, Atlantic fish would initially prey heavily on them before the strong selective force against snake eating took effect. But then a sea snake population explosion could occur, assuming that other environmental factors were favorable.

The question of the ability of sea snakes to move or to migrate is an interesting one since the various species differ greatly among themselves in this trait. One of the most astounding observations ever made on massed sea snakes was reported from the Strait of Malacca by W. P. Lowe in *The Trail That Is Always New*, 1932.

Leaving Colombo we departed for Penang, and the voyage from now on became more interesting, as there was a good deal to be seen, such as rocks covered with sea-birds, chiefly Gannets and Shearwaters. To starboard lay the beautiful green island of Sumatra, and to the port the Malay Peninsula. The water now became very calm and oily in appearance. After luncheon on 4th May I came on deck and was talking to some passengers when, looking landward, I saw a long line running parallel with our course. None of us could imagine what it could be. It must have been four or five miles off. We smoked and chatted, had a siesta, and went down to tea. On returning to the deck we still saw the curious line along which we had been steaming for four hours, but now it lay across our course, and we were still very curious as to what it was.

As we drew nearer we were amazed to find that it was composed of a solid mass of sea-snakes, twisted thickly together. They were orange-red and black, a very poisonous and rare variety known as *Astrotia stokesii*. Some were paler in colour and as thick as one's wrist, but the most conspicuous were as thick as a man's leg above the knee. Along this line there must have been millions; when I say millions I consider it no exaggeration, for the line was quite ten feet wide and we followed its course for some sixty miles. I can only presume it was either a migration or the breeding season. I have on various occasions looked in vain in these same waters, and also inquired from officers of ships navigating this region, but have failed to hear of a similar occurrence. Many people have seen snakes of this description but never in such massed formation. It certainly was a wonderful sight. As the ship cut the line in two, we still watched the extending file of foam and snakes until it was eventually lost to sight.

Our present knowledge of sea-surface phenomena can partly explain this unusual sight. Lowe emphasizes the sea's calmness and that the snakes were mixed with foam. This is a classic description of a slick, albeit an unusually long one. Slicks form when surface water currents converge. Anything floating at the surface, a few molecules of organic material, a sea snake, or a tree trunk, may be concentrated into slicks by the horizontal convergence of flow. I am convinced that the aggregation of sea snakes described by Lowe must have occurred in a large slick because I have observed the same phenomenon, only on a smaller scale, in the eastern Pacific.

On days with little wind, slicks also form off the coasts of Mexico and Central America

and they often contain thousands of snakes. The association of yellow-bellied sea snakes with slicks has been noted many times by fishermen, but only rarely by scientists. It tells us that this sea snake probably spends most of its time at the surface in a passive, motionless state. Yellow-bellied sea snakes are rarely seen swimming actively unless disturbed or diving. They are commonly observed in association with drifting debris in slicks. On windy or choppy days these snakes are widely dispersed and difficult to find. On occasion, currents also carry the yellow-bellied sea snake onto beaches, where it perishes because it is unable to crawl back to the water.

The ability of the yellow-bellied sea snake to drift contributes to its success as a world traveler. Wafted by currents and feeding occasionally on fish that seek cover in its shadow, it can cross vast expanses of open ocean. But it does not habitually live in pelagic, or open ocean areas, probably because these areas are relatively sterile. Fish are more abundant in the coastal zone. The open ocean is no barrier to its movements, however, as it is to many bottom-feeding species of sea snakes found in the Indo-Australian region.

All of the sea snakes are poisonous. In the early stages of their evolution for a life in the sea, sea snakes probably derived a considerable advantage from their venom. The original purpose of the venon may have been to subdue large prey and perhaps secondarily to protect against predators. Yet some sea snakes, for example *Laticauda*, are famous for their docile nature. Children in Fiji pick them up and are rarely bitten. On the other hand, certain sea snakes are easily aggravated and may bite readily if provoked by being stepped on or handled roughly.

Sea snake bites are frequently not fatal, however, because of the snakes' apparent reluctance to inject venom even when they do bite. Only about one-quarter of those bitten by sea snakes ever show signs of poisoning. The purpose of withdrawing the venom is unknown, but whatever the explanation, we should be grateful, for sea snake venom is the most potent of any snake's. H. A. Reid, an authority on snakebite in Malaya, compared the toxic effect of the dried venom of a sea snake (*Enhydrina*) with that of three of the most deadly land snakes—the common cobra, the tiger snake, and the death adder. When injected under the skin of the rats or rabbits, the sea snake venom was about two to ten times as toxic as that of land snakes. But when sea snakes do inject venom, they deliver less of it than do land snakes. This may be of little consideration, however, unless you are the second or third person bitten by a particular snake: one scientist has calculated that the venom ejected by one fresh adult sea snake is enough to kill three men.

For North Americans the main hazard from sea snakes will arise if they are allowed to swarm into the Caribbean and tropical Atlantic through the proposed Panamanian sea-level canal. A specially appointed Committee on Ecological Research for the Interoceanic Canal has agreed with my prediction that the yellow-bellied sea snake would be able to move through a sea-level canal and reach the Atlantic Ocean. This would be ominous for the Caribbean resort trade, because tourists are unlikely to want to share their place in the sun with a dangerous snake. Live sea snakes could be washed ashore in Trinidad, Nassau, or Miami Beach.

The effect of the snake's presence on man might be only one of the problems caused by its entry into the Caribbean. Rubinoff's studies on the interaction between predatory fish and sea snakes indicate that the snakes might eliminate large numbers of Atlantic fish. In some of his tests sea snakes were swallowed by captive Atlantic fish and then later regurgitated alive as the fish died from the effects of a bite. Thus one snake might kill more than one unsuspecting predatory fish.

Other potential canal migrants could be even more dangerous to the ecology of the tropical Atlantic. We only have to look at the history of the introduction of alien species into new environments to see how much damage can be done. The construction of the Welland Canal between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario allowed the movement of lampreys into the western Great Lakes, resulting in the decimation of lake trout. Other introduced species that have become nuisances in their adopted homes are starlings, house sparrows, pigeons, and carp in the United States, rabbits in Australia and Hawaii, goats in New Zealand and the Galápagos Islands, and the mongoose in Jamaica and Hawaii.

The financial and ecological damage done by these and similar introduced pests is staggering. As more alien species become established in an area, the complex web of ecological relationships between the native animals and plants becomes strained and may break in places, causing extinction of some native forms. The demise of most of the unique Hawaiian birds can be directly traced to the introduction of alien species.

The proposed sea-level canal could involve the mixing of species on an unprecedented scale, and no one can predict the consequences. As a biologist, I find the risk of catastrophe so high that construction of the canal must be opposed. There is a slight hope of creating barriers in the canal, of temperature perhaps, to prevent interocean movements. This could be effective against the sea snake because it is very sensitive to high temperatures. But many other organisms may not be so sensitive. In weighing the alternatives and considering possible damage to the environment, the massive costs of a sea-level canal, the expected benefits from the new canal, and the costs and benefits from enlarging the present fresh-water canal. I must conclude that construction of the sea-level canal would be a disaster of the first magnitude. The sea-level canal should not be built and the yellow-bellied sea snake should be kept in its rightful and cultural place in the Pacific.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Nov. 28, 1971]

Washington Mulls Ceding the Panama Canal

(By Richard O'Mara)

Gen. Omar Torrijos, the dictator of Panama, celebrated his third year in power October 11 by staging a big, noisy rally in Panama City during which he handed out 15,000 machetes. General Torrijos' probable purpose in all this was to whip up some enthusiasm for his regime and encouraging peasants to cut more bananas. Among zonians, the Americans living in the fenced Canal Zone, the fear was rife that the long knives would be put to a different purpose.

The immediate expectation of violence was unfounded. But the apprehension in the zone persists that before too long the 38,000 American civilian employees living there will be delivered into the hands of the Panamanians. There is reason for their fear. The United States reportedly is ready to accede sovereignty over the zone to the Panamanian government. Whether "native" rule will prove unendurable to the Americans whether any of them stay on are questions unanswerable at this time.

What is clear is that the new agreement between the U. S. and Panama, if approved by the U.S. Senate, will presage a considerable shift in U.S. policy toward the canal.

SOVEREIGNTY THE ISSUE

The canal was built between 1904 and 1914. It cost the U.S. $340 million and the lives of 4,000 of its citizens. Most died from yellow fever. Under terms of a 1903 treaty with the fledgling Republic of Panama, the U.S. received the right to build and operate a canal. Also, the U. S. was given "all rights, power and authority" over the canal and a strip of land running back five miles on each side of it extending the canal's 50-mile length from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific. These rights and this authority were to be America's "in perpetuity."

Ceding actual sovereignty over the zone to Panama is the most significant result of the present negotiations between the two countries. The talks originally began in 1964 after a bloody conflict broke out between Panamanian and American youths in the zone. After three years the negotiators, led on the American side by Robert B. Anderson, the former Treasury Secretary, produced three draft treaties. They called for America's relinquishing sovereignty over the zone, an increased income to Panama from canal revenues and establishment of a joint U.S.-Panamanian commission to run the canal. The treaties never came to a vote in the U.S. Senate, however. And Panama, which had an unexpected and illegal change of government in 1968, bringing General Torrijos to power, rejected them. For four years neither side moved.

BEGAN AGAIN IN JUNE

With General Torrijos more or less firmly in control, negotiations began again last June 29. Mr. Anderson was still on the American side. The new Panamanian team was led by Ambassador Jose Antonio de la Ossa. Again, besides ending U.S. sovereignty over the canal zone, the new accord reportedly would increase Panama's revenue share. But this time it was decided that the canal's administration would remain in American hands and the U.S. would be responsible for defending the canal. It is not certain the new agreements will fare better than the earlier ones, either in Panama or in the U. S.

The point of continuing disagreement are the words by which the decades-old dispute with Panama is defined: "perpetuity" and "sovereignty."

Panamanian nationalists, on one hand cannot abide the idea of the U.S. exercising absolute control over a piece of land which is really Panamanian; extremists reject even minimal U.S. control.

Zonians, on the other, are understandably resistant to any concessions to Panama. The agreement, if it goes into effect, would change their lives, probably for the worst. As things are, zonians live in a rather antiseptic atmosphere amid a sea of Panamanian squalor, Zonians are not without influence; their interests are defended in the House of Representatives by Representative Daniel J. Flood (D., Pa.) and Senate by Senator Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.). Both have already begun sharpening their own machetes in anticipation of battle over surrendering control over the zone.

OPPOSITION STRENGTH

There is no certain way of estimating the strength of the potential opposition to the accord in Congress.

There was one indication that it is not weak, at least in the House. In late September, Representative Dante B. Fascell (D., Fla.), chairman of the House inter-American affairs subcommittee, held hearings on the Panama question. During those hearings it was 'earned that about 100 congressmen were sponsoring, or were signatory to, between 40 and 60 resolutions favoring the zone's status quo.

Opposition is not nearly so intense in the Senate, which must ratify the agreement when and if it is drafted into treaty form. According to an aide to Senator Frank Church (D., Idaho), who heads the Senate inter-American affairs subcommittee, a majority on the Foreign Relations Committee agrees that relations between Panama and the U.S. are bad and need improving. The committee would be willing to approve ceding authority over the zone to Panama. Senator Thurmond has not been as effective in

championing the zonians in the Senate as Mr. Flood has been in the House.

The relationship between the U.S. and Panama does not begin and end with the question of who controls the zone, however, though that is its most emotional part. Other questions need to be explored.

BUILD ANOTHER?

Among them is whether the U.S. should follow the recommendation of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission. That recommendation was made last December, after five years of work, and calls for constructing a sea-level canal about 10 miles west of the present lock canal. In recommending this, the commission said the new canal would accommodate all 150,000-ton ships and the largest American warships, those which can't squeeze through the present waterway. The new canal could also handle twice the traffic that the present canal can handle. It would take 14 years to build and cost this country $2.8 billion.

Senator Thurmond and Representative Flood, of course, oppose this, as they oppose any change in the present status of U.S. control over the canal and the zone (Mr. Flood dramatically refers to the canal as "the jugular vein of the hemisphere's defense system.)" Both favor widening the present canal. One can criticize Mr. Flood and Mr. Thurmond for jingoism, but many of their arguments regarding the sea-level canal proposal are valid.

For instance, there is the question of cost, as estimated by the Anderson Commission (in addition to serving as U.S. negotiator with the Panamanians, Mr. Anderson chaired the canal study commission). Senator Thurmond pointed out in a recent speech that $2.8 billion was only an initial estimate: "This figure does not include the costs of the right-of-way in which to build the canal or of the inevitable huge indemnity that would be required by Panama."

ECOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS, TOO

Then there are strong ecological arguments against a sea-level canal. Marine biologists are concerned that a sea-level canal, unlike the present lock canal, would provide access to the Pacific to a number of stronger Western Atlantic species of fish, resulting in the extinction of many Pacific species. Conversely, a sea-level canal would open the Caribbean Sea to the poisonous sea snake and the crown of thorns starfish, which is presently plaguing the South Pacific.

Besides the cost and possible ecological dangers a new canal might pose, there is another factor which should discourage potential canal-builders: the political nature of the country through which the canal would be built.

Panama is notoriously unstable. American negotiators have already seen three years of hard work made useless with rejection of the 1967 accord. There is, therefore, no reason to believe that the present agreement—if approved by the Senate and accepted by the Torrijos government—would bind any future Panamanian governments. Also, it would be difficult to imagine the complexity that would arise in trying to write a new treaty covering construction and operation of a new canal.

A DICTATOR, BUT

General Torrijos does not preside over a legal government, only a de facto one. The firmness of that government was enough to encourage Washington to again start negotiations, but since then its stability has been called into question.

One factor that encouraged Washington to start talking was the peculiar position General Torrijos occupied in his country. He had transformed himself from a mere heavy-booted despot to an apparent populist leader. He won tremendous popularity because it was apparent to most Panamanians he was less a tool of the traditional oligarchy than any of his presidential predecessors. It was felt that if the two countries reached agreement, the treaties could be ratified in a referendum in Panama. In this way they would have a better chance of surviving the shifting sands of Panamanian politics.

But it seems the sands have already begun to shift; the opposition to Mr. Torrijos that wasn't there in the spring developed through the summer. The incident that brought it into being was the kidnaping of a priest in rural Panama. The Rev. Hector Gallego's organizing work among the peasantry reportedly offended some financial interests and he was kidnaped. The Catholic Church hierarchy has challenged the Torrijos government on this, for it is suspected that the kidnapers were National Guardsmen. If Father Gallego turns up dead, or if he doesn't turn up at all, General Torrijos could be in deep trouble with the church. In Catholic Panama it would be a formidable opponent and the whole affair contains headaches for General Torrijos.

If General Torrijos' future, therefore, must appear uncertain, so is any agreements the United States might strike with him and his government over the canal zone, the canal and any new waterway.

THE NATIONAL CANCER ACT OF 1971

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAFFERY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, December 9, this body gave its final approval to legislation which I believe will be recorded as one of the great achievements of this or any other Congress—the National Cancer Act of 1971.

I harbor no doubt that history will look upon our action as a turning point, a moment when the American people finally dedicated themselves seriously to the conquest of this most insidious and tragic of diseases.

The wonder is that we have waited until now to summon that national resolve. I venture to say that nearly every Member of this body has had friends or relatives fall to this killer. Statistics tell us that it will strike this year in two of every three families in this country. I personally lost both my mother and father to cancer.

No matter how many times one reads of cancer's awesome human toll, the figures are never any less numbing. In 1971, some 335,000 Americans—more than 900 each day—will succumb to this dread disease. That is more than one-sixth of all the deaths in this country. More than a half-million youngsters under 18 will face life without the guidance of at least one parent lost to cancer.

And most chilling of all is the fact that of the 203 million living Americans, 52 million of us will be hit by cancer, and 34 million of us will die from it. What an incomprehensible waste. Almost one-quarter of our people will battle cancer—and most will lose that battle.

Incredibly enough, that last figure contains an element of encouragement. As recently as four decades ago, only one person in five stood any chance of surviving a cancer attack. Now it is one in three. That is telling proof of the great strides we have made as the Federal effort has grown since the first funds were committed to the National Cancer Institute less than 35 years ago.

Cures for some forms of cancer hinge only upon early detection and effective treatment. Others must await increased research efforts to isolate and identify viruses. But the hard fact is that only money, not rhetoric, will make either possible.

Those of us who sponsored House Resolution 1086 more than a year and a half ago were seeking vastly increased spending. And, much to my gratification, that is what we have achieved in the National Cancer Act of 1971. By authorizing more than one and a half billion dollars for this fight over the next 3 years, we have signaled the beginning of a new national crusade against this disease.

I believe we all owe a special debt to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, who with the members of his subcommittee painstakingly molded this monumental legislation over the last year. When we succeed in this struggle, the role of the gentlemen from Florida will be remembered as a giant one.

His colleague from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) also deserves much credit. Since his sponsorship, as a Member of the Senate, of the bill establishing the National Cancer Institute, he has worked tirelessly to expand this country's war on cancer.

To both of these men and to others, in and out of government, we should be grateful. If we but sustain and enlarge this renewed national effort, America will finally achieve victory over this most elusive and dreaded of enemies. We must do it. We must conquer cancer.

IN SUPPORT OF A CABINET COMMITTEE ON ASIAN AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, no one will controvert the propositions that Americans deserve to be treated as Americans and that each American should be measured against the same yardstick. Although, as Americans, we come from varied cultural backgrounds, we should judge others, and be judged ourselves, on the basis of individual worth to our society.

In the last several years, we as a Nation have come to recognize that a man should not be denied employment, or a seat at a restaurant, or a good education, because of the color of his skin. American society has at long last acknowledged its infliction of wrongful discrimination on blacks, Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans.

Curiously, however, American society has not acknowledged the same discriminatory practices being directed at Asian Americans. The ruling majority in this country have been led to believe what one writer has called the "Myth of the Ideal Minority"; that is, the myth that all Asian Americans are hardworking, well-adjusted people who can always take care of themselves, and who are

immune to racial bigotry and discrimination.

It grieves me, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge that there is no such immunity.

Less than 3 months ago, I finally succeeded in having enacted legislation to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950. That act in effect had legitimated the principles on which was based the imprisonment of about 110,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry and their parents during World War II. For the first and only time in our Nation's history an entire minority group was incarcerated in concentration camps, complete with barbed wire fences and armed guards, purely on the basis of racial ancestry. Important as the erasing of this repugnant law was, it did not end all discrimination against Asian Americans.

That is why I am joining today with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GLENN ANDERSON) and a number of our colleagues, in introducing legislation to establish a Cabinet Committee on Asian American Affairs.

Youth alienation, isolation of the aged, health care, drug abuse, and many other contemporary problems, all have direct and particular application to the Asian American community.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that my own State of Hawaii presents a unique situation. Taken together, Asian Americans constitute a majority of the population. Hawaii has been justly proud of its record with regard to different racial and ethnic groups. Our late President, John F. Kennedy, chose Honolulu as the place to deliver his first major civil rights address as President in June of 1963 because, as he explained, "Hawaii is what America is striving to be."

But some problems still remain in Hawaii, and there is no doubt that problems abound in other areas of the United States.

The proposed Cabinet committee could focus on the problems of Asian Americans, so that the country could begin to seek solutions to them. This is a modest and attainable goal, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the swift enactment of this legislation so that we can begin to work toward its attainment.

FIREMEN SHOULD GET FEDERAL DEATH BENEFIT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to note that on December 11 Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, introduced comprehensive legislation to aid victims of crime, and a portion of his bill would provide a $50,000 death benefit to the families of public safety officials killed in the line of duty. Since introducing my Public Safety and Criminal Justice and Correctional Personnel Benefits Act on November 9, I have strongly advocated that coverage of this sort be extended not only to law enforcement officers, but also to firemen, correctional personnel, including prison guards, and judges and officers of the court. Late last week I began to circulate this bill for cosponsors. I commend Senator MCCLELLAN for providing extensive coverage under the $50,000 death benefit provision, and I look forward to prompt action by the Senate on his very constructive and worthwhile proposal.

Recently there has been some controversy over whether firemen should be included in this proposal. On December 12 there appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer an article by Robert Havel which explores this issue, and I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

STANTON ADVOCATES FULL COVERAGE: DEATH BENEFIT PROPOSAL EXCLUDES FIREMEN

(By Robert J. Havel)

WASHINGTON.—In a little-noticed hearing before a Senate judiciary subcommittee the other day, a Nixon administration spokesman offered some testimony that does not seem designed to win friends among those original hardhats—the firemen.

The hearing was on a bill that would provide a $50,000 federal death benefit to policemen killed in the line of duty. Other measures would make firemen eligible for the benefit.

Richard Velde, associate administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Justice Department, told the hearing that LEAA opposed the benefit for the firemen because "by and large, they are not victims of felonious assault."

If the firemen were included, Velde added, this would lead to pressure from other public service groups for the death benefit and "this could be a very expensive program."

Rep. James V. Stanton, D–20, Cleveland, immediately challenged the administration assertion. He introduced legislation that would do just what Velde said he feared: make eligible for the benefit not only policemen, but also firemen, prison guards, judges and probation officers killed in the line of duty.

Statistics indicate that for the sake of saving a mere few million dollars annually, President Nixon is risking retribution at the polls at the hands of the firemen and others.

According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports for 1970, 100 law enforcement officers were killed last year by felonious criminal action. Another 46 died as the result of accidents in the line of duty.

The International Association of Firefighters reports that 115 firemen died in the line of duty last year. Although none died from felonious assault, 195 were injured during civil disorders and 113 more were hurt through acts of individual violence.

Statistics were not available on the number of judges, prison guards and probation officers killed in the line of duty, but the number is minimal.

Stanton vehemently disputed Velde's contention that firemen are not victims of felonious assault.

"There are numerous cases in Cleveland alone of felonious assault on firemen going to fires," Stanton said. "On Sept. 14, 1970, some 15 shots were fired into a fire station in Cincinnati by a rapid-fire weapon, and two firemen were hit by large-caliber bullets. Numerous instances can be documented, and some have resulted in death."

Firefighters association figures show that four firemen were killed between 1967 and 1970 in civil disorders.

The administration's contention has no basis in fact," Stanton continued. "The basis of their objection is a question of financing. The cost would be negligible. The psychological relief the bill would provide is immeasurable."

On the basis of current statistics, it would cost about $5.7 million a year to provide a $50,000 death benefit for firemen who die in the line of duty. To pay the benefit to policemen killed in accidents in the line of duty would cost another $2.5 million.

So, the apparent total cost of such a program including all policemen killed, would be on the order of $13 million to $14 million a year, an amount that would not make a rounded-off fraction in defense procurement overruns and little more than 2 percent of the $700-million LEAA budget.

This budget has included millions of dollars for purchase of sophisticated riot hardware for sheriffs of rural counties under 20,000 population.

There are about 200,000 paid firemen in the nation, along with about a half million volunteers, according to the firefighters association.

If the President continues to outmaneuver, outthink, outbluff, outperform and outmuscle the Democrats, he will not need the firemen vote. But the cost of buying a little insurance with this group is so little, it is puzzling that the administration would be unwilling to pay the premium—the fairness and decency of the death benefit proposal aside.

DAVID ROCKEFELLER ON LATIN AMERICA: COOPERATION, NOT CONFRONTATION

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, one of this Nation's most distinguished business leaders, Mr. David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, spoke to the seventh annual meeting of the Council of the Americas, a private group representing 90 percent of total U.S. private investment in Latin America. Present at the meeting were more than 200 representatives of U.S. Government agencies and companies with subsidiaries in Latin America as well as representatives of public and private international organizations.

Despite great uncertainty over the future of U.S. investments in several Latin nations, Mr. Rockefeller in his speech to the council makes an eloquent plea for continued U.S. business involvement in bringing a better way of life to the people of the Americas. He urges a new Alliance for Development based on a joint business-government effort. His call for cooperation, not confrontation, deserves the most thorough and thoughtful consideration at the highest levels both here and throughout the hemisphere.

Because of the great merit of David Rockefeller's proposal, I am placing his speech in the RECORD so that my colleagues may acquaint themselves with it.

ALLIANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT

(By David Rockefeller)

Seven years ago this week, I was one of a group of businessmen who had an appointment with the President of the United States. We were to discuss ways in which the U.S. Business Group for Latin America could help to realize the goals of an ambitious program—an Alliance between the free and independent countries of the Southern and Northern continents of America to assure the economic and social advancement of all the people.

President John F. Kennedy was unable to keep that appointment having decided at the

last moment to go to Dallas. The next day, he met his tragic end; so that our group never did meet with President Kennedy. Although the idea of government-business cooperation in Latin America was picked up and actively pursued by President Johnson and his Administration.

Regretably, the main thrust of his Alliance for Progress, which started with such promise, has since been blunted, deflected and largely dissipated by a steadily rising demand for nationalization in Latin America and, more recently, by a short-sighted reversion to "Fortress America" sentiment here at home. Nevertheless, the Alliance in its conception, despite its critics then and now, was a significant move in the right direction.

That Alliance bound us together for a while in a single purpose—to make human existence throughout the Americas something more than merely scratching out inadequate food from the barren soil of the hills. It held out the hope that being alive in the Americas need not mean the wail of hungry children or the unbearable knowledge that there would not be enough schools or enough jobs for them even if they managed to survive and grow.

The Alliance was to have coordinated a flow of technical skills and investment resources from the U.S. private sector—in cooperation with our own and Latin American governments—to create jobs, modernize agricultural techniques, stimulate manufacturing and increase international trade in Latin American nations. To understand why an Alliance founded on these worthy objectives has fallen into its present disarray, we will have to consider—without the emotions that usually surround it—the rise of chauvinism and nationalization in many countries of Latin America.

To a considerable extent their striving for self-identity and self-sufficiency, however premature from an economic viewpoint, is understandable, especially when one takes into account the extreme youthfulness of the people of Latin countries. Because of their high birth rate and rapid population growth, nearly two-thirds of the Latin American population is less than twenty-five years old. As Eduardo Frei Montalvo, former President of Chile, has pointed out, "This youthful mass is in a deeply critical mood, like their peers in the rest of the world." Consequently, he concludes, "headquarters, both for ideas and for actual change, are . . . the universities and student groups."

If that sounds familiar, it is because we, in the United States, have been responding to the same passionate involvement and political concern of our own young people who are playing a growing role in public issues. In response to their concerns, we amended our Constitution to lower the voting age to eighteen. As a nation, we should have little trouble in recognizing and accepting the reality of comparable changes in other countries. But many of us are reluctant to accept the consequences.

When these youthful nations express their independence of thought and purpose through aggressive action affecting our interests, we find many of our own legislators are tempted to respond in kind with punitive and retaliatory measures.

But neither an arbitrary, uncompensated expropriation of foreign investments, nor a resort to violence in retaliation, is an acceptable assertion of self-determination in the context of today's world. In the long run, however, ill-considered expropriation is bound to be self-defeating for those nations that have not as yet accumulated sufficient capital or managerial depth to plan and carry out self-sustaining programs for internal development. On the other hand, in view of our own revolutionary origins as a nation, there are many other expressions of the new rising nationalism in Latin America to which we should be able to comprehend and accept with patience and insight.

This breach in our hemispheric alliance, caused in large part by the growing spirit of independence in Latin America, is further widened by a growing indifference here at home. As we approach 1972, we are preoccupied with the problems of our own people and our own nation. The young and the radicals among us, the disadvantaged minorities, the affluent and the conservative are all asking if we shouldn't solve our own internal problems of the cities, of our economy, of our youth and our educational system before we worry about others outside our borders.

But even if it were possible to solve all our own problems without concern for and in total isolation from the rest of the world, it would prove an empty victory to emerge as an island of prosperity in a sea of misery. The truth is, of course, that we share too many common interests, cultural ties, and mutual dependencies with other nations ever to return to "Fortress America." Whether we like it or not, we live in one world and we have to act accordingly.

When I spoke before this Council one year ago, I expressed the earnest hope that we would be able to prevail on Congress, our State Department and the Executive Branch generally to respond more fully to that mutuality of interests especially as it concerns our neighbors to the south. Now, a year later, we must regretfully acknowledge that the need is greater than ever. But we can tempest our disappointment by reflecting that on a number of fronts progress has been made in meeting the goals of the Alliance.

As a result of cooperative efforts over the past decade. I know of tens of thousands of miles of new roads—thousands of new schools—millions of children going to them—falling death rates—more jobs—more income—and hope that was not there before. But in the face of rapidly rising populations, the question remains, how can more progress be accomplished? The record as revealed in case after case, seems to indicate that government-to-government programs alone never really affect the root problems of development. What is needed is the total involvement of all sectors . . . governmental and private.

In my years as Chairman, I saw many U.S. from the beginning has been an integral part of our own highly successful development process and so, we realize that it must play a comparable role in helping other nations now in the process of development. The faith that this gives the Council of the Americas is a noble mission which we must not abandon. It has been part of our credo from the beginning.

In my years as Chairman, I saw many U.S. companies offer their help, their manpower, their technology and their skills to the governments and people of Latin America. They were "citizens first and businessmen second." They did this without publicity or full-page advertisements boasting of their involvement. As appropriate as this modesty may have been, the lack of publicity about what U.S. companies were doing, has often resulted—even in the business community itself—in ignorance of the facts. This in turn has sometimes drawn the criticism that perhaps the Council was not fulfilling its primary mission and I fear that no detailed accounting of the impact of the U.S. private investor in Latin America, such Herbert May's study for the Council of the Americas last year will convince the unconvinced. But even though more has been done than is generally recognized, I still do not believe the full potential of the private sector has been taped—either by local businessmen or by foreign investors. For this reason, I hope the Council programs for 1972 which you have heard this morning will be pursued aggressively by all of us.

The U.S. business community must make the case in the most forceful terms that development depends not only on capital, manpower, technology, and skills, but on a willingness to employ every opportunity that presents itself. Development is not the exclusive goal of one political system—or of one economic system. It can best be achieved by an eclectic synthesis of whatever works, regardless of its origin.

The Council program for 1972 calls for a heightening of business-to-government and business-to-business missions. It does not call for confrontation, but rather for cooperation. And planning for the future, it requires genuine appreciation by all of us of the necessary elements of development, and a continuous dialogue between those who desire development assistance and those who believe they can provide it. This calls for a new Alliance, if you will—not one pronounced by governments but one agreed to by the participants.

Societies and economies, like people, must grow. They cannot simply be conceived, and executed by the fiat of an outside government or by the spontaneous inspiration of an academic theorist. Only governments within the developing nations must be the ones to engage in the long-range and sustained planning necessary for their own lasting development.

On the other hand, I do not find that governments anywhere are accomplishing development entirely by themselves. Certainly the Soviet Union and the other nations of Eastern Europe are not only recognizing the necessity for private initiative, but they are approaching the great companies of the West to become involved in their development process.

But curiously as the Marxist countries in the Soviet orbit are opening their doors to Western technology, Western capital and Western know-how, some countries in Latin America are slamming their doors against such foreign assistance. That is but one paradox in a "continent of paradoxes." Another is that many Latin American nations which openly admit their need for the free enterprise elements of development, adopt regulations, sign mutual investment codes, and create a climate of uncertainty by expropriation which inevitably militate against the very investments they concede they must have.

There is still another paradox which relates to attitudes in this country. Latin America represents an enormous actual and potential market to U.S. businessmen. And yet, we find many, both in business and in government, who through neglect and by actions that discourage trade seem prepared to place our Latin trade in jeopardy.

These paradoxes do not have to remain forever unsolved. They are not riddle wrapped in mysteries inside enigmas. They are quite simply differences or outlook. Just as business no longer looks to the countries of the development world as mere stockpiles of raw materials for Western industry, Latin governments, however youthful and impetuous, should not look at business as sinister and exploitative. To resolve these misunderstandings, I believe there should be a new Alliance—an Alliance for Development. It should embrace political development, economic development and social development. To accomplish this far reaching goal, it would have to draw together business and governments—organizations and people—universities and international agencies. Only through such concerted effort can it expect to overcome the common and interrelated problems that have stalled true development as one sector or the other sought domination.

What I have described is what the Council will be attempting to do in 1972—coalesce all those who are sincere in their desire for true development, into a well-planned, coordinated, thoroughly expert and professional ef-

fort—an all-out Alliance which has the will and capacity to help.

I urge that you engage yourselves wholeheartedly to that new Alliance for Development and that you support the Council of the Americas as it seeks to lead the way.

A NEW LEADERSHIP FOR THE AMERICAS—A NEW PROGRAM FOR THE 1970'S

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in Excelsior of October 25, 1971, there appeared an account of a press interview with me which took place in my congressional office in Washington. I wish to commend the Excelsior reporter, Fausto Fernandez Ponte, for having performed an excellent job of accurately reporting the answers to the questions he put to me on the role of Mexico in inter-American relations.

Because I feel strongly that Mexico is destined for an increasing leadership responsibility in this hemisphere, I take this opportunity to amplify, and perhaps clarify for others, my views contained in the press interview.

In today's world, with its rapidly moving and changing events, it is important to recognize the necessity for developing the judgment and vision to understand how these events can shape future events, and that we must be prepared to adapt our programs to those events to come.

Too often we in the United States have pontificated about the leadership thrust upon the United States. No leadership has been thrust upon us. Whatever leadership the United States has exercised has been a reaction—a realistic reaction to the necessity for advancing the national interests of the United States. This has been the crux of U.S. foreign policy.

The era of the 1970's, however, I venture to say, will witness a change in this leadership pattern, but with the same objective of national interests. The objective is the same, but the definition should be substantially broadened. The time has come for the exercise of leadership by others to bring about the highest national interest any country can advance, and that is, peace, security, and progress—not alone for itself, but for its neighbors as well. It is this broadened view of national interest that brings me specifically to a consideration of Mexico.

In this hemisphere, the most outstanding record toward achieving those goals of peace, security, and progress is being written by Mexico. Mexico is the model which is held up of a people and nation determined to achieve the well-being of its people in peace, and moving ahead rapidly toward that goal. I say this not as the polite gesture of a guest to his host, but rather as the expression of a consensus of world opinion.

How shall Mexico exercise this new leadership? In my press interview last fall, I suggested one way, which would be essentially the beginning of leadership—a leadership based on economic not political persuasion and practicality.

I therefore suggested the nucleus of a new leadership, with Mexico taking the initiative and including the active participation of Canada, thus confining the preparatory activities to a great representative of Latin America and a great representative of North America. In a supporting role, and I emphasize supporting, would be the United States. It is my thought that this nucleus of three countries, economically and politically mature, would be later expanded to include other countries of the hemisphere. But the start can be made only by Mexico taking the initiative in this operation.

Why, you may inquire, should Mexico be so singled out? The answer lies, I think, in the clear understanding of what must happen in Latin America and how best the desired goals may be achieved. The South American portion of our great dual hemisphere must be allowed to move forward in the modern mode bringing to the people of this area some of the aspects of improved conditions in food, shelter, education, transportation, and health. These improvements should be accomplished within a framework which reflects the traditions of the people affected; cognizant of aspirations which naturally emerge from the area rather than reflecting desires formulated by others and impressed from without; and finally, accommodated to a pace which allows for healthy and stable development and progress.

I venture to suggest that each of these criteria have, in the main, been followed in the advances made in the last 20 years in Mexico. There lies in this country not only the closer touch with the conditions which must be dealt with, but equally important a natural simpatico with the people which will be involved. It should be strongly noted having set forth that alone, that this is not to say that we entertain the absurd idea that each of the countries of Latin America are alike. Our belief is quite the contrary. The various nations of Latin America are as diverse as any found elsewhere in the world. We do, however, maintain that the commonality of language, religion, and historical experience with a single foreign power influence over several centuries provides a common bond which is of some significance. Mexico has this commonality.

I have emphasized that I see the era now arrived as being one in which economic and cultural policies will dominate rather than the political and military policies of the past 30 years. There will be at the same time a continuance and, I believe, increasing tendency toward regionalism. Multinational institution building guided by predominantly leadership from within the region affected and multinational support for such institutions dominated by leadership from without the region. In this pattern for Latin America there is a clear role for both Mexico within the Latin portion of our hemisphere and America. At the same time, the scenario recognizes that each in carrying out its role will seek and encourage cooperations from others who seek the mutual goals of peace and progress in a developing world.

Specifically, what can be done? First there needs to be initiated by the leadership within Latin America a list of projects and institutional structures that Latinos feel are of greatest need and most promise for serving their goals of progress. These should in a priority setting be presented to the United States and other potential supporters for their consideration for support. Some may require more Latin support than others. In such a fashion innovation and selection can be in the proper and appropriate hands and roles are sorted so that claims of sovereignty jeopardy or outside dominance are avoided.

With and alongside of regionalism, it is reasonable to assume that unilateral arrangements in a variety of forms and under differing conditions will continue; and in each instance, that of multilateral regionalism or in the case of unilateral arrangements it is to be expected that considerations of national interests in the local sense will be present and should be expected.

There is a new day dawning, one which calls for action and innovation on the part of countries other than the power centers. In such a time the State of Mexico under the active leadership of President Luis Echeverria Alvarez has a potentially dynamic part it would and should play.

Throughout this discussion I have deliberately tied anticipated action on the part of both countries within the developing hemisphere and the United States to their national interest. My belief is that economic imperialism or military domination does not serve the national interest of any country. Economic cooperation and economic support by the United States of projects that lead to peace, security, and progress are in our national interest and particularly so in our own hemisphere. Latin projects initiated by Latin leadership which predictably can serve the community of interests in Latin America encouraged, supported, and assisted by the United States—this should be the thrust of the 1970's.

What I am calling for is a focal point of leadership for Latin America. I believe that focal point to be the country of Mexico—where the present administration under President Echeverria Alvarez has turned Latin rhetoric into Latin action.

IRS REVERSES ITSELF ON TAX PREPARERS ISSUE

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1971, I called to the attention of the Members of the House the problems arising out of the unregulated growth of tax return preparation services. I included a copy of a letter from the Internal Revenue Service which reflected a reluctance to venture into the regulation of this activity. I introduced at that time H.R. 7973, authorizing the IRS to establish appropriate regulations of tax services. I am pleased to report to the House that the IRS appears to be changing its tone

on this question. I call to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the December 10, 1971, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

EASIER TO FILE RETURNS LATE, IRS ANNOUNCES

TWO-MONTH EXTENSION GRANTED IF TENTATIVE FIGURES ARE MADE AND ESTIMATE PAID BY APRIL 15

WASHINGTON.—The Internal Revenue Service has made it easier for individuals to file late income tax returns but has taken steps to get most of its money by April 15 even if the return is late.

IRS Commissioner Johnnie M. Walters said the service will automatically grant taxpayers two extra months in which to file late returns without paying a penalty. But to qualify for the automatic extension, individuals must make a tentative estimate of their taxes and pay the estimated balance due when taking an extension.

Mr. Walters disclosed the new late-filing procedures in a speech prepared for the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants at Boca Raton, Fla., where he also listed several actions the IRS is considering to curb what he termed abuses by tax preparation services.

The new automatic extension policy is designed to cut the workload of the IRS and tax preparation services. It puts individuals on a par with corporations, which receive such grace periods. In the past, individuals had to get special permission to file late returns. In 1970 about 750,000 such applications were filed, Mr. Walters said.

As with the old system, taxpayers must pay a 6% annual interest charge on any portion of the payment found to be due when the return is filed.

The IRS also liberalized its rules on the assessment of late penalties imposed when there isn't a "reasonable cause" for filing a late return. The penalty is ½% a month on the balance due. Under the new procedure a late charge won't be imposed if the actual amount due when the final return is filed doesn't exceed 10% of the total balance due.

In discussing the increasing number of tax returns filled out by tax preparation services, Mr. Walters observed, "the activities of certain nonprofessional returns-preparers over the last few years are creating real problems." At least half of the 78 million 1970 individual tax returns were prepared by tax services, the IRS states.

Mr. Walters said the IRS wants to regulate tax preparation services and is considering several possibilities. One would extend the negligence penalty to tax services as well as to taxpayers, who now must pay a penalty equal to 5% of any underpayment the IRS finds is due to negligence.

The service might also seek court injunctions to block the preparation of returns by companies that prepare false or deficient documents. It is considering requiring preparers to make copies of all returns and to retain them for three years to permit IRS inspection. An IRS spokesman said the retention requirement would stop "fly-by-night" services.

To curb false advertising, the service is mulling the imposition of a $1 penalty for each return prepared by a concern that misrepresents its qualifications or the extent to which it will indemnify clients for error.

Mr. Walters didn't indicate when the IRS will decide whether the proposals will be adopted.

ON THE NEED FOR REGULATION OF MEDICAL X-RAY SYSTEMS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would require that all existing X-ray machines used for diagnosis and treatment be upgraded so as to meet the new performance standards for X-radiation required of newly manufactured machines by Public Law 90–602. Further, my legislation mandates that there be annual inspections of such machines so as to make certain that they continue to operate at the required performance level. Equally important in the bill is a provision requiring that those doctors and technicians operating the machines protect their patients with protective shielding so as to make certain that the patient's body is not subjected to more X-radiation than is absolutely necessary.

My interest in this matter occurred as a result of an incident involving my sister. Not long ago, her 5-year-old son Jared, sprained his ankle and she took him to the hospital for diagnostic X-rays. When the child was placed on the examining table, it was clear that he was not to be protected with shielding so as not to expose to the X-rays any other part of his body but the ankle involved. She said to the X-ray technician, "I would appreciate your covering my son with shielding to protect him." In response, the X-ray technician told her, "I do this my way and if you do not like it, get someone else." She asked to see the physician in charge of the emergency service at the hospital, explained her request and his response was, "If you do not like the way he is doing his job, you can go to another hospital."

As you can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, she had no choice. Her son was on the table and so the X-rays were taken without the shielding. I inquired of other physicians expert in radiation, and was told that there are procedures and protective devices to be used so as to make certain that there is no overexposure, but unfortunately, too often, they said they are not used by the radiologists.

Mr. Speaker, I pretend no expertise on the subject of radiation, but as a result of this incident I have acquainted myself somewhat with the subject and have found that experts uniformly agree that no acceptable level of radiation exposure has been established and that X-ray radiation exposure should be avoided whenever possible. The degree of danger from exposure depends on many factors, including age. The fetus is, of course, most in danger and a young child is in greater danger than an adult. It is important to note that last August the Public Health Service ascertained that X-ray radiation levels lower than previously estimated can cause genetic damage.

Last October, Commissioner Dr. Mary C. McLaughlin of the New York City Health Department warned dental patients of the danger of overexposure to radiation through repeated X-rays taken when, for instance, an individual changes his dentist. A personal note: Recently, I went to my dentist for a checkup. As a matter of course, he took X-rays. As he commenced the procedure, I asked him for a protective shield. He said that he had one and used it whenever a patient requested it, but he said he seldom was asked and that the X-rays are so low in intensity that they are not harmful. I insisted on the protective chield and he took out a shield made of lead and vinyl and put it on me, protecting my body from possible unnecessary X-ray radiation. His attitude on protection comes from the fact that he does not protect himself and is in the room whenever the machine is used. Most patients, Mr. Speaker, are unaware of this shielding and so do not request it. My bill would make the use of the protective shielding on patients mandatory on the part of the technician.

A study by the Public Health Service, entitled "The Need for Controlling the Sale of Antiquated X-Ray Equipment," reports that in a survey taken of 765 secondhand X-ray machines, 595 deficiencies were found. The three most frequently occurring deficiencies were insufficient filtration, excessive beam size, and short exposure switch cords.

One of the major reasons for limiting needless exposure of patients to radiation is the concern about genetic damage. Federal studies have indicated that the danger of genetic damage from radiation exposure could be cut by at least two-thirds if the sphere of exposure was limited to the area of the body expressly requiring the X-ray.

Under existing law, next year manufacturers have to meet certain high standards in the production of their new X-ray machines. Therefore, virtually all machines manufactured prior to 1973 will not meet these standards. It is these machines already in use which will be required to meet these standards if my bill were to become law.

Dr. Charles E. Edwards, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration recently stated that:

> More than 90 percent of all human exposure to manmade radiation comes from the diagnostic use of X-ray in contrast with about 1 percent from radioactive discharges from nuclear power plants, about which there has been so much public concern.

I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of Radiological Health that many years will elapse before the X-ray machines not covered by the new standards required by existing law are removed from the market. Mr. Speaker, no individual, certainly without his or her knowledge should be required to submit to X-radiation by a machine which does not meet current acceptable standards. It is fair to say we are dealing with the health and safety of the Nation. I urge our colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

DEVELOPMENT OF LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association held its 37th annual meeting in the city of New Orleans. The primary objectives of the association are the economic development of the valley, to protect it from devastating floods

which prior to current Federal programs left tremendous destruction of property and loss of life, and the control, and use of these waters for the betterment of mankind and the environment. Membership in the association is broadly based in the States of Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The association's office is located in Memphis, Tenn., and is under the able supervision of Mr. Bruce Tucker, executive vice president.

During the proceedings of the meeting we were honored with a most excellent address by my colleague and friend, the Honorable FRANK STUBBLEFIELD, a valuable and highly regarded Member of this body from the State of Kentucky. The gentleman from Kentucky addressed himself to several important points including flood control, water resources, conservation, and the environment. His address merits the consideration of all interested in the aforesaid subjects.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the gentleman from Kentucky be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, BEFORE THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION DECEMBER 4, 1971

It is no news to this distinguished association that programs for the development of our nation's water and related land resources are under heavy attack and that they have already suffered serious reverses. The future is in grave doubt.

The distinguished appropriations committee of the House expressed its concern in its report on the public works appropriations bill for fiscal 1971 [1] in part as follows:

"Based on the testimony of over 1700 witnesses representing Federal, State and local agencies and the public, it is evident that corrective action is required in many aspects of the program if the urgent water resources needs are to be met in an effective and expeditious manner."

"Extensive increased costs and delays are also now being experienced in many instances because of environmental considerations. Long awaited improvements in projects evaluation policies and procedures are tied up in controversy between the office of management and budget and the agencies concerned.

"Most important, projects under construction, instead of moving forward to completion have been delayed and stretched out over many years. These must be restored, as soon as possible, to more adequate funding levels to avoid escalating construction costs and delay in obtaining essential benefits in the public interest."

Some of the key facts supporting the committee's conclusions deserve special emphasis.

The rate of funding of the water resource program is lagging seriously behind emerging needs. Many of you will recall the estimates of water resource development needs projected in the summary report on the nation's water resources published in 1968 by the water resources council. A 5-fold increase in withdrawals of water is projected by the year 2020.

A 6-fold increase in inland waterborne commerce is estimated and the council foresees an increase of $3.3 billion dollars in annual flood damage potential by 2020, based upon the current status of flood control works. As evidenced by the Ohio River basin survey completed in 1969, the rate of expenditure to meet essential goals for the Ohio River basin by 1980 must be at least doubled. I have no doubt that this would represent a conservative projection of the funding required to meet national needs. And yet in the teeth of the evidence, appropriations for civil works construction have declined from their high of $1,026,800,000 for fiscal 1966 to $955,500,000 for fiscal 1972 in current dollars, while, in terms of constant dollars measuring comparative purchasing power, appropriations dropped steeply from an equivalent of $847,100,000 for the fiscal 1966 high to a low of $481,600,000 for fiscal 1972—a decline in effective purchasing power of 43%.

During the same period the Federal budget increased from $134.6 billion to $229.2 billion, while the percentage of the total budget represented by appropriations in current dollars for civil works construction dropped from .76% to .41%, a 35% decline in relative budgetary importance.

It must be recorded, however, to the great credit of the Congress that the fiscal 1972 appropriation for civil works construction in current dollars has recovered substantially from its fiscal 1970 low, showing an increase of more than 20%. Moreover, the supplemental budget request for fiscal 1972, proposes an increase over the regular appropriation of $102.4 million or about 10% for on-going construction in areas of high unemployment. Further, I am informed that substantially all funds heretofore impounded in budgetary reserve have been released. It is my earnest hope that these favorable developments mark a reversal of the long downward trend. Of this I am certain, the appropriations committees of the Senate and House under the leadership of Allen Ellender and George Mahon, supported and encouraged by their great public works subcommittees headed by John Stennis and Joe Evins, will do their utmost to lead us toward a level of investment in water resource projects adequate to the needs of this and future generations.

But they and other congressional leaders in the water resource field would be the first to emphasize their inability to do the job alone. What benefits are derived from authorization and funding of projects if they are to be blocked by judicial or executive action on grounds of alleged failure to consider various aspects of possible environmental impact? Already, since the passage of the Environmental Policy Act of 1970, 13 projects are involved in lawsuits instituted by various environmental groups.

Of these, five projects have been stopped by court order, including Gillam Lake, Arkansas, The Tennessee-Tombigbee and The West Tennessee Tributaries, and one—Cross Florida, by order of the President.

I understand also that about ten other projects, including Tocks Island in Eastern Pennsylvania and the Towlesburg Lake in West Virginia are being delayed pending further study of environmental aspects.

What but frustration results from appropriations which the administration refuses to use? How can Congress be expected to authorize and fund projects if standards of evaluation established and applied by the executive branch practically disregard future benefits, and exclude completely considerations of regional development, social well-being and a host of other factors closely related to the National interest?

Above all, how can the congress or any administration be expected to raise funding to appropriate levels—perhaps more than doubling the current figures—unless the program commands dedicated, unified leadership and wide public support?

These, I believe, are some of the questions we must face and for which we must find answers.

First, with regard to the apparent conflict between water resource development and environmental interests, let me say that I think this conflict is much more apparent than real. Both development to channel new resources into our economic life, and preservation of essential environmental values are imperative. Through rational dialogue their compatibility in a balanced program will unfold. It is simply inconceivable to me that improvement by man of his environment for his health, convenience and advancement, is in fundamental conflict with preservation of aesthetic, scenic, recreational and historic values. Indeed, I know of no more effective means of preserving environmental values than a sound system of flood control. Perhaps our flood control programs have been too effective—a view of the Mississippi Valley during the 1928 flood, or of the Ohio Valley in the 1937 flood, with all the sickness, filth and ruin they brought, would have made flood control proponents out of many who now berate and slander the Corps of Engineers. Certainly environmental quality is a major national goal for all segments of our society.[2] But so likewise are adequate supplies of usable water, adequate flood control, and adequate waterways for our commerce. I know of no basis for assigning a higher priority to one than another—each is of the highest importance to the National welfare.

The apparent conflict arises, I think, from a failure of communications among men of good will. The democratic process can well accommodate full expression of all legitimate interests and points of view in project and program formulation, looking toward a rational balance.

As a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which is responsible for overseeing the adminstration of the National Environmental Policy Act, I am confident that it was the intention of that act that such rational balance be attained. Indeed, the statements of purpose and policy in the act give special emphasis to establishing "productive harmony" between man and nature, to creation of conditions under which "the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans" can be fulfilled, and to "achievement of a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of livng and a wide sharing of life's amenities." [3]

But this goal can be achieved only if the process of decision of these novel and technical issues is conducted in a civil and orderly manner, with full and competent presentation of all the relevant data, and not in the spirit of trial by combat which has prevailed in recent encounters.

As the 1971 report [4] of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on administration of the National Environment Protection Act puts the matter:

"The committee feels strongly that the ultimate success of NEPA will depend on the sophisticated participation and involvement of public interest groups. Now that the Federal agencies have been assigned the burden of contributing detailed, factual data on their environment-affecting activities, it would seem obligatory that public groups respond in kind. This will require strengthening and developing their own capacities for handling technical environmental information to arrive at sounder positions on policy issues and for submitting expert comments on impact statements issued by agencies as well as more pointed testimony before congessional hearings."

I am encouraged by this call for a greater degree of responsibility to expect a more rational climate for the discussion and decision of these issues. Similarly encouraging is the provision incorporated in the conference report on the agriculture—environ-

[1] House Report 92-316, 92nd Congress, 1st Session.

[2] House Report 92-316, 92d Congress, 1st Session. Report by Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Administration of National Environmental Policy Act.

[3] Public Law 91-190, Section 101.

[4] House Report 92-376, 92nd Congress, 1st Session.

mental and consumer protection programs, Fiscal 1972 Appropriations Act, which directs:

"... That, in addition to the environmental effects of an action, all required reports from departments, agencies, or persons shall also include information, as prepared by the agency having responsibility for administration of the program, project, or activity involved, on the effect on the economy, including employment, unemployment, and other economic impacts." Under this directive, the Corps of Engineers, for example, would be required to set forth the facts as to adverse economic effects of failures to carry out a project. This again points to a balanced appraisal which should help to correct the current tendency toward environmental bias.

The Congress itself must, I think, shoulder a considerable share of responsibility for the problems it now confronts in formulating and implementing sound programs of water resource development. For in my opinion, these arise in large measure from its tendency over the years to delegate excessive authority to the Executive branch. Time does not permit an elaboration of this point. Let it suffice to say that in my judgment, Congress has surrendered to the Executive branch much of its authority and initiative in the field of water resource development—a distinctively legislative function reserved by the Constitution to the Congress [5]—by delegation to the Water Resources Council of authority with presidential approval to establish "principles, standards, and procedures for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects." (Sec. 103, Water Resources Planning Act of 1965.) The standards of evaluation employed by the executive agencies largely predetermine the outcome of all project studies. As a result of restrictive standard, even favorable reports submitted to Congress often recommend projects which are underscoped. Again many project purposes are completely omitted from the plans proposed. In other cases, negative reports are submitted on projects which under adequate standards would have been favorably reported. The most unfortunate feature is that the reports do not contain the basic information which would reveal these shortcomings. Thus the judgment of Congress in discharging its legislative responsibilities is severely circumscribed.

While for more than two years the Water Resource Council has been considering a task force proposal for more adequate consideration of potential project benefits, the Office of Management and Budget has blocked issuance of the proposal for public comment and is reportedly insisting on use of an interest-discount rate for project evaluation which would sharply downgrade future benefits. Thus, Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, chief of the Senate Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee staff, in his excellent address to the Southeast Basins Interagency Committee on October 20, 1971, expressed doubt that "any water resource project purpose other than domestic water supply could be justified under the standards and criteria approved by the Office of Management and Budget."

Last year in the Public Works Authorization Act, Congress recorded its intention that standards of evaluation set forth in Water Resources Council task force reports be applied in evaluation of Federal water resource projects. But the Office of Management and Budget has declined to implement this statement of congressional policy. Fortunately, as you know, Senators Randolph and Jackson, chairmen respectively of the Senate Committees of Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs, have introduced S. 2612, the National Water and Related Land Resources Policy Act, to make these standards mandatory. This would mean that in project evaluation, consideration would be given to the benefits of the project with respect to (1) enhancement of environmental quality, (2) enhancement of social well-being by the equitable distribution of real income, employment and population and by other specified means, and (3) enhancement of regional development, as well as (4) enhancement of national economic development or national economic efficiency to which as a practical matter benefit estimates are now generally limited. The Water Resources Council would be empowered to implement these policy guidelines.

Enactment of this legislation would constitute a major step in the direction of reestablishment of congressional control over the Nation's water resources development program and I shall give my full support to this measure when it reaches the House.

Further steps, I believe, are needed. As you are well aware, the various elements of the national water resource policy have been scattered over the years throughout a host of congressional acts, committee reports, Executive orders, agency rules and regulations, and policy statements. Many authorizations of projects, not yet started, date from Rivers and Harbors Acts of the 1930's. It is likely that deauthorization would in some cases be appropriate. Procedures have become outmoded; studies and restudies have multiplied to the point of absurdity. The delays encountered between authorization and funding have become intolerable.

The time has come, I respectfully submit, to renovate and modernize the program, to put the house in order and to subject traditional concepts to a searching examination. In a contest with tough, sophisticated, dedicated opponents, well-financed and ably led, and backed by highly organized blocks of public opinion, successful defense and advancement of water resources programs demand vigorous review to assure clear identification of the national purposes to be served and efficient, fair and practical means for their attainment.

To accomplish this end, I would urge consideration of establishment of a select committee of the Senate and House to carry out a current in-depth review of the entire water resources program and to report to the Congress its recommendations for formulation of a sound, comprehensive national water resources policy, adequate for the needs of a rising population and an expanding economy, and embracing all phases of water resources development, conservation and use, including pollution abatement, flood control, navigation, reclamation, water supply, stream flow management, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, hydroelectric power and all other appropriate public uses and purposes.

It would be my hope that such a policy would also provide (1) for establishment of a water resource program funding level having a suitable relationship to the total Federal budget and legally structured to require execution of the will of Congress as to use of appropriated funds, and (2) for specification of water resources goals for the Nation or major river basins where appropriate in terms, for example, of navigation capacity, flood damage to be prevented, and water supply availability, so as to afford overall guidance and direction to the agencies concerned.

My recommendation regarding development of a comprehensive national water policy does not carry any implication as to the form of organization best suited to carry it out. This is a basic issue for consideration by the select committee. I can say with complete conviction, however, that, whatever form the ultimate organization plan may take, having the utmost confidence in the professional competence and integrity of the corps of Army Engineers, I would make every effort to assure that their part in the program of the future would give full recognition to their matchless record or service to the Nation.

Finally and most importantly, survival and strengthening of the water resources program demands a concerted, skillful public relations undertaking—let's call it "Operation Outreach"—and quit talking to ourselves and muttering complaints to one another.

In such a campaign, the rapidly mounting water needs of the Nation must be clearly expounded and those needs and the values at stake for the whole people—their lives and livelihood—must be accurately and convincingly set forth in relation to contemporary interests and concerns. Thus attention might be focused, for example, on the close relationship of low-cost water transportation to expansion of our export trade and its role in meeting competition with foreign goods; the vital relationship of water resource program to rural development, and—that most compelling of environmental concerns—improved population balance; the contributions of comprehensive water resource development, such as the Arkansas River project to job-creating, regional rehabilitation, particularly for chronically depressed areas; and the importance of water resource development for navigation, water supply and hydroelectric power in alleviating the threatened energy crisis.

To carry broad conviction, the facts as to the compatibility of water-based economic development providing jobs and the necessities and amenities of life with environmental goals must be marshalled and effectively presented, with special attention to the contribution available from application of advanced technologies. This means a sophisticated treatment enlisting the objective advice and counsel of the growing body of competent ecologists and environmental scientists in our universities.

It is my sincere conviction that the common sense of the American people will ultimately prevail, that extreme positions will be rejected in favor of a reasonable middle ground, and that these pressing issues will be resolved without sacrifice of social, economic or environmental interests of genuine importance. For I think it is as certain as anything in human affairs can be, that we will not cast aside the marvels of modern scientific and engineering achievement and all the fruits of our struggles to mold the forces of nature to our use and advancement, because of some nostalgic yearning for a bygone age that never was. At the same time, we must and will insist upon protection of the heritage of natural wonders and beauty and of cultural and historic values with which we are so fortunately endowed. But the accommodation of these interests can be greatly expedited and serious setbacks averted if we who believe in sound water resource development and in conservation and environmental enhancement, concert our efforts and see to it that all the pertinent facts are fully and fairly presented to the public and that the half-truths and distortions born of fanaticism or special interest are rigorously examined and exposed.

[5] Oklahoma v. Atkinson, 313 U.S. 508 (1941).

CITIZEN ANTICRIME PATROL ASSISTANCE ACT

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation entitled the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act which would, if enacted, provide Federal financial help to organized groups of residents who contribute to their own security, and the security of their neighbors, by engaging in certain anticrime activities in their own communities.

Fear of senseless, unpredictable, and

often vicious crime has driven many Americans to organize to help protect themselves. In New York City, citizens in at least one neighborhood have organized a police whistle alarm system. In Washington, D.C., apartment house residents regularly meet neighbors who travel after dark, and escort them home. In Alexandria, Va., residents have organized late-evening car patrols to guard against rampant crime. Other such citizen "crime watches" and patrols are operating in Fall River, Mass.; Hammond, Ind.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Omaha, Nebr.; and many other localities.

The wealthy can hire guards or professional protection agencies to provide extra security for their homes and neighborhoods. But middle- and low-income citizens must do it themselves, and often incur considerable costs in scarce time and funds.

The value of organized citizen activity in crime fighting is well recognized. In its report on the police, President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice urged citizens to take an active part in law enforcement:

> To reduce crime in their communities citizens must be prepared to back up their police forces with more than slogans. They need to keep in mind, but in perspective, the possibilities of crime in their daily lives and take reasonable steps to limit criminal opportunities. In emergency situations, they must assume the responsibilities of summoning aid for victims or police in distress; they cannot stay free of involvement and yet expect others to protect them. In groups and even as individuals they can supply desperately needed auxiliary resources to the police, the courts and correctional officers.

Mr. Speaker, existing citizen anticrime projects prove that citizens can actively help protect themselves and do so responsibly and effectively. In my judgment, it is about time the Federal Government did something to encourage such projects, and to reward citizens who take part in them. That is the purpose of the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act.

Under this proposed legislation, residents' organizations offering, or wishing to offer, anticrime services would be eligible for Federal grants to reimburse them for their time and expenses, including stipends, training, and certain equipment. A residents' organization is defined as any community service organization in which the primary criterion for membership is residence in a clearly defined local neighborhood, housing complex, or community.

Residents' organizations seeking grants would be required to submit a plan indicating the services to be performed. In general, such services could include roving or stationary crime watch patrols, escorting of individuals or groups leaving or returning to their places of residence—particularly during evening hours—and rapid warning and reporting of criminal or suspicious activities to the police and other residents.

No funds under the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act may be used for any firearm, chemical, agent or other weapon, or to defray the cost of the use of any motor vehicles. Thus, the bill is designed to contribute to control of crime by increasing the presence of watchful, responsible people in places where trouble often occurs, not by increasing the circulation of guns and weapons. While motor vehicles may be used in patrol programs funded under the proposal, the cost of supplying and maintaining such vehicles at public expense is excluded on grounds that the costs would simply be too great.

Residents' organizations would be required under the act to coordinate their activities with the police and similar organizations in adjacent communities, and to show evidence of financial need, community and police support, and respect for the constitutional rights of members of the community.

When I announced my intention to propose this legislation some weeks ago, the response was most enthusiastic. The following editorial from the December 2 issue of the Bronx, N.Y., Press Review very well sums up the need and justification for this legislation:

[From the Bronx Press-Review, Dec. 2, 1971]

PAINFUL BUT HOPEFUL NECESSITY

Rep. Jonathan Bingham is seeking to have legislation passed in Congress which would enable the formation and partial funding of citizens groups entrusted to patrol specified areas, to combat crime.

We must admit that some time back we might have protested this proposal as "vigilantism." We've changed this attitude, as Congressman Bingham surely must have changed his.

He demands certain safeguards, strict limitations as to the extent of areas to be covered by civilian patrols, their equipment, their programs. Any legislation must be forthright and incisive in these respects.

But we've seen that there are civilian patrols working well and responsibly and with effect, and good men and women who want to give their time and effort to this last-ditch kind of effort deserve encouragement in it, not censure. The controls must be explicit, and they must be rigorously applied.

Citizens must do something for themselves. The continuous calls for police aid, for municipal funds, are not bringing adequate response. The police are setting up special programs—which in a way argue for the citizen patrols, rather than against them. Special efforts to curb crime and to make a free society's streets free of crime—all of them have to be considered.

We hope that we'll hear more from Rep. Bingham on this—much more. And we'd like to hear all members of the Bronx and New York City Congressional delegations address themselves to this painful but hopeful necessity.

Extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Government Operations with regard to the implementation of the Safe Streets Act indicate that funding under that program is seriously clogged. Nationally, 92.1 percent of the funds appropriated for the year ending June 30, 1971—fiscal 1971—have not yet been received by local governments, and 51.1 percent of the funds for fiscal 1970 have not yet reached local communities. As of June 30, 1971, only 27.5 percent of the 1970 funds allocated to New York, and less than 1 percent of New York's 1971 funds, have become available for expenditure at local levels.

The elaborate statewide planning procedures under the Safe Streets Act need to be streamlined to break this logjam. In addition, ways must be found to channel funds directly to high-crime areas. The Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act offers one way to get crime control funds flowing into areas where they are needed. As a special program under the Safe Streets Act, it bypasses the complicated planning procedures which are delaying current safe streets funds.

As a secondary matter, the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act I am proposing would have the added benefit of putting needed funds into the hands of citizens, rather than into the pockets of high-paid security consultants, administrators, equipment manufacturers, and professionals to whom many of the funds under the current safe streets programs are now going. It is the average citizen, not the high-paid professionals, who are most affected both by crime and by the current economic pinch. The program I am suggesting in this bill would directly ease the problems of the average citizen in both these areas—by helping him to help protect himself and his neighbors against crime, and by adding to his earnings in the process.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act follows:

H.R. 12262

A bill to provide Federal citizen anticrime patrol assistance grants to residents' organizations

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 "Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act."

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) public safety and security can best be achieved through cooperation between the general public and local law enforcement officials;

(2) citizens of many communities have demonstrated the ability of citizens responsibly and effectively to organize, plan and ask to help protect their neighborhoods against crime in conjunction with law enforcement officials;

(3) law enforcement officers throughout the Nation welcome organized participation of citizens in combatting crime; and

(4) the regular presence of responsible citizens on the streets, in buildings and in unprotected areas of communities where crime lurks, to watch for and report any sign of criminal or suspicious activity can help to resolve and deter crimes.

Therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (as amended) to provide a program of financial grants to residents' organizations which shall utilize such grants to help prevent crime.

SEC. 3. Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by—

(1) redesignating part G, part H, and part I as part H, part I, and part J, respectively; and

(2) inserting after part F the following new part:

PART G—GRANTS TO RESIDENTS' ORGANIZATIONS

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 551. It is the purpose of this part to encourage and assist through a program of direct grants to local residents' organizations, efforts by citizens through such organizations regularly to patrol and otherwise watch over local facilities and human activ-

ities vulnerable to crime, and to report criminal or suspicious activities to the proper law enforcement authorities and thereby to help deter or resolve crimes.

"ALLOTMENTS TO RESIDENTS' ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 552. The Administration shall make grants to residents' organizations which have established a plan as required under section 553 of this part and which have—

"(1) demonstrated a need for assistance, taking into account such factors as—

"(A) the extent and impact upon their community of crime,

"(B) the financial need of such residents' organization, and

"(C) the expense and difficulty of carrying out the plan for services;

"(2) established the degree to which the plan to be assisted is likely to effect a decrease in crime in the community;

"(3) undertaken to coordinate its activities with the activities of similar organizations in surrounding communities;

"(4) established the degree to which the plan enjoys the support of the members of the community;

"(5) undertaken consultations with local law enforcement authorities in the development of the plan to assure full coordination between the organization and such authorities in the implementation of the plan; and

"(6) established that the plan provides for protection of the civil and constitutional rights of all members of the community.

"PLAN FOR CRIME WATCH AND REPORTING SERVICES

"SEC. 553. (a) In order to qualify for the grants authorized by section 552 of this part, residents' organizations must submit to the Administration in writing a plan to provide one or more of the following services:

"(1) Roving or stationary crime watch patrols.

"(2) Escorts for persons leaving or returning to their places of residence, particularly during non-daylight hours.

"(3) Rapid warning and reporting of criminal or suspicious activities to law enforcement authorities and, where appropriate, to other residents.

"(b) The plan required by subsection (a) shall set forth a program for educating, equipping, and training the members of such organization.

"GRANT CONDITIONS

"SEC. 554. (a) A Federal grant authorized under this part may, subject to the provisions of subsection (b), provide for up to 100 per centum of the total cost of the execution of the plan required by section 553.

"(b) A Federal grant authorized under this part may be used to pay the costs of stipends to, and necessary training and equipment of, residents' organization members actively engaged in implementing a plan; *provided*, however, that no funds under this part shall be used for the purchase, lease, rental, maintenance, or use of any firearm, chemical agent, or other weapon, or the purchase, lease, rental or maintenance of any motor vehicle.

"AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 555. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this part, the sum of $50 million for fiscal year 1973, $75 million for fiscal year 1974, and $100 million for fiscal year 1975."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. Section 601 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (as amended) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) 'Residents' organization' means any organization of persons in which the primary criterion for active membership and participation is current residence in a clearly defined local neighborhood, housing complex or community, and which is organized for the purpose of general service to the community."

TAX GIMMICKS SPAWN SLUM LORDS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have just come across an interesting article in the December 11 issue of the New Republic entitled "Failed Federal Housing—The United States as Slumlord." Actually, this article points up more than just our housing problem. I believe it points up very clearly the fallacy of relying upon tax loopholes and tax gimmicks to stimulate the construction of housing.

I hope all of my colleagues, particularly those interested in tax justice, will take time to read this very informative article:

FAILED FEDERAL HOUSING—THE UNITED STATES AS SLUMLORD

The administration has a pressing reason for wanting to build virtually all subsidized rental housing from now on in the outer and not the inner city. In explaining HUD's new policy of scattering subsidy apartments, Secretary Romney tells us a lot about the scarcity of land in the inner city, about legitimate demands for social justice, and about the flight of jobs to the outer city necessitating new, lower-rent housing in the suburbs. But he doesn't publicly admit the motive of government self-interest: the Department of Housing and Urban Development will have accumulated, by 1978, a multibillion dollar investment in subsidized apartments (estimates range up to $80 billion in total obligations over the 40-year life of the mortgages) and those in the ghetto—about one-third of the present total—are going sour at an alarming rate. In short, HUD faces the grim prospect of becoming the nation's No. 1 slum landlord when privately developed but federally guaranteed and subsidized projects belly up, the bulks turned over to the government for management or disposal.

Having only barely recuperated from the recent speculation scandals of the homeownership program, HUD is now sifting the early but dreary returns on interest-subsidy programs for apartments, particularly projects for low and moderate-income families. The news is bad from Boston, where, for example, the rate of default on mortgages is 80 percent for the 3022 inner-city apartments rehabilitated three years ago. Housing consultant Hortense W. Gabel took a reading on New York City subsidized projects less than three years old and found that many were "already exhibiting mild to severe maintenance problems." HUD's own statisticians have warned Romney to brace for a five percent default rate. George Sternlieb, an expert on inner-city housing at Rutgers University, says flatly "the bulk of all the housing that was built under [interest subsidy] in the central cities is essentially bankrupt."

Real estate entrepreneurs, with large profits already pocketed in many cases, say the problems are too severe in the inner city, and they won't take the plunge again without some kind of protection, such as an association with a community-based organization. "Why should we go into an area where we know we'll get our brains knocked out before we're in round two," said Gerald Schuster, president of Continental Wingate, a Boston construction firm. Schuster and like-minded businessmen have difficulty coping with the demands of community groups for heavy minority representation on construction crews and for a voice in the direction of the projects. They are also unsophisticated about the slum syndrome of crime, drugs, despair and decay that only too readily engulfs their units.

To the surprise of no one familiar with past Federal Housing Administration programs, the real beneficiaries of the subsidies are not low- and moderate-income families ($4000 to $12,000 a year) but the housing business and a new breed of real estate investor. "The housing being produced, by and large, is a disaster," said Roland L. (Sam) Larson, executive director of the Inter Faith Housing Corp. of Boston, one of the nation's leading nonprofit housing packagers. "It's a total ripoff and nobody is going to jail for it. The programs make the rich richer through subsidies but the tenants get only higher rents and modestly improved housing." This from Anthony Henry, executive director of the National Tenants Organization: "I think it's going to be worse than public housing and in a shorter period of time."

Inspection of numerous inner-city subsidy projects by this reporter found appalling instances of shoddy and inept construction. Plumbing backups, severe water leaks and chilling drafts are common. Walls are generally paper thin, doors poorly hung, windows of the cheapest design. The builders, with some justification, blame Congress for unrealistic cost ceilings that prevent quality building. Tenants, with more justification, blame the FHA for inadequate inspection that allows corner cutting in construction.

Rents for these apartments—most of them located in seedy, crime-infested neighborhoods—approach middle-class levels, despite the government's covering all but one percent of the interest charges. Rent scales at Methunion Manor in the South End of Boston run up to $222 a month for a five-bedroom apartment—hardly a rent within the means of even a "moderate" income family. A five-city HUD survey of subsidy projects found the average tenant paying 34 percent of income for rent. The goal was 25 percent. Adding insult, many sponsors have felt forced by soaring operating costs to extract rent increases from these already hard-pressed tenants shortly after the projects opened, the survey showed. The predictable result has been a coast-to-coast wave of tenant strikes and law suits.

The main tenant complaint is about the large profits generated by the special tax preferences given subsidized housing in the 1969 tax revision act. The tax shelters, plus the congressionally mandated goal of 6 million subsidized units by 1978, plus the dire depression of the housing industry in the late 1960s, all combined in a volatile mix that allowed HUD to drive subsidized housing starts to a record 500,000 this year. (Some subsidized projects are occupied with another 2820 under construction.)

The tax shelter, says Boston entrepreneur Max Kargman, is the key to understanding the financial dynamic of multifamily subsidized housing: "That's what makes the whole deal work; it's what makes it profitable for the builder. Otherwise why should he put in all this time and effort, with all the risks and struggle. For what?"

The builder-developers make their profit by selling shelter equity to rich professionals and businessmen. For a percentage of the 90 percent federally guaranteed mortgage, usually between 12 and 20 percent, the investors purchase the right to offset taxes on other earnings with the rapid depreciation losses permitted on the full value of the apartments. In other words, on a 1-million project, they would pay between $120,000 and $200,000 for $1 million in depreciation used over a five-to-ten-year period. The return in federal income taxes avoided can run as high as 30 percent a year for the investor in the 50 percent tax bracket. These absentee landlords, known as limited dividend partners, have no hand in management, which remains in most cases the responsibility of the builder-developer. The investors often don't even know where their investment is located unless their broker tells them.

Shelter sale is also the honey that draws

entrepreneurs to subsidized housing, especially so-called easy fringe and suburban projects catering to young, white professionals with low but rising income. With actual cash equity of only $33,000—a not unusual proportion—a developer of a $1-million project can get a cash return in less than two years equal to five times his investment, if not more, depending on his sophistication.

The inequities and distortions are blatant in the shelter dynamic. When operating costs increase, builder-developers resort to rent hikes and won't dip into front-end profits from the sale or use of shelters. The public hears only about the current $175-million-a-year cost of interest subsidies on the apartments and is ignorant of the millions lost to the Treasury each year because of the tax writeoffs. Furthermore, because profit dominates the process, private enterprise is drawn to the safest location possible for building subsidized apartments—fringe areas where 61 percent are located. "The guy who makes the most money is the guy who builds the projects where they don't need them anyhow," said housing consultant Robert H. Kuehn of Boston. Although the taxpayer guarantees the mortgage, puts up the interest subsidies, and supplies the financial coal, says Milton Semer, a former HUD official in the Johnson administration, private interests are determining where this new brand of public housing will be built, who will live in it, and under what circumstances. And most profits are front-end, meaning that while the government has a 40-year stake in the mortgage, the money men are home free from possible recapture of profits by the Internal Revenue Service if the project remains viable for ten years. "There's nothing to keep their feet to the fire," said an aide to Romney, worrying about a massive bailout of the money interests in the 1980's.

Even nonprofit housing sponsors are thinking up ways to harvest a share of the dollars spinning out of the program. Fearing a loss of their preferred tax status, the nonprofits until now left the tax gimmicks unused when they launched a project. But at least seven of the community-based and church groups have recently launched joint ventures with entrepreneurs, planning to use part of the shelter proceeds to support social services in the projects. "We have a low-income housing program in this country and we are going to use it," said Larry M. Lefkowitz, director of public affairs for the Non-Profit Housing Center in Washington. "You can either do nothing or use the tools in your tool box."

What went wrong with a program once hailed as the ideal way public seed money could generate private sector enterprise of social worth? For one thing, HUD officials, pressured by Romney until recently to meet production goals, have shaved operating and maintenance cost estimates 10–to–20 percent to bring proposed projects within federal cost limits. Since initial rents were pegged to the unrealistic estimates, the predictable result has been increases shortly after, or even before apartments are occupied. Needless to say, general inflation has added to the cost squeeze. For another thing, builders say they can't construct durable subsidized projects because Congress has set unrealistically low cost limits in the mistaken belief that there is such a thing as low-cost (versus low-rent) housing for the poor. And Congress made niggardly allowance for amenities, really necessities, such as playgrounds, day care facilities, teenage recreation centers, and counseling. Particularly important in the government's view is the short supply of competent housing managers.

All these problems are intensified by crime, drugs and decay in ghetto projects. The most desirable tenants tend to leave at the first opportunity for something safer. Finding the right replacement tenant becomes more difficult. Slowly, the project becomes poorer. Repair costs rise, rent receipts decline. Deterioration accelerates. "I just don't have the dollars to stem the tide," complained one hard-pressed housing manager in the Roxbury section of Boston. "Society asks him (the manager of low-income housing) to take on all its problems—drugs, alcohol, and welfare dependency—then blames him when he fails," said Edwin D. Abrams, a Boston housing consultant who also manages subsidy units. "But the government provides none of the social services money that might make this possible."

Faced with the necessity of doing something about a deteriorating situation, the government has the option of tinkering with the interest subsidy formula or changing direction completely in housing the poor. One first-aid method might entail operating subsidies, such as those recently instituted in public housing, to keep rents down and projects afloat. A variant might be infusion of money for social services. A third could be a return to direct, low-interest federal loans for construction. Radical surgery might entail abandoning interest subsidies and moving to direct stipends, allowing poor families to shop for shelter that doesn't carry the social stigma of a "project." Tony Henry and the NTO would have tenants themselves manage and control subsidized units. Norman V. Watson, the assistant HUD secretary for housing management, voiced the government's confusion on just what to do when he observed: "We've got to look at a housing strategy real quick."

CONGRESSMAN STRATTON INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO SEPARATE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1971 FROM WELFARE REFORM; URGES ENACTMENT AS PRIORITY MATTER IN JANUARY 1972

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as we move steadily, and hopefully rapidly, toward the end of this first session it becomes increasingly clear to me that one of the very first pieces of legislation we ought to enact when we come back in January are the social security amendments contained in H.R. 1.

These have been languishing now, as you know, for 6 months in the Senate, and judging from the complex and controversial nature of the welfare reform program to which they are attached, it will probably be months more before the entire package can be approved.

Yet most of the social security amendments were supposed to take effect January 1, 1972. I think we ought to act to see they do take effect on that date, without any further delay. If we continue to wait until we have some kind of agreement in the Senate on welfare reform, hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of senior citizens will no longer be around to enjoy the improved benefits which an overwhelming majority of the Members of both Houses wants them to have.

For some time I have been urging that we cut these social security amendments loose from H.R. 1 and pass them as separate legislation. Last week I introduced the bill which will do just that, H.R. 12200. It contains these amendments and leaves out the welfare reform title of H.R. 1.

Two recent events have made the enactment of H.R. 12200 even more urgent:

First. The recent White House Conference on the Aging demonstrated very clearly that the No. 1 objective of our retired citizens is better income. H.R. 12200 would be a major step in that direction.

Second. President Nixon's recent veto of the OEO legislation was based primarily on the fact that it contained a sizable child-care program. Since the administration's own welfare reform bill, contained in H.R. 1, also involves a similarly extensive day-care program, it is obvious that we face even more difficulty than had been imagined in getting agreement on all the features of H.R. 1.

So we ought to leave welfare reform to be further debated and refined and move ahead quickly to enact the social security provisions of H.R. 1.

I earnestly solicit the support and assistance of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and at both ends of the Capitol. I welcome their cosponsorship of H.R. 12200, and I would also urge them to use their influence in lining up Members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in support of their legislation. If there is enough enthusiastic support for this idea by next January I believe we can put it over the top, and in so doing earn the gratitude of the Nation's retired citizens—often referred to as America's most neglected minority.

FLORIDA'S DEMOCRATIC WOMEN

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the installation speech of Mrs. Margaret H. Cobbe upon her acceptance of the presidency of the Democratic Women's Club of Florida. Mrs. Cobbe, of Gulfport, Fla., is a distinguished member of the Democratic Party in my State, and I am confident she will prove to be an outstanding leader of our Democratic women.

I cite this speech here because it expresses the new spirit of women in politics. It conveys clearly and simply the determination of dedicated women to make our political system work, to make it work for women and for all Americans.

I believe my colleagues of both parties will be interested in Mrs. Cobbe's remarks, which were delivered on October 9 at the annual convention of the Democratic Women's Club of Florida in Miami Beach, in my congressional district.

The remarks follow:

Today the Democratic Women's Club of Florida chartered a new course for the future. I feel humble and proud and a little awed to have been selected as your leader. I don't kid myself into thinking it will be smooth sailing. I'm sure we'll make our share of mistakes but we'll learn from them and we'll pick ourselves up again and row all the more vigorously. With everyone pulling together, I feel confident we'll weather the storms and reach our destination.

You have elected some strong officers here today. I want the Committee Chairman to be just as strong. For this reason, I will delay appointments until I have consulted with many of you. We must have the most capable people in the state to make our reorganization work and I invite you to give me your recommendations.

I am just so proud of our organization and I hope that during these two years I can project that pride to each of you, and

to the small and the mighty throughout the state. We must not only feel affection for our local clubs but we must learn to think regionally and state-wide so that we can multiply our strength and influence and recognition.

Our past presidents have been ladies of the highest order. Their dignity and integrity have been beyond reproach. I promise to work very hard to maintain the high standards they have set and, hopefully, move ahead in other ways:

First, I would like to see a closer liaison with other Democratic organizations. We've made progress, particularly with the State Executive Committee, but there is room for improvement. I believe we should cultivate our Democratic youth; take them under our wing and nourish them. Our Junior Executive Committee project, which we instituted last year, is an excellent opportunity for us to guide our young. Some of their viewpoints may seem radical to us, but with tolerance and vision, they can be tempered with the wisdom of age and experience, and made into workable ideas for us all. They have much to offer and we too can learn. We could use some of their idealism, their enthusiasm and their fresh concepts. The Party is big enough and broad enough to blanket all: the old and young, conservative and liberal, and all the in-betweens. A woman's organization is the perfect vehicle for unifying all Democratic forces—we have the temperament, the patience and the discipline to do it. For years we've bolstered the egos of our men by letting them take the credit for what we've done, and perhaps that's the reason for lack of progress in my next point:

RECOGNITION

Some sources think we're the best-organized Democratic group in the state. Others barely acknowledge our existence. We must take action to alter the thinking of the latter group. We can be aggressive and still remain feminine. We can let them know we're alive without the marching, sign-waving and chanting. We have opinions and we should express them. We should not have to attend a Special Women's Caucus or a Liberation group for fulfillment. We have a ready-made organization right here and we must exercise its full potential. Gone are the days when a candidate can come to town and meet with a group of men only, if he's smart. When a sponsor arranges such a meeting, he does a disservice to the candidate. Women are capable of policy-making, of organizing, of planning. And we should protest when we're excluded from such a gathering. I attended a meeting on the East Coast recently where only three women were present, two of us from out of town. And even though I'd travelled three hours to get there, I'm sure I would've been turned away, as other women were, had it not been for the formidable presence of our National Committeewoman. The power of this organization can and should be used to correct such inequities.

Now we come to a most important point: involvement in the issues, and this becomes intermingled with recognition. No longer is a woman content to follow blindly along just because a candidate or officeholder is a registered Democrat. The coffees and luncheons and little courtesies are nice. We appreciate them; but they are no substitute for good government. We should not have to worry about stepping on the toes of a candidate or officeholder; our main concern should be whether the issue is good for the people. If thorough study convinces us it is not good for the people, then we should wield our influence. An officeholder should be responsive to his constituents and should gracefully receive constructive criticism, especially from those who played a major role in placing him in office, because we too become accountable for his actions.

The Democratic Women's Club of Florida believes strongly in party organization. It is the alternative to power and special interests. Our motivation is completely unselfish—it is simply placing good candidates in office. It isn't enough for us to say, "I got a Democrat elected." The proud moment comes when we can say, "I got a good Democrat elected who's good for the people of Florida." I'd like to see our organization take the lead in this type of party endeavor. We can be the guide—the very conscience—of our party.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD SPEAKS BEFORE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, made a magnificent address at the Drew Pearson Foundation luncheon today honoring the investigative reporter of the year before the National Press Club. On this occasion the Drew Pearson Foundation Award was made to Neil Sheehan of the New York Times for his investigative report relative to the Pentagon papers. Mr. MOORHEAD, speaking as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs and Government Information, spoke movingly on the meaning of free press in America and its significance to the security and well-being of our country. Mr. MOORHEAD made important suggestions as to the part Congress should play in implementing article I of the Bill of Rights.

All will profit who read Mr. MOORHEAD'S able address. I insert it in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I commend it to my colleagues and my fellow countrymen:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD OF PENNSYLVANIA

Ladies and gentlemen. It is indeed an honor for me to be here with you this afternoon.

It is not often that any but the most senior members of the House of Representatives are afforded the opportunity to address such a distinguished and influential gathering.

Maybe you are following the wisdom of a certain Congressional Committee Chairman who, when asked what kind of a government witness he wanted said—"One high enough to speak with authority and low enough to know what he's talking about!"

Speaking about low enough, they tell the story of a local functionary who needed a speaker for an occasion so he sent a telegram to the Republican or Democratic National Committee, I forget which, saying he wanted "a very important person, nothing lower than a Congressman."

The reply that came back was—"There is nothing lower than a Congressman."

Because of that status I am particularly honored to participate in the presentation of the Drew Pearson Award for Investigative Journalism to Neil Sheehan of the New York Times.

To all in general and Luvie in particular let me say how much I admired the courage and conviction of Drew Pearson. There may have been a time or two when I did not share his conviction but always and on every occasion I admired his courage.

When other columnists ducked an issue because it was too hot to handle, or the people involved too powerful, Drew Pearson never failed to rise to the occasion.

There could be no more appropriate memorial to the courage of that brave man and no better way to encourage investigative journalism than the award being given today.

As Thomas Jefferson once said:

"The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

At any rate, democracy without a free press would be unworkable, unthinkable, and, without investigative journalists, probably totally corrupt.

Sometimes I think that you ladies and gentlemen of the press and media don't realize how much power, for good or evil, you possess.

Power in the Democracy rests with the people—and the people are swayed by what you write and broadcast.

Fortunately, almost everybody in your profession is a dedicated citizen desiring to do the best for his country.

I submit to you, that, fortunately, almost everyone in government—elective or appointive—is a dedicated citizen desiring to do the best for his country.

The unfortunate thing is that many government officials consider newsmen the enemy.

Sometimes this feeling is reciprocated.

Drew Pearson's jousts with individuals in government, both in Congress and the Executive branch, were legendary. There were, and today still are, many people who equate Drew Pearson, and reporters in general, with all of the evils in hell, and then some.

They believe that the Drew Pearsons and the Neil Sheehans are to be avoided and that the only way to cooperate with them is not to cooperate at all.

But there is one subcommittee in the Congress institutionally designed toward promoting the proposition—that the more access to information and the more information available to the American public the better our government will be. This is the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information which I happen to Chair.

From his actions I believe that Neil Sheehan would agree with this proposition but I submit that apparently the Attorney General does not.

Neil Sheehan, in an act of great courage, took the leadership in writing of the Pentagon Papers because he believed that in our Democracy the people deserved to know the contents and meaning of those documents. I agree with him. But the Attorney General apparently did not agree. Mr. Mitchell equated the free press with the enemies of the United States. For the first time in our history, our own government sought to obtain prior restraint of publication despite the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights.

Many of us in Congress were outraged at this disregard of the First Amendment.

As you know, shortly after Neil's stories began appearing in the Times, my Subcommittee on Government Information began seven days of hearings into the government's information and classification policies.

The hearings bore fruit. We heard William Rehnquist's contention that the President was right . . . the Defense Department was right . . . the Justice Department and John Mitchell were right . . . and Neil Sheehan was wrong . . . all this by inference only because, naturally, he could not discuss the case before the courts.

Our hearings turned up the not too surprising evidence that the administration of the Executive Order dealing with the classification of information was in utter disarray.

The system seems to have produced loads of inputs but there was little outflow to show

that the same zeal which classified information—and put it out of the reach of Congress and the public—is at work making information available.

Material that has long outlived its valid secretive nature is still being kept under wraps by the Pentagon and other branches. Material which does not qualify for classification is being labeled and tucked away from public and Congressional scrutiny. And probably the most prevalent abuse of the plan, overclassification, is proliferating.

Former Justice Arthur Goldberg testified that when he was Ambassador to the United Nations, less than 10 percent of all of the classified documents that passed his desk deserved a security classification.

William Florence, a retired Air Force classification expert with 43 years of government service told the Subcommittee that he believed that less than one-half of one-percent of all documents currently classified deserved to be so.

The following is an example given my Subcommittee of misuse and subversion of the classification system: A note circulated among service chiefs complaining that too many papers with a Top Secret classification were being passed about and suggesting a reduction of the classification's use, was labeled—you guessed it—Top Secret.

Classification of so much rubbish cheapens the security labels and people begin to lose respect for them.

As Chairman of the Freedom of Information Subcommittee, the objective I seek is to reduce the number of classified documents and increase the penalty for overclassification and the penalty for divulging documents really vital to National security.

The most unique solution and the one I presently favor, with some refinements possibly, is something like the following.

We would introduce legislation creating a classification system with only two categories, Top Secret and Secret, thus dropping the third used now, Confidential.

Anything labeled Secret would become public information in two years. Those items labeled Top Secret would become public information in three years.

Prior to the expiration of the three-year period, any revelations of Top Secret documents, even without an intent to harm the United States would be a felony with severe punishment.

Similarly the revelation of any Secret information before the two year period, even without intent to harm the United States, would be a misdemeanor with a less severe penalty.

Along with the restructuring of the classification system, I would create a congressionally appointed commission as a classification board of appeals and classification advisor.

The Classification Commission might be composed of ten classification experts—six named by the majority leaders of the Senate and House and four named by the minority leaders.

Should an item deserve to be classified for longer than three years, say our defense plans in case of a nuclear attack, the classifying authority would go to the Commission and make the case for a continued classification.

If, but only if, the Commission determined that the classification should be continued, would the revelation of such documents be a crime.

Conversely, the Commission could act as a judge for somebody who gets ahold of a document which he believes to be improperly classified—say another set of Pentagon Papers—and which he wants to publish or talk about in public.

The Commission can advise him that it should remain classified or it can say that you are right, our staff experts agree that this item no longer deserves to be kept from the public and feel free to use it as you will.

Next year my Subcommittee will hold an extensive review of the five years of the Freedom of Information Act. My staff has been compiling reports on refusals of legitimate requests for information, court cases filed under the Freedom of Information Act, and other pertinent data—which by the way we will publish before the hearing as a general history of the Act—to show that we must go further legislatively to insure the right of the public to know.

When the right of the public to know is pitted against the power of the government to operate in secrecy, far removing the factor of responsibility, you will find Bill Moorhead with the Neil Sheehan's and the Drew Pearson's.

This country belongs to its people—and if that fact is sometimes forgotten by public officials—it is the responsibility of the Drew Pearsons and the Neil Sheehans of this world to remind them.

Washington is a fertile field for investigative reporting and it will continue to be so, long after anyone of us is here to read the newspapers.

And it takes a Neil Sheehan digging and researching and investigating to remind those, who may have forgotten, that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

I think that Neil Sheehan's courageous act and the public's outcry against the attempt to gag the New York Times will mean that government will be a little more wary of treating the press as the enemy.

But the mere absence of hostile action on the part of the Executive is not enough.

Affirmative action is needed to end this secrecy in the Executive branch of government.

What I propose is an alliance between the legislative branch and newsmen—an alliance aimed at ending unnecessary secrecy in government—an alliance dedicated to the necessity, for a workable democracy, of the peoples' right to know.

The first steps in forging this alliance could be taken in the hearings next year on the Freedom of Information Act before my Subcommittee.

The goals of an investigative congressman and an investigative journalist are not dissimilar.

The peoples representatives in Congress cannot properly legislate without information now being withheld from them.

The people cannot judge the performance of the legislative branch or the Executive branch unless they are adequately informed by the news media.

The problem is basic and fundamental, constitutional and political. But as former Justice Goldberg said before our Subcommittee:

"Often it takes a dramatic event to bring a serious public problem to national attention."

For that dramatic event, the nation should be grateful to our investigative journalist of the year—Neil Sheehan.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT AND THE CONGRESS

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Congress has had to deal, with increasing frequency, with a number of questions arising from rapid advances in science and technology. These questions range from nuclear power to detergents, from the SST to the air bag, and from the Alaska pipeline to the computer.

Many of these questions require that the Congress carefully balance the progress that can be attained by proceeding with a particular technological project against the adverse effects that will be encountered as a result.

Furthermore, as we have seen in the last few years, these questions often come to the attention of the Congress only after a good deal of damage has been done, after funds from the public purse have unnecessarily been spent, or after better technology has been developed elsewhere.

In order to deal with these types of questions, I believe that the Congress can and should have available an improved capacity to assess the probable impacts of technology, good and bad. The issue of how such information might be obtained has been addressed by the Committee on Science and Astronautics during the last several sessions of Congress. The Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, which I have the privilege to chair, has heard a number of expert witnesses on this subject, and has concluded that an Office of Technology Assessment should be established to provide appropriate evaluations to the Congress.

The Office of Technology Assessment, which we propose, would work closely with the two organizations already established to provide information and advice for the Congress; the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. It would, however, undertake a function not now performed by either of them within their established areas of responsibility. This function is the evaluation of the plus and minus impacts of technology in the broadest sense, a function which is summed up by the term "Technology Assessment." The details of this proposal are found in the bill H.R. 10243, and House Report No. 92-469 which accompanied the bill as reported.

One important point which I would urge my colleagues to bear in mind about this bill is that the Office of Technology Assessment—OTA—would in no way alter the hearing system. The basic ideas behind the OTA are to permit congressional committees to seek its aid as a supplement to current methods of inquiry, and to permit committees of both Houses to begin considerations of any technological matter or issue at a higher plateau of understanding and information—not on the question of whether the technology involved is itself good or bad, but with regard to the likely effects of the proposed use of that technology.

The types of problems with which the Office of Technology Assessment should provide help in the future are not difficult to identify. I should like to indicate briefly, by way of example, some of our past and present problems which would have been amenable to this sort of assessment.

Before I begin, I would like to point out that the need for technology assessment is not a new problem to this country. One of the earliest examples of Government concern with a serious technological problem dates back well over a hundred years to the year 1824. The new technology in question then was the use of steam engines to power boats, and the problem which came to the fore was

the frequent explosion of that type of engine.

In 1824, the engine on the steamboat *Aetna* exploded in New York Harbor, killing 13 people and causing many injuries. Congress took notice, and a resolution was introduced in the House calling for an inquiry into possible legislation barring the issuance of a certificate of navigation to any boat operating at high steam pressures. However, no further action was taken at that time.

Steam boilers continued to explode, and as a result, public demands that something be done increased. Action was finally taken in 1830 when the executive branch awarded the first Government research grant to the Franklin Institute of Philadelphia to study steam boiler explosions. The results of this research eventually led to provisions for inspections and standards of construction for steam boilers of all types.

In this early case, Congress was unable to respond effectively and it fell to the executive branch to evaluate the impact of the new technology and find a solution to the resulting problem. For the most part, that same pattern has continued over the years. Congress has not, to any significant degree, exercised a leadership role when it comes to anticipating the problems and opportunities raised by scientific and technological developments.

Let me now turn to some much more recent examples of technological questions that have come before the Congress. In each of these it is clear that Congress could have done, or could do, a better job if we had an improved capability to assess independently the effects of the technology in question.

The congressional deliberations on the supersonic transport—SST—are still fresh in the minds of most of my colleagues. The Congress first provided funds for the SST in August of 1961 with an appropriation of $11 million. Following President Kennedy's declaration in 1963 that the development of the SST jointly by industry and Government was a national objective, the annual appropriations by the Congress passed the $100 million mark.

It was only in 1967 and 1968, however, that a whole series of environmental and economic questions, which eventually led to cancellation of the program, were raised. The environmental questions included the sonic boom, the takeoff noise level, stratospheric water and carbon dioxide accumulation, instability of the ozone layer, and inadvertent weather modification. The economic aspect was related to questions of aircraft productivity, market potential, and competition from the British-French and Russian SST's. A variety of social and psychological factors were also evident, including the concept of premium transportation for the affluent, as well as possible public disenchantment with a transport system which eliminated all sense of travel. There seems little doubt that an Office of Technology Assessment could have provided valuable assistance to the Congress not only in resolving the serious questions of policy which arose, but also in anticipating many of these questions before the project went as far as it did.

An issue which has similarly been of great interest to many of the Members of this body, although it has not yet involved specific legislation, is the oil pipeline in Alaska. This pipeline would carry oil from the North Slope 800 miles across the State to a port on the southern coast.

Opponents of the project have stressed the dangers of an "ecocatastrophe" which would result from a break in the pipeline due to an earthquake or to a melting of the permafrost in the ground below the pipe, a possibility which is enhanced by heating the oil to 170 degrees in order to facilitate the flow through the pipe.

Those favoring the pipeline have maintained that each of these problems can be solved by appropriate engineering, and that the projected demands for energy by the American economy necessitate exploitation of the North Slope oil.

Recently, alternatives to the pipeline, in the form of tankers through the Arctic Ocean or a pipeline through Canada, have been proposed. The latter, of course, involves major political considerations as well as economic and social ones. It is not inconceivable that still other alternatives, as well as new problems, will be brought forward in this debate.

Again I suggest that Congress is not now well-equipped to evaluate many of these questions, to be informed on the possible consequences of each of the proposed alternatives, and thus be in the best possible position in making its judgments. An Office of Technology Assessment would assist the Congress in each of these areas.

While I am on the subject of transporting oil, I am reminded that there is a further troublesome assessment problem with which the Congress may have to deal involving the so-called supertankers. These are the giant, outsized, oceangoing vessels whose sheer bulk dwarfs anything that we have had up until the last few years.

The physical and ecological side of this matter has been graphically demonstrated by the *Torrey Canyon* affair and a variety of similar spillage episodes since that time. But there are many other considerations to be taken into account as the trend toward the building of supertankers continues in response to the enormous demands of the civilized world for energy and petroleum products. For example, only a few harbors in the world are presently able to adequately handle these monster ships, with the result that there is growing discussion about building facilities on offshore islands to accommodate them.

It is not difficult to guess at the sort of issues which this move might raise. As is the case with the Alaskan pipeline, economic and social, as well as physical and political, considerations would come to the fore.

A very high percentage of the issues which face our country have some sort of technological content which requires assessment. Two which readily come to mind are the concerns surrounding the rapid development of mobile homes and the so-called "community antenna" television proposals.

Modern technology has made the mobile home an extremely popular product, yet widespread use of such homes is creating, and will continue to create, marked changes in the physical and social structure of the Nation. Without trying to enumerate all the ways in which mobile home technology may one day demand congressional attention, I do want to point out that we in the Congress can expect to devote considerable time in the future to this technology since the entire concept is so strongly immersed in interstate commerce.

With regard to community antenna television, sometimes called cable assisted television, we may soon be dealing with a developing technology which will make it possible for every American community to have something like 50 to 75 television channels instead of the present four or five which are allocated to large urban areas and the one or two which are allocated to the more moderate sized cities.

Again, I do not believe it is necessary to pinpoint individual issues which may arise in this connection, but we can be fairly certain that the Congress will become involved in it. In addition to its responsibility for the regulation of interstate commerce and the electromagnetic spectrum, research into the economic and social ramifications of CATV—plus their careful assessment—are likely to require governmental enunciations of policy.

Still another important issue centers around computers. No one today doubts the enormous benefits which our society has derived from the computer. Furthermore, most would agree that we are just at the beginning of the computer era and that untold future applications have still to make their appearances in our society.

The increased use of computers, however beneficial, does also pose problems. One aspect which has already received congressional attention is the invasion of the individual's privacy vis-a-vis the establishment of comprehensive data banks. The use of such data banks in the credit information field has already resulted in some cases of unauthorized disclosure of personal information.

The combination in a central data bank of credit information, medical information and tax information poses the potential threat of a further invasion into the individual's privacy by the computer. We must, therefore, carefully assess the advantages to be gained from centralization of data systems and weigh them against the potential hazards which misuse can produce.

The protection of privacy problem was not fully recognized until the computer had been with us for some time and some damage had already occurred. In other cases, the expected threat, as predicted by those potentially affected, did not in fact materialize. The computer also offers an example of this.

In the 1950's the computer was introduced into the production process both on the factory floor and in the office. Many feared that this process, which was commonly referred to as "automation," would eventually lead to mass un-

employment. With the benefit of hindsight, we can now see that this assessment of computer technology was, at the least, overstated. Increased productivity led to increased demand, while the computer industry itself produced large numbers of entirely new jobs. Information about such gradually emerging technological effects should be available to Congress from the most neutral source possible. The OTA offers, I believe, the best immediate solution of this need.

Furthermore, I would like to emphasize that this is a need which is bound to grow in future years. The rapid developments in science and technology which we have witnessed in the last 25 years will continue at an even more rapid pace between now and the year 2000.

Already, new technologies are with us which have the potential for deeply affecting our national life.

These include mass-produced housing, the video telephone, agricultural innovations, the electric automobile, and so forth. In the longer perspective, new technologies are on the horizon which promise even further changes in our society. Among them are weather modification, new medical technologies and services, genetic manipulation, and potent new drugs.

Of particular significance is the search for new technologies to assure adequate, clean energy sources for the future, and the search for useful materials to satisfy human needs, both of which are likely to need careful assessment.

It is the considered opinion of those of us who serve on the Committee on Science and Astronautics that the Congress must play an important role in dealing with the potential benefits and problems arising from these new technologies. It is a responsibility we cannot evade. And we solicit the help of all the Members of the House so that we may carry out this responsibility to the fullest.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1972

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter and tables.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include herewith for the information of the House a copy of the joint resolution which I introduced today, making further continuing appropriations for the current fiscal year, together with a statement in explanation of the provisions of the resolution:

H.J. RES. 1005

Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That the joint resolution of July 1, 1971 (Public Law 92–38), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) Section 102 is amended to read:

"SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation which is available for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) March 15, 1972, whichever first occurs."

(2) Section 108 is amended to read:

"SEC. 108. Except as hereinafter provided in this section, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other sections of this joint resolution, obligations incurred hereunder for foreign economic assistance, military assistance and sales, security supporting assistance, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and activities provided for in titles III and IV of H.R. 12067, 92d Congress, shall not exceed the lowest of (i) the rate for operations which would be authorized under H.R. 9910, 92d Congress, as passed by the House, (ii) the rate for operations which would be authorized under S. 2819 and S. 2820, 92d Congress, both as passed by the Senate, or (iii) the rate for operations which would be provided by H.R. 12067, 92d Congress, as passed by the House: *Provided*, That military credit sales to Israel may be conducted at not to exceed the rate for operations provided for under section 101 (d) of this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That foreign military sales activities (other than with respect to Israel) may be conducted at a rate of operations not exceeding $175,000,000; *Provided further*, That activities for the Indus Basin development fund (loans), administrative and other expenses (other than section 637(a)), the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Peace Corps, Ryukyu Islands administration, assistance to refugees in the United States, migration and refugee assistance, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Export-Import Bank of the United States may be conducted at not to exceed the rates which would be provided for under H.R. 12067, 92d Congress, as passed by the House."

(3) by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 109. Notwithstanding section 102 of this joint resolution, as amended, emergency school assistance activities for which an appropriation was made in the Office of Education Appropriation Act, 1971, may continue to be conducted at a rate for administrative operations not to exceed the fiscal year 1971 rate."

SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall take effect December 9, 1971.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON THE HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PERIOD DECEMBER 9, 1971–MARCH 15, 1972

THE UNFINISHED APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS

The fiscal year 1972 continuing resolution—Public Law 92–28—as thrice extended, expired last Wednesday, December 8. An extension is needed to cover—

First. The defense appropriation bill, H.R. 11731, awaiting final conference action early this week.

Second. The District of Columbia appropriation bill, H.R. 11932, likewise awaiting final conference action early this week.

Third. The foreign assistance appropriation bill, H.R. 12067, which passed the House December 8—but which is not scheduled for Senate action until early next session because of a conference deadlock on the related authorizations, S. 2819 and S. 2820.

Fourth. Fiscal year 1972 authorizations and appropriations that have not been finalized for the following ongoing programs that have been operating since July 1 under the continuing resolution—

First. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—$32.2 million in final supplemental but contingent on enactment of authorization legislation still pending.

Second. American Revolution Bicentennial Commission—$1.4 million in final supplemental but contingent on enactment of authorization legislation still pending.

Third. Emergency school assistance activities—operating at not to exceed last year's rate; authorization legislation passed House as part of H.R. 7248, Higher Education Act Amendments, but still pending.

PROVISIONS IN THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION (OTHER THAN FOREIGN ASSISTANCE)

Section 2 mends the gap between the time the previous resolution expired—December 8—and the date of approval of this new resolution by making it effective December 9.

Subparagraph (1) rewrites section 102 to incorporate the new expiration date of March 15, 1972, in clause (c) and by adding the words "which is available" in clause (a), assuring interim continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and the American Bicentennial Revolution Commission.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty would continue, for the time being, at not to exceed last year's rate of $31.6 million, as compared to the $32.2 million in the supplemental bill. The Bicentennial Commission would continue, for the time being, at not to exceed last year's rate of $670,000, as compared to the $1.4 million in the supplemental bill.

Subparagraph (3) would add a new section 109 to permit emergency school assistance activities to continue to operate, for the time being, at not to exceed last year's rate—but limited to administrative operations only—pending final disposition of the question of authorization. They have operated since July 1 under the continuing resolution at not to exceed last year's appropriation rate of $75 million. We are advised that approximately $73 million has been obligated this year. Section 109 does not enlarge the interim appropriation; it merely extends its time period.

CONTINUATION PROVISIONS FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Subparagraph (2) rewrites section 108 of the expired resolution to incorporate a new set of ground rules with respect to the interim rates for operations for foreign assistance and related activities for which provision would be made in the foreign assistance appropriation bill, H.R. 12067, passed by the House last Wednesday, December 8.

From July 1 to November 15, these activities basically operated at not to exceed the lower of the fiscal year 1971 rate or the fiscal year 1972 budget estimate rate—section 101(b) of the continuing resolution. Under section 101(d) of the continuing resolution, military credit sales to Israel were authorized to be conducted at not to exceed the fiscal year 1971 level which was $500,000,000, that had been appropriated in the Supplemental Act for 1971, Public Law 91–665, based on authority in section 501 of Public Law 91–441.

From November 16 to December 8, the interim rate for operations was stepped down by roughly $700 million through

addition of section 108 in the last extension of the continuing resolution. Section 108 cranked into the "lower of" formula the authorization bills passed by the two Houses—H.R. 9910 and S. 2819 and S. 2820.

The new continuing resolution, in the rewritten section 108—with the exception of military credit sales to Israel, and several items not dealt with in pending authorization bills, discussed below—drops any reference to the fiscal year 1971 rate or the fiscal year 1972 budget rate and instead hitches the interim rates to the lowest of—

First. The applicable rate in H.R. 9910, the House authorization bill.

Second. The applicable rate in S. 2819 or S. 2820, the Senate authorization bills, or

Third. The applicable rate in H.R. 12067, the House foreign assistance appropriation bill.

The interim rates for items not involved in pending authorization bills are hitched to "not to exceed" the rates that would be permitted under H.R. 12067, the appropriation bill as passed by the House. They are:

Indus basin development fund, loans—sharply below budget: slightly below last year.

State administrative expenses—below budget; slightly above last year.

OPIC—same as budget; slightly over last year.

Peace Corps—sharply below budget and last year.

Ryukyu Islands administration—below budget; below last year.

Cuban refugee program—sharply below budget; below last year.

Migration and refugee program—same as budget; above last year.

Inter-American Development Bank—sharply below budget and last year.

Export-Import Bank—same as budget; sharply above last year.

These items are dealt with in the last proviso of section 108.

MILITARY CREDIT SALES

The new continuing resolution has these two provisos:

Provided, That military credit sales to Israel may be conducted at not to exceed the rate for operations provided for under section 101(d) of this joint resolution: *Provided further,* That foreign military credit sales activities (other than with respect to Israel) may be conducted at a rate of operations not exceeding $175,000,000:

The first proviso merely continues unchanged, for this interim period, the authority that has been in the continuing resolution since July 1, which authorized a fiscal year 1972 rate of "not to exceed" the fiscal year 1971 appropriated rate; namely, $500 million—worldwide, including Israel, the total fiscal year 1971 appropriation was $700 million.

The fiscal year 1972 budget estimate is $510 million, worldwide, with no separate earmarking for Israel. The amount tentatively programed by the executive branch for Israel exceeds 50 percent of this sum and since this is considerably less than the $500 million authorized rate in the continuing resolution, the program of the executive branch is considerably below the authorized rate.

It should be pointed out that while the executive branch under the pending resolution is authorized to proceed during the interim period at the level not to exceed $675 million for worldwide military credit sales, the House foreign aid authorization bill, H.R. 9910, provided for only the budget estimate of $510 million.

The House appropriation bill, H.R. 12067, provided an appropriation of $510 million.

The Senate authorization bill provided for an authorization of $400 million for worldwide military credit sales.

Nevertheless, as stated, under this resolution the maximum interim rate available to the executive branch is $675 million for military credit sales worldwide. This is not to say that the rate will be at that level because the executive branch is proceeding at a rate of about $300 million for military credit sales to Israel despite the availability of an authorized level not to exceed $500 million.

It must borne in mind that funds expended during the life of a continuing resolution are always charged to the final appropriation bill whenever it is enacted into law. And this will determine the final total of funds which may be available for expenditure for military credit sales during the current fiscal year.

It should be pointed out that the continuing resolution as amended expired on November 15. It was renewed effective is of that date. In the renewed continuing resolution, section 108 was added which had the effect of setting an interim rate for military credit sales worldwide of not to exceed $400 million. Such resolution, of course, expired as of December 8 and for this interim of 23 days the maximum rate for military credit sales worldwide was $400 million.

As of October 31 only $30 million had been obligated for military credit sales. This is typical of the operation of the sales program. Usually the authorization and appropriation come late in the fiscal year and normally obligations for the program fall heavily in the latter part of the fiscal year.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TOTALS IN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Rates for operation are determined by by applying the "lower of" ground rules and the special provisions on an individual program and activity basis in line with the appropriation structure. The aggregate appropriation rate with respect to this new continuing resolution—December 9–March 15 period—as it relates to foreign assistance and related programs is $2,648,255,000 with respect to titles I and II of H.R. 12067, which deal with foreign economic, supporting, and military assistance and sales, and $2,979,-161,000 for the resolution as a whole.

This is $24,300,000 below the total of H.R. 12067.

It is $1,255,000 above the Senate authorization totals.

It is $1,363, 474,000 below the budget requests.

And it is $833,096,000 below last year's appropriations.

Pertinent comparisons are:

	Titles I and II	Other	Total
This resolution	$2, 648, 255, 000	$330, 906, 000	$2, 979, 161, 000
The appropriation bill	2, 672, 555, 000	330, 906, 000	3, 003, 461, 000
Senate authorization	2, 647, 000, 000	NA	NA
House authorization	3, 443, 350, 000	NA	NA
Budget estimate	3, 595, 218, 000	747, 417, 000	4, 342, 635, 000
1971 appropriation	3, 142, 685, 000	669, 572, 000	3, 812, 257, 000

For simplicity and ease of identification, these amounts are the specific new authorizations or new appropriations and thus exclude certain estimated receipts, reimbursements, and reobligational resources available for operations, principally—though not entirely—in development loan programs. The agency had this type authority last year; it was proposed in the budget estimates; it has been available this year under the continuing resolution; H.R. 12067 would continue it; and it is intended that it continue to be available, as usual, during the interim covered by this extension resolution. Very roughly, something like $447 million is involved this year.

REPORT ON THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each session I summarize the activities of Congress, reprint it from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at my expense, and mail it to constituents so that they might have at least a brief summary. Of course, I cannot cover the status of all of the hundreds of thousands of bills in the Congress but I will include those bills and activities which I believe to be of the most importance or interest. Following is the summary:

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Public Law 92– the National Cancer Act, specifically declares that additional Federal resources will be used to aid in the search for a cure for cancer and authorizes the National Cancer Institute to establish 15 new centers for clinical research, training and advanced diagnostic and treatment methods relating to cancer. Actually this authority has existed anyway. Congress has been appropriating more money than the Administration requested for these purposes but now the Administration is at least committed on the record to a greater effort.

Money alone will not, at this time, provide a cure and answers which can only be supplied by basic research are still needed before developing the cure for this dreaded disease. It is for this reason that basic research is still important and my amendment to increase basic research funds last year was passed and used.

Public Law 92–5 includes a provision increasing Social Security benefits by an average of 10 percent, effective January 1, 1971.

Public Law 92–32 amends the Child Nutrition Act to continue and expand the pro-

gram under which the Federal Government provides financial assistance to states and local school districts for breakfasts for needy children.

Public Law 92–35 provided an emergency appropriation of $17 million to finance the summer feeding program for needy children and directed the Administration to finance the programs developed by local agencies.

Public Law 92–153 was passed by Congress to prevent an effort by the Administration to reduce financial support for the School Lunch Program and to reaffirm the policy, established by Congress last year, that the program should provide meals to as many needy children as possible.

H.R. 1 (passed the House, pending in the Senate) contains the Administration's welfare reform proposal. The bill would establish uniform Federal standards for administration of the welfare program, including a basic minimum rate, and require that employable applicants register for work or training before being eligible for benefits. The bill would also make improvements to the Medicare and Medicaid programs and provide a 5-percent increase in Social Security benefits, effective June, 1972.

The House passed this bill in June but the President, during his mid-August announcement on the wage-price freeze, stated that he wanted Congress to delay action on this bill. If the Senate acts on this legislation during 1972, almost certainly some changes will be made in the bill as passed by the House.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Public Law 92–15 includes a provision extending until May, 1972, the authority contained in the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 giving the President stand-by authority to impose wage and price controls.

When the President signed the 1970 law, he said he was against the use of wage and price controls and would not exercise the standby authority. However, last August the President used this authority to establish a 90-day wage-price freeze.

Public Law 92–9 extends for two years the interest equalization tax on the sale of foreign securities in this country. This law is designed to help deal with the balance-of-payments problem.

Public Law 92– continues the provisions of the Economic Stabilization Act, with some changes, through April, 1973. This legislation was requested by the Administration in connection with "Phase Two" of its economic program.

TAXATION AND REVENUE

Public Law 92– the Revenue Act of 1971, is designed to improve the Nation's economy by providing tax reductions for individuals and tax incentives for business. The law increases the personal exemption for Federal income tax purposes, liberalizes deductions for child care expenses, repeals the excise tax on cars and light-duty trucks, provides for a 7 percent investment tax credit to encourage purchases of new machinery, establishes a tax credit for employers who hire persons on a long-term basis through the work incentive program and provides a tax-deferral incentive for U.S. firms to increase their exports.

The President said he would veto this bill if it contained a provision, added in the Senate, which would have allowed persons to allocate $1 of their Federal income tax to the political party of their choice for use during the 1972 presidential election. A joint House-Senate Conference Committee, which drafted the final version of this law, modified the Senate amendment to make it apply to the 1976 presidential election.

EDUCATION

Public Law 92–157, the Health Manpower Training Act, continues and expands the Federal programs for assistance to students preparing for a career in the medical profession and for grants to schools of medicine for the construction of teaching and other facilities. The law provides for Federal assistance in starting new schools and also grants to schools of dentistry, osteopathy, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry and pharmacy in ratio to the number of students.

Public Law 92–158, the Nurse Training Act, provides for continuation of the Federal student assistance program for nurses and establishes new programs for startup grants for schools of nursing, loans for construction assistance and for grants to schools of nursing based on the number of attending students. It is hoped that the law will increase the number of nurses in this country by about 300,000 in the next 10 years. Although the Administration opposed funding the grants to nursing schools, we appropriated $31.5 million for this purpose. I am convinced we are going to become even more dependent upon an adequate supply of nurses in overcoming the health care problems.

I have proposed that the new health care legislation permit payments to nurses—practitioners who provide services delegated by or under the direction of a physician even though the physician is not present at all times. This would permit them to operate a well baby clinic, make house calls on the elderly, give penicillin shots and do many things, provided they have access to a physician's advice at all times by telephone, radio or other modern means.

Both the House and the Senate passed bills to assist colleges and universities and to improve the Federal student assistance programs. The House version of the bill also includes a number of provisions banning the use of Federal funds for the busing of students to achieve racial balance. A joint House-Senate Conference Committee will meet next session to resolve differences in the two bills and work out the final draft of a higher education bill.

ENVIRONMENT

Public Law 92—extends the authorization for the current Federal water pollution control program until next year. The Senate has passed a bill containing major improvements to this program and which is designed to clean up all the nation's rivers and lakes by 1985. The Administration, however, has raised objections to this bill and the House will be considering the alternatives to improving the water pollution control program during the next session.

Public Law 92–175 increases to $250 million the annual authorization for water resources research centers.

Public Law 92– gives the Department of Interior authority to protect wild and free-roaming horses and burros in the Western United States to save them from extermination.

Strip Mining

Some attention is now being directed toward requiring the replacement of top soil and leveling of strip mining operations. I first proposed this ten years ago but there has been little public interest. I believe such a law may pass within the next year or two.

S. 1113 (passed the Senate, pending in the House) would establish a National Environmental Center and a system of environmental laboratories to conduct research and make recommendations on ways to protect the natural environment.

RED ROCK LAKE

A new study is underway to determine the level at which Red Rock Lake should be held during the recreation season. It has been proposed that the level be lowered following the spring rains to about 730 feet above sea level rather than 725 and left at that level most of the recreation season. It could be reduced in preparation for a flood and also be used to supply more water below the dam in a very dry year.

The Corps of Engineers has promised to have buoys for boaters in place this next spring and to at least get started on other improvements including better facilities for boats and log removals. Constant attention is being given to keep their attention directed toward improvements.

Actually, the west end of the reservoir turned out to be shallower than had been expected when the 725-foot level was set in 1962. There were some errors in the unrefined maps they used at that time.

Some people made preposterous claims that adverse results would occur from holding the reservoir at a slightly higher level during the recreation season. There was even one claim that it would "wipe out" the wildlife refuge. These and other matters will be the subject of a study to be completed by September. Although the Corps has indicated a prejudice against the higher level and is known to have staff people who are not recreation-minded to say the least, it is hoped they will be objective enough to set forth both the good and adverse results to be expected.

AGRICULTURE

H.R. 1163 (passed the House, pending in the Senate) is my bill to establish a reserve (or "food bank") for wheat and such feed grains as corn. It would provide for better management of our reserves of grain. Some grain would be purchased and insulated from the market when there is a surplus so it would be available during times of short supply. The Department has now agreed to buy some of the surplus and this bill would also tighten up the purchase and resale guidelines to protect against unpleasant experiences of the past. This bill is designed to aid the farm economy by keeping grain prices from dropping so far in good crop years and to protect consumers by making sure that an adequate supply of wheat and feed grains is on hand in case of an emergency. It also contains other features to promote U.S. exports of grain.

Despite strong opposition by the Administration and a few large grain merchandizing interests, H.R. 1163 passed the House on December 8th. The Senate did not get the bill voted upon before adjournment, but I am hopeful that it will be approved there early next year.

Even though the Administration opposes the bill, debate and movement on the proposal have already forced them to make some moves to reduce the financial pressure on mid-western farmers.

Public Law 92–12 amends the Rural Electrification Act to establish a Rural Telephone Bank to finance rural telephone cooperatives by selling obligations to the public, instead of through direct appropriations by Congress.

Public Law 92–138 extends the Sugar Act. The purpose of this law is to authorize entering into contracts guaranteeing both the price and supply of sugar for U.S. consumers.

Public Law 92– the Farm Credit Act, seeks to aid the farmer-owned cooperative system which makes credit available to farmers and farm cooperatives by modernizing and consolidating the existing farm credit laws to assure an adequate and flexible flow of money into rural areas.

Public Law 92–152 authorizes the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with other Western Hemisphere nations to control livestock epidemics such as the epidemic of sleeping sickness in horses.

H.R. 10729 (passed the House, pending in the Senate) would prohibit the sale or distribution of any pesticide unless it has been registered with the Environmental Protection Agency. The bill up-dates the existing Federal pesticide registration law in a variety of ways and includes a provision under which pesticides are to be classified for general use

or restricted use. Many pesticides now on the market, including some used by housewives, could be sold only to persons securing an "applicators" license.

SST

Public Law 92–7, which provided appropriations for the Department of Transportation, includes a provision cutting off funds for further development of the supersonic transport plane. Work on the American SST has now been halted.

FOREIGN AID

In a surprise move, a combination of those opposing economic aid and those opposing military aid in the Senate voted against authorizing about $2.9 billion in foreign aid funds. Although the program has been sharply reduced, this was the first time since the late 1940's that either House of Congress rejected a foreign aid bill. Both the House and the Senate later passed scaled-down foreign aid proposals.

The Senate vote against foreign aid set off a prolonged debate including the way in which the foreign aid program is administered and the value of military assistance as compared to economic aid. There are examples where economic aid seems to have helped people while there are others where it resulted in resentment toward us. There are also examples where military aid help provide stability during a period of development while in other cases the results were not good. There seems to be general agreement that some kind of combination foreign aid program will continue, but there will also be disagreement over what sort of program it should be.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Senate ratified a treaty with Japan returning Okinawa to Japan in 1972 but permitting the United States to retain its military bases on the Island.

Public Law 92–135 authorizes continuation of the Peace Corps, which now has more than 6,000 volunteers serving abroad.

VIETNAM

Public Law 92–156, the military procurement law, includes a modified version of the so-called Mansfield Amendment which declares it to be the "policy of the United States" to end all U.S. military operations in Indochina as soon as possible. The amendment also calls upon the President to set a final date for withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Indochina, provided North Vietnam agrees to release U.S. prisoners of war.

The President signed this legislation into law, but said he would ignore the provisions of the Mansfield Amendment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Public Law 92–129 extends the Selective Service Act until July, 1973, and provides for a $2.4 billion increase in pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces, including a 100 percent increase in basic pay for those just entering the service. It is directed at recruiting enough volunteers so the draft will not be used. While it is too early to determine to what extent it will be successful, reducing the financial hardship servicemen in the lower ranks have suffered is bound to help.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Public Law 92–31 extends the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act under which the Federal Government provides financial assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies to deal with this problem.

Public Law 92–13 increases the financial authorization for the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse. The Commission is conducting a comprehensive study on how better to deal with the marihuana and drug abuse problem.

ELECTION REFORM

Both the House and Senate passed legislation limiting campaign expenditures in elections for Federal office and providing for greater disclosure of election expenditures and contributions. As of today, a joint House-Senate Conference Committee is working out details of the final version of the bill.

There has been a growing demand for election reform legislation. I personally feel that action in this field is needed, and that it is very serious and very bad to have so many campaigns financed primarily by persons of enormous wealth or by special interests who therefore obtain an opportunity to have undue attention paid to their points of view.

I believe average citizens pay dearly when a person can no longer be elected or afford to serve unless he is personally wealthy or beholden to some special interest. No one has suggested a foolproof way to fully protect against this but at least an effort is being made to improve the situation.

ANTIPOVERTY

Congress passed, but the President vetoed, legislation extending the antipoverty program for another 2 years, establishing a new child day care program and setting up a new National Legal Services Corporation designed to insulate the administration of the current Legal Services Program from outside pressures.

The President vetoed this bill because he objected to child day care program. After the veto, Congress passed stop-gap legislation continuing the antipoverty program until next July in its present form.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Public Law 92–64 increases the amount of money which may be appropriated for activities by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Public Law 92–128 repeals a provision of the Internal Security Act under which the Government had authority to establish so-called "emergency detention camps." This authority was never used and many felt that the law which was repealed was unconstitutional.

S.J. Res. 7 provides that persons 18 years or older shall have the right to vote in Federal, state and local elections. This bill, which is now the 26th Amendment to the Constitution, was approved by Congress in early 1971 and ratified by the necessary number of states on July 1, 1971.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

At the beginning of this Congress, the Democratic majority caucus in the House which selects the chairmen of the various committees, adopted the recommendations of a special 11-member committee, of which I am a member, dealing with changes in the rules concerning the seniority system. The new rules require that each committee chairman be elected by a vote of the members, and that seniority need not be followed in selecting the chairman of a committee. Specific provisions were made to assure a secret ballot and that any member can be a candidate. Also, in order to spread the work of the House, the new rules prohibit a Member from being chairman of more than one subcommittee.

LABOR

Congress passed, but the President vetoed, a bill that would have established an accelerated public works program to reduce unemployment by providing Federal assistance for the construction of such public works facilities as sewage treatment plants.

Public Law 92–54, the Emergency Employment Act, establishes a 2-year program to reduce unemployment by providing Federal assistance to finance public service jobs with state and local agencies. The law requires that the jobs involve services that are needed and that the "make work" approach be avoided. A total of $1 billion was appropriated for this program during the fiscal year beginning July 1 and programs are in force throughout Iowa.

Public Law 92–46 provides for a 10 percent increase in railroad retirement benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1971.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Public Law 92–75 establishes a new national program to promote safety in pleasure boating and authorizes the Department of Transportation to regulate safety in the construction and operation of pleasure boats.

VETERANS

Public Law 92– provides an increase in dependency and indemnity compensation benefits to widows, children and needy parents of veterans who died as a result of service-incurred disabilities.

Public Law 92– provides for an average increase of 6.5 percent in non-service connected disability pensions for about 1.1 million veterans and veterans' dependents. The law also provides for an increase in outside income limitations for these pensioners so they will not suffer a pension reduction as a result of the Social Security increase approved in early 1971.

Public Law 92–95 provides mortgage protection life insurance for service-connected disabled veterans who have received Veterans Administration grants for specially adapted housing.

BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Public Law 92–126 extends until June, 1974, the operation of the Export-Import Bank, which guarantees and makes loans to promote foreign purchases of American products.

Public Law 92–70, the Emergency Loan Guarantee Act, authorized the Federal Government to guarantee loans not to exceed a total of $250 millions to firms whose failure would cause serious unemployment and adversely affect the economy. This is the bill the Administration promoted in order to make a loan to the Lockheed Aircraft Corportation.

SMALL BUSINESS

Public Law 92–16 increases by about $900 million the total amount of loans, guarantees and other obligations which the Small Business Administration may have outstanding at any one time.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Reorganization Plan No. 1, approved by Congress, combines the Peace Corps, VISTA (the agency for domestic antipoverty workers) and some smaller programs into Action, a single agency administering Government volunteer service programs.

Public Law 92–41 extends the Renegotiation Act for 2 years and includes a provision authorizing the Treasury Department to determine the interest rate on excessive profits by defense contractors.

Public Law 92–65 provides Federal assistance for projects designed to help rebuild the economy in "distressed" areas.

PENDING LEGISLATION

In addition to those bills which became public law, the following bills passed either the House or Senate but not both. They should receive further consideration during the next session of Congress.

S. 2097 (passed Senate, pending in House) would set up a special Federal agency to supervise and provide improved coordination for the Government's programs to combat drug abuse.

H.R. 8389 (passed House, pending in Senate) seeks to help solve the drug problem by requiring that states receiving Federal assistance under the 1968 anti-crime law develop programs for the treatment of narcotic addicts who are in prison or on parole.

H.R. 10835 (passed House, pending in Senate) would establish a Consumer Protection Agency to assure that the views of consumers are fully represented in the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

S. 2824 (passed Senate, pending in House) would establish a Federal inspection program under the Food and Drug Administration to assure that consumers purchase clean and wholesome fish and fish products. If enacted into law next session, this bill would be a follow-up to laws I sponsored for the inspection of meat, poultry and eggs.

H.R. 5066 (passed House, pending in Senate) amends the Flammable Fabrics Act to provide increased safeguards to protect consumers against fabrics which might cause death or injury if exposed to fire.

S. 986 (passed Senate, pending in House) provides minimum disclosure standards for written consumer product guarantees, defines minimum Federal content standards for such warranties and gives the Federal Trade Commission additional authority to protect consumers against fraud.

S. 215 (passed Senate, pending in House) would fill a gap in existing Federal law by establishing the procedures to be followed if a convention to amend the Constitution is called by petition of State Legislatures. The Constitution has never been amended in this way, but efforts to call such a convention have been made in the past.

H.J. Res. 208 (passed House, pending in Senate) is a proposed constitutional amendment providing that "equality of rights" shall not be denied on account of sex. This is generally referred to as the womans' rights amendment.

S. 1438 (passed Senate, pending in House) would protect civilian employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government from unwarranted governmental invasions of privacy.

S. 2482 (passed Senate, pending in House) would establish an Office of Indian Education and authorize additional Federal assistance for the education of American Indians.

H.R. 8805 (passed House, pending in Senate) would further prohibit sending obscene material through the mails to persons under 14 years of age.

H.R. 9936 (passed House, pending in Senate) would require that manufacturers and processors of drugs submit to the Government a list of all drugs manufactured or processed for commercial distribution.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS PASSED BY 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972 (JULY 1971 TO JULY 1972)

Departments or Agencies	Total approved	Over or under last year	Over and under President Nixon's request
1. Education	$5, 146, 311, 000	+$563, 104, 500	−$6, 875, 000
2. Legislative	557, 029, 264	+114, 124, 945	−3, 242, 858
3. Treasury-Postal Service—General Government	4, 528, 986, 690	−1, 038, 472, 210	−280, 229, 310
4. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection	13, 276, 900, 050	+3, 727, 992, 500	+1, 172, 086, 200
5. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4, 067, 116, 000	+243, 763, 700	−149, 686, 000
6. Interior	2, 250, 056, 035	215, 835, 135	+24, 612, 000
7. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	18, 341, 325, 000	+1, 342, 850, 000	+882, 721, 000
8. Transportation	2, 730, 989, 997	−253, 630, 068	+44, 983, 000
9. Labor-HEW	23, 389, 317, 000	+5, 834, 638, 500	+735, 160, 000
10. Public Works-AEC	4, 675, 125, 000	+210, 140, 000	+59, 043, 000
11. Military Construction	$2, 037, 097, 000	$+333, 023, 000	$−92, 708, 000
12. Defense	70, 849, 113, 000	+1, 268, 411, 750	−2, 694, 716, 000
13. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	285, 597, 000	+150, 334, 000	−3, 600, 000
14. Foreign Assistance	3, 003, 461, 000	−808, 796, 000	−1, 339, 174, 000
15. Emergency Employment Assistance (H.J. Res. 833)	1, 000, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000, 000	
16. Summer feeding programs for children (H.J. Res. 744)	17, 000, 000	+17, 000, 000	+17, 000, 000
17. Federal unemployment benefits and allowances (H.J. Res. 915)	270, 500, 000	+270, 500, 000	
Net total	153, 685, 886, 521	+10, 452, 368, 697	−1, 786, 783, 968

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, Monday, December 13, and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. ERLENBORN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for Monday, December 13, on account of funeral services for his mother-in-law, Mrs. Florentina Fisher.

Mr. HALL, for 7 days, on account of official business in district.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for an indefinite period, on account of death and funeral of a former member of staff.

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. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, December 14, 1971; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RHODES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLORY, for 30 minutes, December 14.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CAFFERY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HANNA in three instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MICHEL, immediately prior to the vote on the bill H.R. 11628.

Mr. MAHON and to include extraneous material and tables.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. DICKINSON in three instances.

Mr. GOLDWATER in five instances.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. QUILLEN in five instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in four instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. QUIE in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. CAREY of New York.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. MOSS in three instances.

Mr. DRINAN in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. BEGICH in five instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in four instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. FRASER in three instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. HICKS of Washington in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. REES.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. CABELL in three instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 216. An act to permit suits to adjudicate certain real property quiet title actions; to the committee of the Judiciary.

S. 1874. An act to provide for the establishment of projects for the dental health of children, to increase the number of dental auxiliaries, to increase the availability of dental care through efficient use of dental personnel, and for other purposes to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2945. An act to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit the appointment by the President of certain additional persons to the service academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S.J. Res. 173. Joint Resolution to provide for the appointment of A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of John Paul Austin as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert Francis Goheen as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution on national American Indian policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 45th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3749. An act for the relief of Richard C. Walker and to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana;

H.R. 6893. An act to provide for the reporting of weather modification activities to the Federal Government;

H.R. 9961. An act to provide Federal credit unions with 2 additional years to meet the requirements for insurance, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11341. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11955. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 113. An act for the relief of certain individuals and organizations;

S. 248. An act for the relief of William D. Pender;

S. 1828. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to strengthen the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health in order more effectively to carry out the national effort against cancer;

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Clayton Bion Craig, Arthur P. Wuth, Mrs. Lenore D. Hanks, David E. Sleeper, and Dewitt John;

S. 2042. An act to provide for the apportionment of funds in payment of a judgment in favor of the Shoshone Tribe in consolidated dockets Nos. 326–D, 326–E, 326–F, 326–G, 326–H, 366, and 367 before the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. 2887. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosection of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 1, 1971:

H.R. 10947. A bill to provide a job development investment credit, to reduce individual income taxes, to reduce certain excise taxes, and for other purposes.

On December 13, 1971:

H.R. 3749. A bill for the relief if Richard C. Walker and to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana;

H.R. 6893. A bill to provide for the reporting of weather modification activities to the Federal Government;

H.R. 11341. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11955. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 14, 1971, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report of exports of significant defense articles on the U.S. munitions list for the period July through December, 1970, pursuant to Public Law 90–629; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1355. A letter from the National Adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the report of the Disabled American Veterans' national gathering for 1971, together with a report of the proceedings of the organization for the year ended June 30, 1971, and a report of its receipts and expenditures as of December 31, 1970, pursuant to Public Laws 249 and 668, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 92–183); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1356. A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the Commission for fiscal year 1971, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 715(b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1357. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of receipts and disbursements pertaining to the disposal of surplus military supplies, equipment, and materiel, and for expenses involving the production of lumber and timber products, covering the first quarter of fiscal year 1972, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1358. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Trustees, Public Defender Service of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Service for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a copy of the Determination of the President numbered 72–7 concerning the grant of defense articles and services to the Khmer Republic, pursuant to section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1360. A letter from the President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Corporation for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1361. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 24, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Lynnhaven Inlet, Bay, and connecting waters, Va., authorized by section 6 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1362. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen and improve the private retirement system by establishing minimum standards for participation in and for vesting of benefits under pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, by allowing deductions to individuals for personal savings for retirement, and by increasing contribution limitations for self-employed individuals and shareholders-employees of electing small business corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 742. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1005. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 92–744). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 2891 (Rept. No. 92–745). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 10367 (Rept. No. 92–746). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 12207. A bill to authorize a program for the development of tuna and other latent fisheries resources in the Central and Western Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Cali-

fornia, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SISK, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 12208. A bill to establish the Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12209. A bill to restore and maintain a healthy transportation system, to provide financial assistance, to improve competitive equity among surface and air transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 12210. A bill to provide for the prevention of sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 12211. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 12212. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself and Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 12213. A bill to amend section 2, title 28 of the United States Code to improve judicial machinery by providing Federal jurisdiction for certain types of class actions and certain violations of consumers' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 12214. A bill to assure to all first offenders the restoration of their Federal civil rights after the completion of their sentence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12215. A bill to assure to all first offenders the restoration of their civil rights after the completion of their sentence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12216. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax or payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12217. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, and authorize the imposition of life imprisonment in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia:

H.R. 12218. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which relate to the checkoff procedure for financing presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself and Mr. KING):

H.R. 12219. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which relate to the checkoff procedure for financing presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEIGER, of Arizona, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CELLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FUQUA, and Mr. GIAIMO):

H.R. 12220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HULL, Mr. KARTH, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MANN, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 12221. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12222. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, to extend to mentally retarded or physically handicapped dependents of certain members and former members of the uniformed services the special care now provided to similarly afflicted dependents of members on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12223. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of special health care coverage for retarded or handicapped dependents of certain members of the armed forces after the retirement of such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12224. A bill to provide that compensation received by an individual from the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disability shall not be taken into account as income so as to prevent his occupancy of Government-sponsored housing (or so as to increase the rent which he would otherwise be required to pay); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12225. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require reduced-rate transportation for certain disabled veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12226. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit veterans to determine how certain drugs and medicines will be supplied to them; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12227. A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12228. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to $100 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12229. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to credit physicians and dentists with 20 or more years of service in the Veterans' Administration with certain service for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12230. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that pensioners may be furnished necessary medical services in Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12231. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, to make a career in the Department of Medicine and Surgery more attractive; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12232. A bill to amend 38 United States Code 5001 (a) (3) so as to increase to 6,000 the number of beds in Veterans' Administration facilities for the provision of nursing home care to eligible veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12233. A bill to amend section 3101 of title 38, United States Code, to prevent consideration of proceeds of, or transfer of proceeds of, U.S. Government Life Insurance and National Service Life Insurance for Federal estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12234. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for a pension of $100 per month for unremarried widows of men awarded a Medal of Honor posthumously; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12235. A bill to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12236. A bill to provide for annual adjustments in monthly monetary benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, according to changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12237. A bill to make available to veterans of the Vietnam war all benefits available to World War II and Korean conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12238. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize increased benefits for veterans requiring regularly scheduled hemodialysis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12239. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to assist veterans with a permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss or loss of use of one upper and one lower extremity to acquire specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12240. A bill to amend title 38, of the United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12241. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize the Administrator to make advance educational assistance payments to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12242. A bill to amend title 38, of the United States Code, to provide an annual clothing allowance to certain veterans who, because of a service-connected disability, wear a prosthetic appliance or appliances which tends to wear out or tear their clothing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12243. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12244. A bill to amend title 38, of the United States Code, to provide mustering-out payments for military service after August 5, 1964; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12245. A bill to provide that veterans be provided employment opportunities after discharge at certain minimum salary rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12246. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility for pensions under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12247. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for cost-of-living increases in compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, and pension payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12248. A bill to amend section 333 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans who serve 2 or more years in peacetime shall be entitled to a presumption that chronic diseases becoming manifest within 1 year from the date of separation from service are service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12249. A bill to amend subsection (d) (1) of section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to provide that where any veteran having neither wife nor child is being fur-

nished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration, no pension in excess of $40 per month shall be paid to or for the veteran for any period after (a) the end of the second full calendar month of admission for treatment or care or (b) readmission for treatment or care within 6 months following termination of a period of treatment or care of not less than 2 full calendar months; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12250. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a special allowance of $55 per month to a child or dependent parent who is (1) a patient in a nursing home or (2) helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12251. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide educational assistance at secondary school level to eligible widows and wives, without charge to any period of entitlement the wife or widow may have pursuant to sections 1710 and 1711 of this chapter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12252. A bill to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same eligibility criteria for Vietnam era veterans as is applicable to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12253. A bill to amend title 38 to provide that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be considered active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12254. A bill to provide equitable treatment of veterans enrolled in vocational education courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12255. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional educational benefits to veterans who have served in the Indochina theater of operations during the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12256. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the business loan program for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12257. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual who has a service-connected disability incurred or aggravated while on active duty in a combat zone and rated by the Veterans' Administration at 50 percent or higher, or who dies as a result of disease or injury incurred or aggravated while on such duty, shall be considered to be fully insured, and to be insured for disability benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 12258. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 12259. A bill to facilitate the administration of the laws in the District of Columbia relating to the conduct of public demonstrations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 12260. A bill to assist in combating crime by reducing the incidence of recidivism, providing improved Federal, State, and local correctional facilities and services, strengthening administration of Federal corrections, strengthening control over probationers, parolees, and persons found not guilty by reason of insanity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 12261. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12262. A bill to provide Federal citizen anticrime patrol assistance grants to residents' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12263. A bill to amend section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts which the taxpayer pays as alimony or separate maintenance shall be deductible from his gross income in determining adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12264. A bill to promote research and development of drugs or chemical compounds for use in the cure, prevention, or treatment of heroin addiction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 12265. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe radiation standards for, and conduct regular inspections of, diagnostic and other X-ray systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 12266. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 12267. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KING, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 12268. A bill to provide for Federal collection of State individual income taxes, to provide funds to localities for Federal high-priority purposes, and to provide funds to States to encourage more efficient use of revenue sources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 12269. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which relate to the checkoff procedure for financing presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1005. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself and Mr. WIGGINS):

H.J. Res. 1006. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of the term of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.J. Res. 1007. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the first week in March of each year as "National Beta Club Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 1008. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.J. Res. 1009. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to change the date of Veterans Day to November 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ROE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. HOGAN, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.J. Res. 1010. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 484. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the application of the cargo preference laws to military cargoes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con Res. 485. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should release all funds for annual contributions contracts for public housing; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself, Mr. WYATT, Mr. PELLY, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. ADAMS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. MEEDS):

H. Res. 743. Resolution to express the sense of the House that U.S. fishing industry representatives be included in the U.S. delegation to the 1973 United Nations Law of the Sea Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MURPHY of ILLINOIS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. UDALL, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota):

H. Res. 744. Resolution calling for a U.S.-initiated effort to achieve a holiday cease-fire leading to meaningful negotiations and a permanent end of hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. Res. 745. A resolution calling for peace in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

288. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the national transportation planning study; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

289. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal-aid highway funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 12270. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Marvin C. Mathison, U.S. Army National Guard (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12271. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Laurence E. Gardner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Con. Res. 486. Resolution relating to the status of Mrs. Sylva Yosifovna Zalmanson Kuznetsov, a citizen of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 487. Resolution relating to the status of Sylva Yosifovna Zalmanson Kuznetsov, a citizen of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H. Con. Res. 488. Resolution relating to the status of Sylva Yosifovna Zalmanson Kuznetsov, a citizen of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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 third calendar quarter 1971:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ≤

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.≤

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1≤

A. John G. Adams, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First Mortgage Investors, 401 41st Street, Miami, Fla.

A. John J. Adams, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 330 South Fourth Street, Richmond, Va.; Vepco, Seventh and Franklin Streets, Richmond, Va.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of U.S. Dyestuff Producers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. American Feed Manufacturers Asociation, 53 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

A. American Postal Workers Union, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence A. Arata, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Suchard American Corp., 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Chocolate Tobler American Corp., 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Cresca Co., Inc., 2500 83d Street, North Bergen, N.J.

A. Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc., Post Office Box 754, Springfield, Mo.

A. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Diana Washbon Bird, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward L. Bowley, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph M. Bowman and Richard C. O'Hare, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Merger Committee, National Basketball Association, 2 Park Plaza, New York, N.Y.; and Merger Committee, American Basketball Association, 1700 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue, Morristown, N.J.

A. Philip N. Buckminster, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. California Arizona Citrus League, Post Office Box 7888, Valley Annex, Van Nuys, Calif.

A. Lee Campbell, Poultry and Egg Institute of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Poultry and Egg Institute of America, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Leonard Casso, 131–35 134th Street, Ozone Park, Long Island, N.Y.
B. Grass Roots Inc., 131–35 134th Street, Ozone Park, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Basketball Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

A. Coalition for a National Population Policy, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Cohen, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cylinder Manufacturers Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for Legalization, 226 Woodland Avenue, Lynn, Mass.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Peter L. Coye, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taiwan Sugar Corp., One World Trade Center, New York, N.Y.

A. Pamela G. Curtis, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Orgalime (Organisme de Liaison des Industries Metalliques Europeennes), Brussels, Belgium.

A. Larry C. Davenport, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Plaintiffs' Trial Attorneys of Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kansas City Southern Industries, Inc., 114 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Forth Worth, Tex., Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas Tex., Central Power & Light Co., Corpus Christi, Tex., and West Texas Utilities Co., Abilene, Tex.

A. Dennison Manufacturing Co., 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

A. Claude J. Desautels, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Orgalime (Organisms de Liaison des Industries Metalliques Europeennes), Brussels, Belgium.
A. Albert Donnici, 1212 West 114th Terrace, Kansas City, Mo.
B. City of Kansas City, City Hall, 414 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Ted Downey, 801 South 15th Street, Springfield, Ill.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louise C. Dunlap, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Daniel J. Edelman, Inc., 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trial Lawyers Association, 20 Garden Street, Cambridge, Mass.

A. Gertrude Engel, 2450 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bob Hoffman, York Barbell Co., Inc., 26 North Ridge Avenue, York, Pa.

A. Glenn R. Erickson, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Russell G. Ernest, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Francis S. Filbey, American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Finley, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Crown Zellerbach Corp., One Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Post Office Box 89, Lakeland, Fla.

A. Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, c/o O. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Charles L. Frazier, 485 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Vance Sanders & Co., Inc., Boston, Mass.; Federated Investors, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Fidelity Management & Research Co., Boston, Mass.

A. Wayne Gibbens, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. John Goldsum, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex., Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., Central Power & Light Co., Corpus Christi, Tex., and West Texas Utilities Co., Abilene, Tex.

A. Robert B. Harding, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, Calif.

A. Frederic W. Hickman, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Gregory A. Humphrey, American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lester S. Hyman, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First Mortgage Investors, 401 41st Street, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Intermediate Harvesters & Handlers Association, c/o B. C. Cook and Sons, Haines City, Fla.

A. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue, Morristown, N.J.

A. Arnold C. Johnson, Seymour S. Mintz and William A. Plumb.
Hogan and Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Ronald K. Jones, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Gibson Kingren, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.

A. Peter M. Kirby, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Koch, Jr., 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va.

A. Kominers, Fort, Schlefer, Farmer & Boyer, 500 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., Commerce Building, Post Office Box 53068, New Orleans, La.; and Pacific Far East Line, Inc., 141 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Charles B. Kornmann, South Dakota Railroads Association, Post Office Box 489, Aberdeen, S.D.

A. Bruce S. Lane, Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Legislation for Animal Wards, 2225 Observatory Place, Washington, D.C.

A. James P. LeGory, 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 630, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Dennison Manufacturing Co., 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

A. Leibman, Williams, Bennett, Baird & Minow, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, Washington, D.C.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First Mortgage Investors, 401 41st Street, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Zel E. Lipsen, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew K. Marckwald, Jr., 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alwyn F. Matthews, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Uganda Sugar Manufacturers Association.

A. Eugene McCabe, Philip Murray Building, Room 100; 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barr McClellan, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex., Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., Central Power & Light Co., Corpus Christi, Tex., and West Texas Utilities Co., Abilene, Tex.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., 3308 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 933 North Kenmore Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Marine Corps League, 933 North Kenmore Street, Arlington, Va.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 933 North Kenmore Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Non Commissioned Officer Association of the United States of America (NCOA), Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, Smathers & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Bank of Montreal, Two Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Royal Bank of Canada, 68 William Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Toronto-Dominion Bank, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Arnold C. Johnson.
Hogan and Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.

A. J. Anthony Moran, 2750 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Donald Applegate, Ferriday, La., and Rex Youngquist, Miami, Fla.

A. Donald L. Morgan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Morgan-Taylor & Associates, Inc., 4903 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniel Morgan, 4903 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Morgan-Taylor & Associates, Inc., 4903 5th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Farmer-Elected Committeemen, 19400 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 51 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. NBA Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard D. Norling, 2100 M Street NW., Room 311, Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. L. T. Barringer & Co., 161 South Front Street, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Charles E. Olson, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenton H. Pattie, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Sr., Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Post Office Box 89, Lakeland, Fla.; Intermediate Harvesters and Handlers Association, Inc., Haines City, Fla.; Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, Waverly, Fla.; Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 20155, Orlando, Fla.

A. Roger J. Phaneuf, 1735 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill.

A. Franklin A. Pickens, Post Office Box 1552, Odessa, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.; Chicago, Rock Island, & Pacific Railroad Co.; Fort Worth & Denver Railway Co., et al.

A. William T. Plumb; Seymour S. Mintz and Arnold C. Johnson; Hogan and Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Political Action Committee for Engineers and Scientists, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. California Arizona Citrus League, Post Office Box 7888, Van Nuys, Calif.

A. Poultry & Egg Institute of America, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Pulp & Paper Machinery Manufacturers' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Maxwell E. Rich, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Reynolds D. Rodgers, 8425 Boone, Kansas City, Mo.
B. City of Kansas City, City Hall, 414 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Elbert G. Rudasill, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, Box 605, Winona, Minn.

A. Sam Rayburn Dam Electric Cooperative, Inc., 303 North Jackson Street, Livingston, Tex.

A. Richard E. Schmelzkopf, 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Dennison Manufacturing Co., 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Liquor Stores Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. R. Serviss, 3620 Warwick, Kansas City, Mo.
B. City of Kansas City, City Hall, 414 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Norman R. Sherlock, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. South Dakota Railroads Association, Post Office Box, 489, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

A. John M. Stackhouse, Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of U.S. Dyestuff Producers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Pulp and Paper Machinery Manufacturers' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Breezy Point Cooperative, 202–30 Rockaway Point Boulevard, Rockaway Point, N.Y.

A. Tex-La Electric Cooperative, Inc., 501 South Main Street, Quitman, Tex.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William D. Thompson, 1660 L Street, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Blvd., Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,236.77.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Tydings, Bender Building, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coalition for a National Population Policy, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ted Van Dyk and/or Kirby Jones, Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1224 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill.

A. De Melt E. Walker, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. The Washington Office, 207 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Catrala of D.C., c/o Claude Blackwell, Northeast Ford, Inc., New York and West Virginia Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. The Washington Office, 207 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Catrala of D.C., c/o Claude Blackwell, Northeast Ford, 2175, West Virginia Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Ray Wax, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association of Farmers Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va.

A. F. Paul Weiss, United Air Lines, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dennis W. Weissman, American Optometric Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washingon, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, Box 605, Winona, Minn.

A. Mrs. Anne Wexler, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill.

A. Williams & King, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mergenthaler Linotype Co., Mergenthaler Drive, Plainview, N.Y.

A. George M. Worden, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. V. T. Worthington, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va.

A. Douglas G. Wright, 1023 Petroleum Building, Tulsa, Okla.
B. Tex-La Electric Cooperative, Inc., c/o J. D. Nichols, Quitman, Tex., Sam Rayburn Dam Elec. Co-op., Inc., c/o Robert Willis, Box 431, Livingston, Tex.

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1971:

(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

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	("Period" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Sothoron Kirby Able, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John G. Adams, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First Mortgage Investors, 401 41st Street, Miami Beach, Fla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1.25.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of U.S. Dyestuff Producers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $630.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,119.53. E. (9) $7,119.53.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc. Arba Bldg., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,181.44. E. (9) $10,181.44.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Ale, American Life Convention, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30.

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. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1040. E. (9) $1,470.05.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $51.08. E. (9) $619.33.

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) $1,350. E. (9) $30.42.

A. All-Industry Committee for Radio All-Channel Legislation, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. 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.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $9,397.90.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,939.10. E. (9) $7,939.10.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,229.11. E. (9) $3,229.11.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $37,808. E. (9) $37,808.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50,263.46.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $93,332.08. E. (9) $2,201.60.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,436.89. E. (9) $5,436.89.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,633.59. E. (9) $3,287.10.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,785.50.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $16,452.88. E. (9) $16,452.88.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,793.84. E. (9) $2,643.75.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,296.41.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $26,336.41.

A. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,435.26. E. (9) $2,192.09.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,404. E. (9) $10,410.

A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,881.59.

A. American Postal Workers Union, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,109,195.59. E. (9) $77,820.70.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, Box 605, 117 W. Third Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,734.82. E. (9) $3,734.82.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washingotn, D.C.
D. (6) $1,142.02. E. (9) $1,142.02.

A. American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,502.45. E. (9) $2,850.

A. American Surveys, Embassy Square, 2000 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 1 World Trade Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300.00. E. (9) $53.29.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.50.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $14,549.63. E. (9) $14,549.63.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $38,680.55.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, DC.
E. (9) $150.

A. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,847.02. E. (9) $4,485.95.

A. Edward T. Anderson, 2100 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $54.60.

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, J., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. George W. Apperson, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. $46.32.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fairchild Camera and 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, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance & Securities Inc., 100 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Associated Dairymen, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $650.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $148.17. E. (9) $223.60.

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., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,325.25. E. (9) $5,325.25.

A. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $84.92. E. (9) $649.79.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $390.

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.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $1,358.37.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $21.40.

A. Richard W. Averill, Director, American Optometric Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $301.

A. Gary D. Avery, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $9.51.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas H. Barksdale, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,215. E. (9) $304.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, Colonial Sugar Refining Co. Ltd., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washintgon, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, Interbank Card Association, 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) $159.25.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, EC3A 8ET, England.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $5,032.51.

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, Oreg.
B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Court House, Roseburg, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $539.23.

A. Weldon Barton, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver Colo.
D. (6) $3,138.43. E. (9) $111.87.

A. Batzell & Nunn, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Terminal Operators Association, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. David Baumhart, Post Office Box 553, Lorain, Ohio.
B. Green Olive Trade Association, 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $7.64.

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) $1,770.

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. $14.45.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,127.71. E. (9) $641.02.

A. Jack Beidler, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,884.60. E. (9) $709.20.

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) $31.35.

A. E. Markham Bench, Bonneville International Corp., 136 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $936.05.

A. Thomas P. Bennett, American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Reed A. Benson for The John Birch Society, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Austrian Trade Delegate in the United States, 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $64.75.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $79.91.

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) $1,200. E. (9) $97.90.

A. Robert L. Bevan, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $44.15.

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. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Laurel Hill Cemetery Association, Clayton, Mo.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co., 12th Street at Hill, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $16.66.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Paul Revere Corp., Worcester, Mass.
E. (9) $18.56.

A. William Blum, Jr., 704 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $833.33. E. (9) $475.94.

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 Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $192.71. E. (9) $15.50.

A. Albert D. Bourland, Industry Government Relations, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $763.43.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Edward L. Bowley, American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO.
D. (6) $6,898.05.

A. Wayne W. Bradley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,323.13. E. (9) $465.60.

A. Charles N. Brady, Highway Department, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. Thomas C. Brickle, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.; National Institute of Drycleaning, 909 Burlington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.
D. (6) $500.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, The Madison Building, 1155 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $87.50. E. (9) $8.

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) $3,750.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $72.14.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virgina Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cominco American Inc., West 818 Riverside, Spokane, Wash.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ebasco Industries (a division of Boise Cascade Corp.), 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morristown, N.J.
E. (9) $49.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $32.63.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Housing Producers, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman, & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Franchise Association, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

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. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $49.92.

A. Philip N. Buckminster, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, in care of Mr. Chaco Chase, 109–20 71 Road, Forest Hills, N.Y.
E. (9) $127.91.

A. Richard L. Bullock, National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,249.98. E. (9) $1,980.94.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $6,182.88. E. (9) $733.

A. George Burnham IV, United States Steel Corp., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Steel Corp., 600 Grant St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $169. E. (9) $165.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.
E. (9) $25.10.

A. Charles S. Burns, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $243.39.

A. George Bursach, American Society of Bank Directors, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Bank Directors, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

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) $3,920. E. (9) $226.89.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $1,304.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., Oil and Natural Gas Producer, 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) $582.

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) $1,102.40.

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. Carl C. Campbell, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $47.72.

A. Charles Argyll Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $195.72.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone.
D. (6) $1,559.46. E. (9) $2,328.05.

A. Ronald A. Capone, The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $4,050. E. (9) $453.04.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, One Dupont Circle, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

A. 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, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $1,240.

A. Philip Carlip, District 2, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, 650 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. District 2, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, 650 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Philip Carlip, Seafarers International Union, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,467.77.

A. Carpet and Rug Institute, Post Office 2048 Dalton, Ga.
E. (9) $1,086.30.

A. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 501 Raleigh Building, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $115.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,666.66. E. (9) $180.36.

A. Albert A. Carretta, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Work Glove Manufacturers Association, 1717 Howard Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $762.50.

A. John R. Carson, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union) P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

A. David C. Carter, Director of Information & Public Relations, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Suite 1019, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank H. Case III, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,250.

A. James B. Cash, Jr., The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $43.90.

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) $937.50.

A. James W. Chapman, Senior Legislative Counsel, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,423.

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) $1,380.

A. Chapman, Duff & Lenzini, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fouke Company, Route One, Box 168, White Horse Road, Greenville, S.C.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $318.50.

A. Chapman, Duff & Lenzini, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fouke Co., Route 1, Box 168, White Horse Road, Greenville, S.C.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $318.50.

A. Chapman, Duff & Lenzini, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, Secretary's Office, 5727 Blake Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $78.75.

A. Chapman, Duff & Lenzini, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Libby, McNeill & Libby, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William C. Chapman, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,730.47.

A. Leslie Cheek, III, American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. Mr. A. H. Chesser, United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $300.

A. Edwin Christianson.
B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union) Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lowell T. Christison, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Box 605, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $42.04. E. (9) $21.15.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr., American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $3.53.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $43,680.57. E. (9) $415.21.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $136.35.

A. Richard W. Clark, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,062.50.

A. Mr. Robert M. Clark, The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Co., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 6, Pittsburg, Kans.

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) $519.60. E. (9) $519.60.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cabot Corp., Complex Co., Copolymer Rubber and Chemical Corp., Dart Industries, Inc., E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, et al.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Interbank Card Association, Suite 3600, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1–7 O'Connell Street, Sydney, Australia.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $463.95.

A. William T. Cleary, 1126 16th Street NW., Room 200, Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Room 200, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Brands, Inc., 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $50.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Meyers Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lorillard, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris Inc., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $45.

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. National Basketball Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $22.75.

A. Larry D. Cline, 1315 16 Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.90.

A. Coalition for a National Population Policy, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,889.98. E. (9) $726.98.

A. Mr. Jeffery Cohelan, Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. David Cohen, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Colihan, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1211, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $600.

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) $766.24.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cylinder Manufacturers Committee, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye 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 Eye 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 Eye 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 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye 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 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $525.

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. Paul G. Collins, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I.
B. 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.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, c/o Langdon P. Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $21,208.78. E. (9) $31,281.91.

A. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $832,560.18. E. (9) $153,495.21.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $122.13.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $104.55.

A. James T. Conner, The Madison Building, 1155–15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $310. E. (9) $118.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 841 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $295.

A. John A. Connor, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $211.74.

A. Jack T. Conway, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Cook & Franke S.C., 660 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

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) $563.38.

A. Eileen D. Cooke, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $99.36.

A. J. Milton Cooper, Suite 401, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,220.41.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Converse Rubber Co., Malden, Mass.; B. F. Goodrich Footwear Co., Charlotte, N.C.; Randy Manufacture Co., Randolph, Mass.; Uniroyal, Inc., Naugatuck, Conn.
E. (9) $2.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, Canada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $4.

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) $263.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, care of Langdon Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

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.

A. Robert M. Coultas, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute for Rapid Transit 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $998.31. E. (9) $998.31.

A. Raymond L. Courage, Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. MGIC Investment Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va.

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 (USA) Inc., 75 Piandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Midland Building, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $25.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Hubert M. Crean, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $363.

A. Jay Creswell, 802 South Summerlin Avenue, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $86.32.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. A. Crowder, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Crowell Collier & Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.98.

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) $3,270.69.

A. William Kay Daines, 1156 15th Street NW., Washingon, D.C.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $60.48.

A. Richard C. Darling, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $443.43.

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) $145.50.

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) $288.83.

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) $4,040,16.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza—No. 5200, Chicago, Ill.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $118.13.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza—No. 5200, Chicago, Ill.
B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $449.79. E.(9) $92.49.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza—No. 5200, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $11,850.64. E. (9) $1,107.59.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza—No. 5200, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Myron Stratton Home, Post Office Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo.
D. (6) $1,341.66. E. (9) $186.60.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza—No. 5200, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $92.49.

A. Mr. Fred E. Davis, National Association of Manufacturers, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $225.

A. R. Hilton Davis, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter L. Davis, 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) $750.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Day, Washington Staff, Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $270.75.

A. Phil Dean Associates, Inc., 271 North Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $75.98.

A. Tony T. Dechant, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $148.45.

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. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Federation of Natives, 1689 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Soybean Association, Hudson, Iowa.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Merger Committee, National Basketball Association, c/o Abe Pollin, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Merger Committee, American Basketball Association, c/o H. Wendall Cherry, 601 Portland Federal Building, 200 W. Broadway, Louisville, Ky.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,665. E. (9) $945.53.

A. George S. Dietrich, Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Dillon, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Toro Manufacturing Corp., 8111 Lyndale Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $35.

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) $2,320.54. E. (9) $160.54.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Marysville Dam Committee, Post Office Box 1550, Marysville, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Post Office Box 15830, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,601.45. E. (9) $51.45.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, Post Office Box 815, West Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,124.25. E. (9) $44.25.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $38,107.05. E. (9) $38,107.05.

A. William H. Dodds, UAW, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,277.25. E. (9) $94.25.

A. James F. Doherty, Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,875. E. (9) $1,810.57.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $244.83.

A. C. L. Dorson, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,389.74. E. (9) $320.

A. Dow, Lohnes and 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, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East 6th Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harry J. Doyle, American Optometric Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, Box 605, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $579.84. E. (9) $553.75.

A. Robert H. Doyle, National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,281.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $90.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,162.52. E. (9) $100.

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, Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $390.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $975.

A. Roy W. Easley, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89.04.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21.41. E. (9) $33.69.

A. Hope Eastman, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,939.10. E. (9) $7,939.10.

A. Jaye R. Ediger, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington. D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.25.

A. Hallett D. Edson, 956 N. Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 N. Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Macon T. Edwards, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $165. E. (9) $42.27.

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) $36.35.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.
D. (6) $3,054.68. E. (9) $3,176.29.

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. Roy Elson, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $477.77.

A. Ely, Bartlett, Brown & Proctor, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Massachusetts Federal Savings Council, Inc., 11 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $5,483. E. (9) $421.19.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,530. E. (9) $5,326.

A. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis.
E. (9) $750.

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) $1.46.

A. Gertrude Engel, 2450 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bob Hoffman, York Barbell Co., Inc., York, Pa.
D. (6) $500.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Glenn R. Erickson, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $800.

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) $22.50.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $73,966.95. E. (9) $23,294.03.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101–17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. Fensterwald & Ohlhausen, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $123.33.

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. Francs S. Filbey, American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,794.64.

A. Matthew P. Fink, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $39. E. (9) $5.

A. Thomas W. Fink, Ring Building, 1200–18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $345. E. (9) $15.

A. James W. Finley, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Crown Zellerbach Corp., One Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. William J. Flaherty, Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,375. E. (9) $30.

A. 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. Frank U. Fletcher, 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, National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Gene N. Fondren, 337 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 210 North 13th Street, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,025. E. (9) $203.75.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads Association.
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) $356.23.

A. John S. Forsythe, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,116.39.

A. William C. Foster, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., Post Office Box 576, Bellevue, Wash.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $106.50.

A. William C. Foster, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $102.86.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $245.

A. John G. Fox, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $37.50.

A. Charles L. Frazier, 485 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $2,670.00.

A. R. Frank Frazier, National Broiler Council, 1155 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.00.

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 and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Devils Lake Sioux Tribe.
E. (9) $14.34.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Ave., NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.
E. (9) $2.27.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $14.38.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima Maricopa Community, Box 120, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.
D. (6) $62.50. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.
D. (6) $117.40. E. (9) $2.27.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Sisseton & Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Sisseton, S. Dak.
E. (9) $7.92.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26,538. E. (9) $12,860.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $581.09.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virgina Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virgina Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Frosh, Lane and 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. Bernard Fuchs, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Residents & Interns, Inc., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $49.25.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Royal Crown Cola Co., Columbus, Ga.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Vance Sanders & Co., Inc., Boston, Mass.; Federated Investors, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Fidelity Management & Research Co., Boston, Mass.

A. James E. Gaffigan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $138.45. E. (9) $20.50.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $5,625.

A. John W. Gardner, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,033.40.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $2.75.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

A. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $658.80. E. (9) $686.35.

A. William T. Gibb, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $29.29. E. (9) $2.16.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Thee 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., 1 Shell Plaza, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $500.

A. Dave Givens, Tennessee Railroad Association, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $4,625. E. (9) $1,134.51.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,450. E. (9) $2,450.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.30.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $5.84.

A. James M. Goldberg, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J.
D. (6) $154. E. (9) $27.75.

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. Edward Gottlieb & Associates Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 W. Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Government Employes Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,395.35. E. (9) $6,316.48.

A. Donald E. Graham, 1129 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,068.75. E. (9) $55.55.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Gray, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va.
D (6) $9,999.98. E. (9) $386.40.

A. Robert K. Gray, Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $125.

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) $382.50. E. (9) $305.10.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, Union Pacific Railroad, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
E. (9) $1,069.29.

A. Dale Greenwood, Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $1,197.50.

A. William G. Greif, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bristol-Myers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fred J. Greiner, Evaporated Milk Association, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Griner, American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,046.40. E. (9) $2,294.79.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,585.57.

A. James J. Gudinas, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry P. Guenther, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ben Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,682.70. E. (9) $925.

A. R. William Habel, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,880. E. (9) $423.59.

A. Robert J. Habenicht, 1400 South Joyce Street, Arlington, Va.
B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va.
D (6) $300. E. (9) $250.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $350.72.

A. Matthew Hale, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $150.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $2,490.74.

A. John F. Hall, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,953.89.

A. Keith Halliday, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $24.89.

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) $4,166.68.

A. Hamel, Park, McCare & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor Law Study Committee, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $10.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 79 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $990. E. (9) 34.46.

A. Donald K. Hanes, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $29.91.

A. Edward F. Harding, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $102. E. (9) $367.78.

A. Franklin Hardings, Jr., 144 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.
B. California Savings and Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Post Office Box R, Pasadena, Calif.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $208.65.

A. Andrew E. Hare, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.75.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1104, Washington, D.C.
B. Procter & Gamble Mfg. Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $69. E. (9) $69.

A. Mildred B. Harman, Suite 640, Warner Building, 13th and E. Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $411.25.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $81.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Harper, 1140 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $189.99.

A. Walter D. Harris, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborne Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,987.50. E. (9) $500.63.

A. Dennis E. Hart, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $996.55. E. (9) $15.28.

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) $5,605.60.

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. 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) $3,565.25. E. (9) $703.81.

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) $1,286.50. E. (9) $1,460.75.

A. Robert T. Hayden, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,544. E. (9) $671.15.

A. Hays & Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,073.35. E. (9) $11,073.35.

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.

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 Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $889.45.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. 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, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. Leslie P. Henry, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $113.75. E. (9) $6.

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) $503.06.

A. Andrew I. Hickey, Jr., 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,420. E. (9) $278.84.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Association, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $1,403.25.

A. Frederic W. Hickman, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $92.49.

A. J. Thomas Higginbotham, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Consumer Bankers Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $404.15.

A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., 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) $753.98.

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, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $195.

A. Thomas P. Holley, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $5,840.

A. John W. Holton, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $25.

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) $719.60.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $8,250. E. (9) $2,002.30.

A. Edward W. Hummers, Jr., 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David J. Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $428.50.

A. Richard M. Hunt, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. NL Industries, Inc., Multi-Division Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. James L. Huntley, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerk International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,825. E. (9) $1,239.39.

A. Lester S. Hyman, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First Mortgage Investors, 401 41st Street, Miami Beach, Fla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $17.05.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 808, 135 East Eleventh Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 808, 135 East Eleventh Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,184.50. E. (9) $1,547.30.

A. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industrial Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $630.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,712.25. E. (9) $7,712.25.

A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,845.10.

A. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 217–19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.
E. (9) $3,731.49.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $17,002.84.

A. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,127.92.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $8,745.07. E. (9) $8,268.24.

A. William E. Isaeff, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald A. Jacks, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reinsurance Association of America, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles E. Jackson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $150.76.

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. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $195.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,061.25. E. (9) $46.10.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $910.00.

A. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morristown, N.J.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,098.43. E. (9) $379.70.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. H. Daniel Jones III, Suite 1001, 1150 17th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $115. E. (9) $20.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.37.

A. Oliver H. Jones, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $11,316.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl D. Jordan, 408 East Maple, Fremont, Mich.
B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $145.

A. Ardon B. Judd, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW.

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) $12.50.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Centro Azucarero Paraguayo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Born Corp., 3421 North Central Avenue, Chicago Ill.

A. Gerald M. Katz, 1800 Mercantile Bank and Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agriculture Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.
E. (9) $1.46.

A. Carleton R. Kear, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $848.

A. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grain & Feed Association, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. 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. Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (A Delaware Corp.), Post Office 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $11.48.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $710.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $9,561.32.

A. Francis A. Kelly, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $4,449.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. George Kelm, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Myron Stratton Home, Post Office Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo.
D. (6) $1,341.66. E. (9) $186.60.

A. R. G. Kendall, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $430. E. (9) $484.52.

A. Edward F. Kenehan, 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.
D. (6) $833.32.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $264.20.

A. Jeremiah J. Kenney, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $92.03.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $150.

A. Charles L. King, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $96.

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) $737.10. E. (9) $26.02.

A. Mrs. Walter G. Kimmel, 1715 25th Street, Rock Island, Ill.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $154.28.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,344.88. E. (9) $441.76.

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) $576.07.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $380.70. E. (9) $408.69.

A. James D. Kittelton, 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.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 409 La Salle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietor Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $66.69.

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) $669.18.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

A. Bradley R. Koch, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $130.

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) $38.75.

A. Robert M. Koch, Jr., 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836 Crystal City, Arlington, Va.
E. (9) $4.60.

A. Kominers, Fort, Schlefer & Boyer, 500 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., Commerce Building, Post Office Box 53068, New Orleans, La.; Pacific Far East Line, Inc., One Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $12,468.

A. Horace R. Kornegay, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $175.

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.
E. (9) $300.

A. Kenneth S. Kovack, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,071.50. E. (9) $1,463.21.

A. Howard R. Koven and Abe Fortas, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and Canal Square, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

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) $137.75.

A. Germaine Krettek, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. James S. Krzyminski, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $731.25. E. (9) $9.29.

A. William J. Kuhfuss, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue. Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $938. E. (9) $92.03.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,072. E. (9) $953.50.

A. Laborers International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,145.08.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $13,333.85. E. (9) $8,213.

A. John P. Lagomarcino, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.02. E. (9) $38.25.

A. Lake Carriers Association, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
E. (9) $200.

A. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $250.

A. Asger F. Langlykke, 1913 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society for Microbiology, 1913 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James J. LaPenta, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $546.19.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $525.

A. Hugh C. Laughlin, 6153 Garden Road, Maumee, Ohio.
B. Owens-Illinois, P.O. Box 1035, Toledo 1, Ohio.
D. (6) $11,750. E. (9) $1,311.05.

A. Robert B. Laurents, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Donald F. Lavanty, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, Box 605, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $568.80. E. (9) $474.95.

A. William Lazarus, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $770.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 230 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) $2,198. E. (9) $2,505.64.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $160.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,749.98.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals 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. Steven H. Lesnik, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., 4750 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $675.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First Mortgage Investors, 401 41st Street, Miami Beach, Fla.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $43.30.

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. Herbert Liebenson, 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, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,480.92. E. (9) $4,480.92.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, Ninth Floor, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,700. E. (9) $1,598.44.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, Loyalty Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $103.26. E. (9) $8.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,825. E. (9) $725.06.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 1010, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 1010, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $288.75. E. (9) $170.12.

A. Ira S. Loss, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Blake Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, Blake Building, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

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. Otto Lowe, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Wilbur C. Lowrey, Suite 300, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Oil Co., One Shell Plaza, Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $500.

A. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., 4750 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,350.00.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Menswear Retailers of America, Room 390 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.

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) $1,609.

A. James H. Lynch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Streeet NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,233.60. E. (9) $205.68.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $988.62.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Printing Industries of America, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $1,392.45.

A. Joseph V. Machugh, 225 A Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Menswear Retailers of America, Room 390, National Press Building., 14th and F Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Mack, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $597.46.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,871.81. E. (9) $106.30.

A. Mike Manatos, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $22.01. E. (9) $22.01.

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, 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., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, M.

A. Ralph J. Mariatt, 640 Investment Building., 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,905.85.

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) $672. E. (9) $16.

A. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $159.32. E. (9) $127.95.

A. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.
E. (9 $1.46.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6)$100.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz.
D. (6) $500.

A. Guy B. Maseritz, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Associates of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul J. Mason, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $59.46. E. (9) $3.45.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Room 603, Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 603, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,499.91. E. (9) $660.

A. P. H. Mathews, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $355. E. (9) $79.06.

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) $435. E. (9) $423.55.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,954. E. (9) $276.67.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,420. E. (9) $470.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,082.27.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf-Western Industries, Inc., One Gulf-Western Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $544.30.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $44.33.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., 3308 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $50.97.

A. E. L. McCulloch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $284.60. E. (9) $81.50.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $399.80. E. (9) $155.55.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 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) $85.68.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Raymond McGlaughlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $7,080.

A. Myles F. McGrail, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $187.04.

A. Darrell V. McGraw, Jr., Shepherdstown, W. Va.
B. Community Action Strategy Team, 403 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $200.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,959.10.

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, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $2.80.

A. Teresa D. McLaughlin, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $2,739.

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. (9) $175.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $930. E. (9) $480.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $238.83. E. (9) $10.87.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $804.94.

A. McNutt, Dudley, Easterwood & Losch, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dredging Co., 12 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Dunbar & Sullivan Dredging Co., 2312 Buhl Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,150. E. (9) $1,061.72.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,888.99. E. (9) $1,037.19.

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. R. Otto Meletzke, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $40.20. E. (9) $2.04.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East Forty-Second Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $535.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington. D.C.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,010.

A. Larry L. Meyer, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $710.

A. James G. Michaux, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $500.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bank of Montreal, 2 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4.71.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Toronto-Dominion Bank, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4.71.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Royal Bank of Canada, 68 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4.71.

A. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $119.52.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $26.94.

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) $133.40.

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) $1,355.34.

A. Hermon I. Miller, 425 13th Street NW., 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. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $1,194.22.

A. Jack Mills, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $200.

A. John G. Mohay, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62.70. E. (9) $198.24.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bituminous Coal Operators Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. O. William Moody, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $669.52.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 330 South Fourth Street, Richmond, Va.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Civil Airlift.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $141.02.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock,
B. 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) $374.41.

A. James G. Morton, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $50.

A. Jack Moskowitz, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $102.73.

A. Lynn E. Mote, 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.
E. (9) $83.63.

A. William G. Mullen, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $158.36.

A. Richard W. Murphy, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J.
D (6) $400.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $654.08. E. (9) $761.08.

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, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $812.49. E. (9) $37.74.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,657.49. E. (9) $73.67.

A. John J. Nangle, Suite 812, 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) $586.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $41.25. E. (9) $182.35.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $95.50. E. (9) $95.50.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $523.50. E. (9) $523.50.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $25,858.39. E. (9) $4,666.64.

A. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Credit Management, 475 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,323.57. E. (9) $7,865.57.

A. National Association of Former Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $35.41. E. (9) $35.41.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 Eye 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) $12,754.79.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $785,281.08. E. (9) $33,498.85.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,922.68. E. (9) $1,922.68.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,243.52. E. (9) $8,243.52.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $35,000. E. (9) $25,614.91.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $13,697.44.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $10,846.54. E. (9) $2,503.04.

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) $563,002.60. E. (9) $6,171.56.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $453,653.71. E. (9) $9,709.56.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $13,552.90. E. (9) $13,552.90.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,464.91. E. (9) $14,024.57.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $567. E. (9) $627.76.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $833.34. E. (9) $162.24.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga.
E. (9) $1,800.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $282,466.81. E. (9) $17,158.70.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,149.33. E. (9) $13,637.97.

A. National Grain & Feed Association. 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington D.C.
D. (6) $141,230.89. E. (9) $10,750.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,070.75.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,427.68. E. (9) 15,838.61.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $461.94. E. (9) $1,943.04.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,291.56. E. (9) $1,160.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,442.65. E. (9) $2,442.65.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $4,258.59. E. (9) $4,258.59.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,588.42. E. (9) $7,588.42.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $801.10.

A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,310. E. (9) $750.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,623. E. (9) $1,325.

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 Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $11,700.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $956.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $859.19. E. (9) $859.19.

A. National Turkey Federation, Mount Morris, Ill.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $10,510. E. (9) $5,122.04.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $4,186.62. E. (9) $263.37.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,650. E. (9) $7,421.25.

A. NBA Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,873.78. E. (9) $3,873.78.

A. Alexander W. Neale, Jr., Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1531. E. (9) $31.60.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $90.45.

A. Allen Neece, Jr., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frances E. Neely, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,266.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $180.30.

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) $222.21.

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. 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 Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,929.01. E. (9) $529.01.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Postal Workers Union, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,715.79. E. (9) $472.97.

A. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

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 Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $76.56.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. Daniel J. O'Callaghan, 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. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 465 L'Enfant Plaza West SW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $130.

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) $112.

A Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $416.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,199.98. E. (9) $90.77.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

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, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,109.98. E. (9) $1,191.36.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. 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 and Feed Association, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $43.95. E. (9) $3.

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. Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

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) $22.50.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $148.45.

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.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Norman Paige, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. George F. Parrish, 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) $190.32.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Boating Industry Association, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Engine & Boat Manufacturers, 537 Steamboat Road, Greenwich, Conn.
D. (6) $750.

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.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $1,475.52.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nestle Co., 100 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, N.Y.
D. (6) $300.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
D. (6) $650.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y.
D. (6) $650.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Pecoraro, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 217–19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.
D. (6) $2,177.50.

A. Pennzoil United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $7,842.80.

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. 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) $1,728.40.

A. Michael Petresky, 400 First Street NW., Washington,D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,825.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $250.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Bruce E. Phillips, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $640.

A. James F. Pinkney, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,501.13. E. (9) $25.64.

A. James H. Pipkin, Texaco, Inc., 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) $7,438.33. E. (9) $1,350.

A. George G. Potts, 640 Investment Building NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,613.40.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, Shaw, Pittman, Potts 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $21.20.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14.05.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $570. E. (9) $27.64.

A. William C. Prather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $475.

A. William H. Press, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Jerry C. Pritchett, 1414 30th NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mechanical Contractors Association of America, Inc., 5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 750, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $533.11.

A. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $818.48. E. (9) $818.48.

A. Pulp & Paper Machinery Manufacturers' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Room 910, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $630.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Quin, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 1, Box 199, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $76.25. E. (9) $16.79.

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. Thomas H. Quinn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,222. E. (9) $523.89.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $296.16.

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) $38.25. E. (9) $6.34.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atkins, Kroll & Co., Ltd., 417 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Island Equipment Co., 3300 Northeast Yeon Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $179.74.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co. and Miller Redwood Co., 315 Pacific Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $250.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,752. E. (9) $10,752.

A. G. J. Rauschenbach, Communications Satellite Corp.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $735.

A. William W. Rayner, 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.
B. Crowell Collier and Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.
A. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
E. (9) $7,928.50.

A. David J. Reedy, 1517 Virginia Street, Downers Grove, Ill.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 S. Harlem Avenue, Bedford Park, Argo, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

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. John A. Reilly, Esq., Kenyon & Kenyon, Reilly Carr & Chappin, 59 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $25.

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.

A. Reserve Officers Association of United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $755. E. (9) $251.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,281.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Warner Building, 13th and E Streets, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,174. E. (9) $12,168.92.

A. William L. Reynolds, National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $36.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Maxwell E. Rich, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. James W. Richards, Standard Oil (Indiana), 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,513.99. E. (9) $13.58.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Rosalie Riechman, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1 North 13th Street., Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

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) $70.

A. William Neale Roach, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.50.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. 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) $55.

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. Frank W. Rogers, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & 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.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Michael J. Romig, American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Blake Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

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 Corporation, 3250 South West Third Avenue, Miami, Fla.
D. (6) $5,600. E. (9) $41.62.

A. Elbert C. Rudasill, American Optometric Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Box 605, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $120.60. E. (9) $114.65.

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) $2,253.78. E. (9) $294.35.

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) $2,500. E. (9) $729.11.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,060.12.

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. (6) $960.

A. Stanley H. Ruttenberg, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ella Marice Ryan, duty by attorney, E. M. Ryan, Consultant, Logos Bldg., 3620 South 27th Street, Arlington, Va.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,137.50. E.(9) $480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 500 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Shell Oil Co., Mobil Oil Corp., Atlantic Richfield Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Union Oil Co., Gulf Oil Corp., all of Los Angeles; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Midland, Tex.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum, Frohlich & Tayler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson Street, Muncie, Ind.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $18.95.

A. Carl K. Sadler, American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,124. E. (9) $5,913.45.

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.
D. (6) $2,500. E.(9) $130.50.

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 Mercentile Bank and Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium, State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.
E. (9) $1.46.

A. A. Cleve Schneeberger, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $3,058.81.

A. Millard Schulberg, Suite 304, 1900 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Liquor Stores Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $16.

Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington, D.C. Retail Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $555. E. (9) $70.

A. John W. Scott, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jefferson Pilot Corp., Post Office Box 21008, Greensboro, N.C.

A. Earl W. Sears, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $4.93.

A. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, Mrs. Emma Giambaldi, George Hallingby et al.
E. (9) $149.10.

A. William M. Segall, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Carpet and Rug Institute, Post Office Box 2048, Dalton, Ga.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $26.30.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 802, Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $10.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $182.40.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pfizer Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $300.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., El Paso, Tex.
D. (6) $4,377.75. E. (9) $815.18.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Doubleday & Co., 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) $3,614.76.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,075.

A. Robert H. Shields, 1156 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. 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. E. (9) $20.

A. Harvey A. Shipman, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Penn Central Transportation Co. Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Six Agency Committee, 217 West First Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $10,970. E. (9) $3,000.

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) $4.

A. A. Z. Shows, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Avionics Communication Systems Inc., Subsidiary of Mechanical Technology Inc., Latham, N.Y.

A. Sidney & Austin, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Silver, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $56. E. (9) $61.32.

A. Lana H. Sims, S. C. Railroad Association, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
D. (6) $75.68. E. (9) $101.73.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen, Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carstens Slack, Phillips Petroleum Co., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. William L. Slayton, The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Smathers and 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) $502.33.

A. Smathers and Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Horse Council, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $796.69.

A. Donald E. Smiley, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (A Delaware Corp), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $687.11.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 E. 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,184.50. E. (9) $1,547.30.

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) $103.80.

A. Robert William Smith, Ford Motor Co., Washington Staff, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $245.90.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Co.'s, 2511 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, Washington Staff, Ford Motor Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $839.85.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $119.46. E. (9) $126.50.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Assn., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $183.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE, Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,013.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,609.75. E. (9) $6,842.20.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First, St., Reno, Nev.; Southern Pacific Transportation Co., Western Pacific Railroad Co.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $1,008.93.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, 330 S. Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,999.80.

A. James M. Souby, Jr., 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,322.34. E. (9) $4.52.

A. Frank J. Specht, Schenley Industries, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Mfrs. & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. Nicholas J. Spiezio, Associate Counsel, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $4,503.

A. Louis P. Spitz, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 500, 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) $450.

A. J. Gilbert Stallings, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. INA Corporation, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 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) $200.

A. Steinhart, Goldberg, Feigenbaum & Ladar, Crocker Plaza, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center, Calif.
D. (6) $1,475. E. (9) $513.70.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Robert College of Istanbul, Turkey 305 East 45th Street, New York, New York.
D. (6) $210.00. E. (9) $6.00.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $4.

A. B. H. Steuerwal, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 40 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of U.S. Dyestuff Producers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $130.

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) $2,000. E. (9) $450.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $130.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pulp and Paper Machinery Manufacturers' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Room 910, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $130.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $130.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. World Trade Committee on Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $130.

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) $405.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger, and Kennedy, Attorneys, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Group, American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Iron & Steel Exporters' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

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. 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 of the U.S., 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,724.50. E. (9) $481.73.

A. William M. Stover, Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $980. E. (9) $100.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 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) $5,610. E. (9) $303.34.

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. 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. Roger H. Sullivan, 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Amstar Corp., 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,426.85.

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) $2,214. E. (9) $642.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, Managing Director, 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.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $24.61.

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) $6,249.

A. John R. Sweeney, Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 701 East Third Street, Bethlehem, Pa.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $350.75.

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) $583.28. E. (9) $398.56.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rev. Charles C. Talley, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roy W. Terwilliger, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Tobacco Association, 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) $149.60.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electrical Contractors, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $580. E. (9) $494.35.

A. John P. Tracey, Assistant Director, American Bar Association.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $50.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $630.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. M. Trevarrow, 1056 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $91.50.

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. Paul E. Trimble, Lake Carriers' Association, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $75.

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) $25.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
D. (6) $792. E. (9) $250.

A. James R. Turnbull.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7,142.59.

A. Richard F. Turney, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $287.84.

A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $118. E. (9) $46.92.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 66 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,199.80.

A. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $24,441.86.

A. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,304.34.

A. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 11 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $39,452.52.

A. David E. Ushio, 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. John A. Vance, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,255. E. (9) $1,020.84.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,137.50. E. (9) $480.

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) $121.77.

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) $121.77.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1224 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $95.78.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1224 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $95.78.

A. Venable, Baetjer and Howard, 1800 Merchantile Bank and Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.
E. (9) $1.46.

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) $1,594.16. E. (9) $131.25.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $261.65.

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) $127.75. E. (9) $65.50.

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) $22.37.

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) $788.80. E. (9) $212.22.

A. Wald, Harkrader, Nicholson & Ross, 1320 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. F. Waldrop, Jr., 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) $224.79. E. (9) $55.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,077.75. E. (9) $292.67.

A. William A. Walton, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, 8th and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, 8th and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans.

A. Alan M. Warren, 1025 Connecticut Ave-NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $305.96.

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. Mr. Ray Wax, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va.
E. (9) $8.75.

A. Herman Webb, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, O'Hare Office Building, Suite 400, 10400 W. Higgins Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $708.43.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $9,500.01. E. (9) $45.60.

A. Dennis W. Weissman, American Optometric Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o M. L. DeBolt, O.D., Box 615, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $82.04. E. (9) $76.

A. Bernard J. Welch, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $113.56.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred M. Wertheimer, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,749.98. E. (9) $44.45.

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. $113.30.

A. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz.
E. (9) $400.

A. Wheeler, Van Sickle, Day & Anderson, 25 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.
B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Clyde A. Wheeler, Jr., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sun Oil Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1,650.

A. John L. Wheeler, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $15.

A. Donald F. White, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $850.

A. Ed White, Western Railroad Association, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. White, Marathon Oil Co., 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $495.12.

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) $500. E. (9) $150.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,625.13. E. (9) $4,198.27.

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 Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $545.29.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $19.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bonneville International Corp., 136 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $12.50.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $390.08.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Pierre Agency, Pierre, S. Dak.
E. (9) $87.59.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hoopa Valley Tribe, Post Office Box 817, Hoopa, Calif.
E. (9) $38.55.

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) $51.02.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $86.49.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, New Town, N.D.
E. (9) $78.32.

A. Francis G. Williams.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.00.

A. John C. Williamson, Realtors' Washington Committee on the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $213.67.

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) $410.68. E. (9) $100.23.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,718. E. (9) $105.75.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Express Co., 65 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 51 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $416. E. (9) $17.15.

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, 1 Greenwich Plaza, Greenwich, Conn.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Pennzoil United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $4,600. E. (9) $794.87.

A. R. J. Winchester, 900 Southwest Towers, Houston, Tex.
B. Pennzoil United, Inc., 900 Southwest Towers, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $647.93.

A. Richard F. Witherall, Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $2,350.

A. Peter L. Wolff, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370 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) $8,080.80. E. (9) $467.61.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Signal Companies, Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $637.

A. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $630.

A. V. T. Worthington, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va.

A. Gerald L. Wykoff, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Motion Picture and Television Producers 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., Hollywood A.F.L. Film Council, 7715 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif., Screen Actors Guild, 7750 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.

D. (6) $1,300.

A. Wayman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associacion Nacional de Cultivadores de Cana de Azucar, P.B. 4448, Cali, Colombia.

D. (6) $775.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kutchel, 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.

D. (6) $250.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, 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.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Merger Committee National Basketball Association, c/o Abe Pollin, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Merger Committee, American Basketball Association, c/o H. Wendell Cherry 601 Portland Federal Building, 200 W. Broadway, Louisville, Ky.

D. (6) $4,725. E. (9) $19.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $2.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Unionamerica, Inc., 435 South Figueros 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) $82.99.

A. Albert H. Zinkand, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles O. Zuver, the American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $228.98.

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 second calendar quarter of 1971 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Paul W. Airey, 4517 Sunset Drive, Panama City, Fla.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Frederick K. Alderson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $920. E. (9) $221.70.

A. American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,626.10.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.,
D. (6) $26,544.53. E. (9) $26,544.53.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,440.36.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,580.

A. American Optometric Association, Box 605, 117 W. Third Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $5,230.45. E. (9) $5,230.45.

A. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,250.

A. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $1,344.

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. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Conwood Corp., 701 North Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $9,615. E. (9) $446.34.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Record Merchandisers, Inc., Trianon Building, Suite 703, 20 Conshocken State Road, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
D. (6) $12,085. E. (9) $1,556.05.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,083.33. E. (9) $1,391.09.

A. Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., 6767 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Tex.

A. Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc., Post Office Box 754, Springfield, Mo.
(9) $50.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $41.25. E. (9) $104.02.

A. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va.

A. John C. Bagwell, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Charles W. Bailey, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15.

A. Davis M. Batson, Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Donald S. Beattie, Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1736.85.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Suite 325, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Suite 325, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. George E. Bradley, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of USDA (OPEDA), 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $420. E. (9) $25.

A. Cyril F. Brickfield, 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) $1,315.64.

A. Thomas C. Brickle, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.; National Institute of Drycleaning, 909 Burlington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $23,015.43. E. (9) $23,015.43.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1–7 O'Connell Street, Sydney, Australia.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $195.36.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association—Government Relations and Citizenship, 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. David A. Bunn, 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, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $700.

A. J. J. Burke, Jr., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $121.38.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $254.90.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $146.65.

A. John H. Callahan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $240.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $2,084.50. E. (9) $2,672.80.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, One Dupont Circle NW., Washintgon, D.C.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association–Government Relations and Citizenship, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,063.60. E. (9) $45.95.

A. Frank H. Case III, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,050.

A. E. Michael Cassady, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Water Resources Congress, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank Chelf, 220 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Conwood Corp., 701 North Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,649.75. E. (9) $8,456.22.

A. Larry D. Cline, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.90.

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.

A. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,104.01.

A. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $36,633.45. E. (9) $26,320.73.

A. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,742.90. E. (9) $8,066.07.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $320.

A. Conwood Corp., 701 North Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.
E. (9) $11,861.34.

A. Harry N. Cook, Suite 200, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $43.71.

A. Council of AFL–CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,250.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adhesive & Sealant Council, 1410 Higgens Road, Park Ridge, Ill.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Diamond Association of America, Inc., 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 156 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Road, Miami, Fla.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Casualty & Surety Agents, 83 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y.

A. 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, Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1715 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $2,846.97. E. (9) $771.37.

A. Harold L. Crosier, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $1,466.40.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Canned Meat Importers' Association, c/o North American Foods, Division of Deltec International Ltd., 2801 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla.
D. (6) $1,245. E. (9) $113.99.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taiwan Sugar Corp., One World Trade Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $382.46.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.98.

A. William Kay Daines, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $26.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Cocoa, Chocolate & Confectionery Alliance of Great Britain, London, England.
E. (9) $1,561.66.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Industry Export Corp., Ltd., New Delhi, India.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $3,523.09.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Chemical Fibres Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Woolen & Linen Textiles Exporters Association, Osaka, Japan.

A. Richard C. Darling, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $751.

A. Vincent A. Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,875. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 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) $661.80. E. (9) $119.97.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $1,910.70.

A. Discover America Travel Organizations, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $63,083.33 E. (9) $682.50.

A. Louise C. Dunlap, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $2,000.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $975.

A. Jaye R. Ediger, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.50.

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) $1,250. E. (9) $70.

A. D. A. Ellsworth, 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) $4,518. E. (9) $473.91.

A. Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $150.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,820. E. (9) $5,298.

A. Federation of American Scientists, 203 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,292.50. E. (9) $1,072.48.

A. Fensterwald & Ohlhausen, 905 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $200.25.

A. Francis C. Fini, Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank U. Fletcher, Fletcher, Heald, Rowell, Kenehan & Hildreth, 125 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David H. Foerster, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,202. E. (9) $66.54.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $83.84. E. (9) $40.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, Fort Totten, N. Dak.
D. (6) $1,631.25. E. (9) $11.19.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.
D. (6) $234.75. E. (9) $4.81.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima Maricopa Community, Route 1, Box 120, Scottsdale, Ariz.
D. (6) $125.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y.
D. (6) $937.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Sisseton, S. Dak.
D. (6) $1,068.75. E. (9) $28.75.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Royal Crown Cola Co., Columbus, Ga.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $118,475. E. (9) $4,129.06.

A. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $658.80. E. (9) $686.35.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,176.25. E. (9) $56.25.

A. Ernest Giddings, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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. and Florida Sugar Cane League, Post Office Box 1148, Slewiston, Fla.

A. Horace D. Godfrey, Post Office Box 7265, Alexandria, Va.
B. Gold Kist, Post Office Box 2210, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James M. Goldberg, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,100.

A. Jack Golodner, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of AFL–CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional & Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Government Relations and Citizenship.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,493.06. E. (9) $3,703.63.

A. Robert K. Gray, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $190.

A. James W. Green, National Educational Association, Suite 505, 316 West 12th Street, Austin, Tex.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.25. E. (9) $100.

A. Dale Greenwood, Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $429.78.

A. John F. Hall, National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,670.70.

A. William E. Hardman, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die and Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew E. Hare, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7.

A. Robert E. Harman, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $548.25. E. (9) $75.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, Warner & Harris, Inc., 1030 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. Richard I. Hersh, Box 1333, Syracuse, N.Y.
B. Agway Inc., Box 1333, Syracuse, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $458.50.

A. Leo D. Hochstetter.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye 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. Peter W. Hughes, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $101.59.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil, Inc., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C.

A. David J. Humphreys, Paulson & Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufactured Housing Association of America, Inc., 39 S. La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. David J. Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $174.50.

A. Gerald W. Hyland, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,069.47. E. (9) $121.75.

A. Bernard J. Imming, Secretary, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $5.53.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $17.63.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15,369.07.

A. Robert C. Jackson, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (1) $2,750. E. (9) $175.45.

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. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $230.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $947.20.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825.

A. Elmer A. Jones, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $464.86.

A. William R. Joyce, Jr., 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Centro Azucarero Argentino, Reconquista 336, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ardon B. Judd, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $4,411.20. E. (9) $736.71.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $820.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, The Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $100.

A. James D. Kittelton, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

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) $32.25.

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) $27,375. E. (9) $843.85.

A. Kominers, Fort, Schlefer & Boyer, 500 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., Commerce Building, Post Office Box 53068, New Orleans, La., and Pacific Far East Line, Inc., 141 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Charles B. Kornmann, South Dakota Railroads Association, Post Office Box 489, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $308.05.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16.75.

A. Robert B. Laurents, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 N. Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. William Lazarus, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $850.

A. League for Economic Assistance and Development, Inc., 390 Plandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y.
D. (6) $555. E. (9) $692.65.
A. Charles W. Lee, Congressional Hotel, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Steven H. Lesnik, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., 4750 N. Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $675.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 3d Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,093.23. E. (9) $14,753.65.

A. George A. Lucas, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $1,622.40.

A. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., 4750 N. Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menswear Retailers of America, R. 390, National Press Bldg., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. James H. Lynch, American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,939.20. E. (9) $284.73.

A. Manufactured Housing Association of America, Inc., 39 S. La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,000.

A. John V. Maraney, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $4,186.62. E. (9) $296.68.

A. Albert E. May, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $82.50. E. (9) $3.88.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., room 410, Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,420. E. (9) $310.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. $475.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Education Association, Government Relations and Citizenship, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4416.57. E. (9) $261.50.

A. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 1st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $3,054. E. (9) $1,167.92.

A. William H. McLin, 20 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
B. National Education Association, Government Relations and Citizenship, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $529.38. E. (9) $75.

A. George G. Mead, 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) $225.

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) $2,000. E. (9) $1059.85.

A. Larry L. Meyers, American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $710.

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, Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Avenue, Monrovia, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Lester F. Miller, Secretary, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $271. E. (9) $14.25.

A. Paul J. Minarchenko, Jr., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $632.05.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. David J. Muchow, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sugar Distributors of Venezuela, Edif. de la Luz Electrica de Venezuela, Av. Urdaneta, 7th Floor, Caracas, Venezuela.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $41.25. E. (9) $104.02.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $690.97. E. (9) $986.22.

A. National Committee for an American SST, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington. D.C.
D. (6) $7,747.46. E. (9) $15,520.66.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15,500.80. E. (9) $15,033.02.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $25,971.60. E. (9) $5,420.46.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $31,680.37. E. (9) $29,850.82.

A. National Association of Record Merchandisers, Inc., Trianon Building, Conshohocken State Road, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
(9) $12,085.

A. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200,972.96. E. (9) $680.93.

A. National Convocation of Lawyers To End the War, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,995.33. E. (9) $11,252.56.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920–922 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 150 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, Calif.
D. (6) $20,916.32. E. (9) $20,916.32.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,861.87. E. (9) $28,262.11.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,669.90. E. (9) $1,669.90.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $825.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,415.36. E. (9) $3,415.36.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Associa-

tion, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,868. E. (9) $3,943.

A. National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $26,196.68. E. (9) $13,266.35.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,186.58. E. (9) $4,150.86.

A. National Taxpayers Union, 319 Fifth Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,578.03. E. (9) $10,349.30.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $6,578. E. (9) $6,956.61.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $270.65.

A. William E. Neumeyer, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. GTE Service Corp., 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $20.75.

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 NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,004.

A. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $23,100.

A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa.
B. Northern Helex Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,212.50. E. (9) $696.51.

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. Claude E. Olmstead, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $271. E. (9) $18.50.

A. Roy W. Olson, Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $25.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13.75.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2000. E. (9) $215.

A. Alejandro Orfila, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Centro Azucarero Argentino, Reconquista 336, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $4,277.16.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (OPEDA), 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $870. E. (9) $1395.48.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Glaydwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., Campbell Place, Camden, N.J.

A. Lew M. Paramore, P.O. Box 1310, Town House, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Water Resources Congress 1130 17th Street N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Alaska Federation of Natives, Anchorage, Alaska.
E. (9) $1704.82.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mass Retailing Institute, 570 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $10.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 707, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. J. Pessel, 2919 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $2927.

A. Bruce E. Phillips, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $640.

A. Anthony T. Podesta, 4932 No. Kentucky, Chicago, Ill.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $412.78.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Presidential Heritage Clubs, Inc., 303 West 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $750.

A. H. P. Pressler, 1122 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Jerry C. Pritchett, Director of Government Affairs, 1414 30th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mechanical Contractors Association of America, Inc., 5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $583.11.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, and Arthur Lee Quinn, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Belize Sugar Industries, Belize City, British Honduras.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, and 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, and 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, and Arthur Lee Quinn, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Indies Sugar Association, Bridgetown, Barbados.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
E. (9) $1,505.51.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $370.20.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., the 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., the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Island Equipment Co., 3300 Northeast Yeon Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

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. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co., & Miller Redwood Co., 315 Pacific Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $250.

A. Alan T. Rains, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Rial M. Rainwater, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $271. E. (9) $15.

A. Louis J. Rancourt, 400 First Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $1,528.80.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
E. (9) $7,674.50.

A. John T. Reggitts, Jr., R.D. No. 2, Boonton Avenue, Boonton, N.J.

A. W. W. Renfroe, Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $145.

A. Darrell G. Renstrom, 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. Ronald E. Resh, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

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. 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) $50.75.

A. Walter E. Rogers, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $72.40.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Sam Rayburn Dam Electric Cooperative, Inc., 303 North Jackson Street, Livingston, Tex.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $555. E. (9) $50.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $221.87. E. (9) $46.59.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $962.50. E. (9) $132.12.

A. Leo Seybold, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,479. E. (9) $265.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,075.

A. Norman R. Sherlock, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $865. E. (9) $277.99.

A. Robert F. Sykes, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $107.80.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.
B. Water Resources Congress, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,319.60. E. (9) $2,516.04.

A. James M. Souby, Jr., Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. South Dakota Railroads Association, Post Office Box 489, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
E. (9) $508.05.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. J. Gilbert Stallings, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Joseph J. Standa, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $510.25. E. (9) $75.

A. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan-American Coffee Bureau, 1350 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,125. E. (9) $5,175.

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) $405.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Breezy Point Cooperative, 202-30 Rockaway Point Boulevard, Rockaway Point, N.Y.
D. (6) $450.

A. Norman Strunk, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

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) $6,249.

A. Monroe Sweetland, National Education Association, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $566.88. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. Roy W. Terwilliger, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tex-La Electric Cooperative, Inc., 501 South Main Street, Quitman, Tex.

A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,477.50. E. (9) $378.97.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American National Insurance Co., Anico Building, Galveston, Tex.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco, Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

A. J. P. Trainor, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $1,404.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $205. E. (9) $343.39.

A. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,924.82. E. (9) $2,924.82.

A. R. Dick Vander Woude, O'Hare Office Bldg., 10600 West Higgins Road, Des Plaines, Ill.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.25. E. (9) $75.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1224 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hertz Corp., 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $510.83.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1224 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $484.59.

A. Veterans of World War I of the USA, Inc., 916 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
D. (6) $21,460.16. E. (9) $69,830.32.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $12.60.

A. Wald, Harkrader, Nicholson & Ross, 1320 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Richard D. Warden, 1823 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1823 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $10,388.01.

A. Warner & Harris, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,902. E. (9) $5,833.

A. Leonard Warner, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C.
B. Warner & Harris, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. James A. Warren, 5500 Prospect Place, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. REA Express, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $150.

A. Herman Webb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, O'Hare Office Bldg., 10400 West Higgins Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $708.43.

A. Fred Wegner, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Weissbrodt & Weissbrodt, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, Box 529, Juneau, Alaska.
E. (9) $185.40.

A. Westbay Associates, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald F. White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $750.

A. Ed White, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Western Railroad Association, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert E. Wick, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $117.

A. J. D. Williams, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., P.O. Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.
A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,042.50. E. (9) $977.14.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil Investment Institute, 1 Greenwich Plaza, Greenwich Court, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $5.

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. 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. 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) $325.

A. John L. Zorack, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,415. E. (9) $418.90.

SENATE—*Monday, December 13, 1971*

The Senate met at 12 meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we lift our hearts in thanksgiving for the ancient message "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon His shoulder."

When our work is done may we rest this Government on His shoulder, commit all our labors to divine keeping, and join the hosts across the world in the celestial anthem "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will toward men."

We pray in the name of Him who is called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 10, 1971, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1483) to further provide for the farmer-owned cooperative system of making credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives, for rural residences, and to associations and other entities upon which farming operations are dependent, to provide for an adequate and flexible flow of money into rural areas, and to modernize and consolidate existing farm credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 11, 1971, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

RESIGNATION OF DAVID PACKARD AS DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not know of the resignation of David Packard as Deputy Secretary of Defense until after the Senate had adjourned on Saturday last.

I regret the resignation of this man who has performed so outstandingly and with such high integrity in the difficult position which he occupied for just under 3 years. His loss will be felt by all of us in Government. It will be a real and a deep loss, in my opinion, to the Department of Defense.

I asked the Department of Defense to send me a biography of Mr. Packard, and they have done so. I ask unanimous consent that the biography of this man, whose resignation I deeply and personally regret very much, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID PACKARD, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

David Packard was nominated as Deputy Secretary of Defense by President Richard Nixon on January 20, 1969, and confirmed by the United States Senate on January 23, 1969. He was administered oath of office by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird at a Pentagon ceremony on January 24, 1969.

Prior to assuming his new position, Mr. Packard was Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Hewlett-Packard Company of Palo Alto, California.

Mr. Packard was born in Pueblo, Colorado, on September 7, 1912, and attended public schools there, graduating from Centennial High School in 1930. He entered Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, that year, graduating from the University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1934. He then began post graduate study at the University of Colorado, subsequently entered business and then returned to Stanford University, receiving his Electrical Engineering degree from Stanford in 1939.