

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 10, 1972

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

Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer.—Psalms 19: 14.

O Thou infinite and eternal God, as we enter the portal of a new day inspire us with the consciousness of Thy presence and instill in us a confidence in Thy power for daily living. Increase our fitness for the difficult duties of these demanding days and make us ready for the responsibilities of these high hours. Let us not allow our faith to grow dim when men speak in fear and frustration instead of using the language of freedom and friendship.

By Thy spirit may we go forward with courage keeping our trust in the ultimate triumph of great principles upon which our Nation was founded and by which we can be more than a match for the movements of this modern life, for Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory forever. 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. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13825. An act to extend the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribe, band, or group.

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

H.R. 12674. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a national cemetery system within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3939) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BUCKLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PROXIMIRE, and Mr. BROOKE be appointed as additional conferees on the bill (S. 3939) entitled "An act to au-

thorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes."

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

S. 1524. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property;

S. 1928. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the St. Croix River, Minn. and Wis., as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system;

S. 3627. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain mineral rights in certain lands located in Utah to the record owner thereof;

S. 3930. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and under lands in Onslow County, N.C.; and

S. 4059. An act to provide that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District of Columbia shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of his blood, breath, or urine, for the purpose of determining the blood alcohol content.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16754, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16754) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SIKES, PATTEN, LONG of Maryland, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. MCKAY, MAHON, CEDERBERG, JONAS, TALCOTT, and BOW.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a privileged report on the bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16593, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a con-

ference report on the bill (H.R. 16593) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, have the papers in connection with H.R. 1 been returned to the House by the Senate?

The SPEAKER. They have.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1) to amend the Social Security Act to increase benefits and improve eligibility and computation methods under the OASDI program, to make improvements in the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis on improvements in their operating effectiveness, to replace the existing Federal-State public assistance programs with a Federal program of adult assistance and a Federal program of benefits to low-income families with children with incentives and requirements for employment and training to improve the capacity for employment of members of such families, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS of Arkansas, ULLMAN, BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Messrs. BYRNES of Wisconsin, BETTS, and SCHNEEBELI.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. I understand that certain changes have been made in the calendar for today and that we will take up the debt limit bill right off. I wonder if the other part of the calendar will remain as it is and be called up consecutively as it is on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has received information that the Committee on Rules would not call up the two special resolutions, which are privileged, at this time, so it is the Chair's understanding, after checking with the chairman of the committee, that those two resolutions

will be taken off and the debt limit bill will precede them.

MR. PATMAN. Then, the 14 unanimous-consent request bills will be taken up after the debt limit has been disposed of?

THE SPEAKER. The Chair has no knowledge. Permission has been granted or an announcement has been made that those bills may be brought up at some time under unanimous consent. It would be the Chair's intention to try to get the bills that must go to the Senate, like the debt limit bill, out of the way, of course, and unanimous-consent requests can be called up at any time.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
October 6, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives received on this date from the U.S. Marshall by certified mail (138444) an unattested copy of the attached Amending and Supplemental Petition in Civil Action No. Jules W. Hillery, (Class Action) v. Carl Albert, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, William M. Colmer, the Chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Civil Action File No. 72-1126, Section H, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. The Amending and Supplemental Petition adds W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and Kenneth R. Harding, Sergeant at Arms of the United States House of Representatives as defendants to this action.

It is my purpose by this letter to inform you that I have this date under 2 USC 118 requested the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana to take appropriate action, as deemed necessary, under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General in defense of this suit against the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D.C.
October 6, 1972.

HON. GERALD J. GALLINGHOUSE,
U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of
Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. GALLINGHOUSE: I am attaching a copy of the Amending and Supplemental Petition in Civil Action No. 72-1126, Section H in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana adding me in my official capacity as Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives as a defendant in this civil action and served on me this date from the U.S. Marshall by certified mail (138444).

In accordance with the provision of 2 USC 118, I respectfully request that you take appropriate action, as deemed necessary, under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General in defense of this suit against the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives. I am also sending you a copy of the letter I forwarded this date to the Attorney General of the United States.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 6, 1972.
HON. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLEINDIENST: I was this day served with the attached copy of an Amending and Supplemental Petition in Civil Action No. 72-1126, Section H in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

In accordance with the provisions of 2 USC 118, I have sent a copy of the complaint in this action to the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana requesting that he take appropriate action under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General. I am also sending you a copy of the letter I forwarded this date to the U.S. Attorney.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 6, 1972.

HON. GERALD J. GALLINGHOUSE,
U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. GALLINGHOUSE: The Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives has this date sent you a copy of the Amending and Supplemental Petition in Civil Action No. 72-1126, Section H in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana adding me in my official capacity as Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. House of Representatives as a defendant in this civil action and served on the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives this date from the U.S. Marshall by certified mail (138444).

In accordance with the provision of 2 USC 118, I respectfully request that you take appropriate action, as deemed necessary, under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General in defense of this suit against the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives. I am also sending you a copy of the letter I forwarded this date to the Attorney General of the United States.

Sincerely,

KENNETH R. HARDING,
Sergeant at Arms.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 10, 1972.

HON. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLEINDIENST: The Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives was served on October 6, 1972, a copy of an Amending and Supplemental Petition in Civil Action No. 72-1126, Section H, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

In accordance with the provisions of 2 USC 118, the Clerk of the House has sent a copy of the complaint in this action to the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana requesting that he take appropriate action under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General. I am also sending you a copy of the letter I have forwarded this date to the U.S. Attorney.

Sincerely,

KENNETH R. HARDING,
Sergeant at Arms.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROMISE TO END THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA MADE 4 YEARS AGO

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

MR. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the fourth anniversary of a campaign speech in which President Nixon

stated those who "could not produce peace, should not be given another chance."

Since that statement was made, more than 20,000 American boys have lost their lives, untold numbers of Vietnamese men, women, and children have been killed or maimed, and no American POW's have been returned through the efforts of the Nixon administration. And still there is no end in sight. I do not believe we are closer to peace today than when Mr. Nixon assumed office.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS WINDING DOWN THE WAR

(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 am somewhat shocked by the observations and comments of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL). The gentleman from Massachusetts has said that we are no closer to peace than we were 4 years ago. At this time the facts are that 510,000 fewer Americans are engaged in combat duties in South Vietnam.

MR. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. GERALD R. FORD. If the gentleman will let me continue my remarks, then I will yield.

The facts are that casualties are down literally to zero. The facts are that we are negotiating almost around the clock to end the war. I believe that the President is making a maximum effort, and getting practically the kind of results that the American people want him to achieve to end the war. We are going to get our prisoners of war back, and we are not going to sacrifice our principles in the process.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

MR. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, may I say at this time to the gentleman from Michigan that the entire complexion of the war has changed. There are presently over 150,000 military personnel in Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. It is true that thousands of American boys are not dying in the combat fields of Vietnam, but thousands of American boys are involved in air bombing missions over North Vietnam, and thousands of American boys are involved in naval mining operations off the coast of Haiphong. I wholeheartedly believe we are no closer to peace today than we were 4 years ago when President Nixon made his statement.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 16810, PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

MR. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), I call up House Resolution 1149 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1149

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16810) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except (1) amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means to title I of the bill; (2) an amendment containing the text or a portion of the text of H. Con. Res. 713 if offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to title II of the bill H.R. 16810; and (3) an amendment proposing to strike out title III of the bill; and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 417]

Abourezk	Dulski	Matsunaga
Anderson,	du Pont	Metcalfe
Tenn.	Dwyer	Mikva
Badillo	Edmondson	Mills, Md.
Baring	Evans, Colo.	Mink
Bell	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.
Biaggi	Fish	Murphy, N.Y.
Blanton	Fraser	Pelly
Blatnik	Gallifianakis	Powell
Bow	Gallagher	Purcell
Brooks	Goldwater	Reid
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Roberts
Buchanan	Gross	Roncalio
Burke, Fla.	Haley	Rooney, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Rosenthal
Caffery	Hanley	Royal
Carey, N.Y.	Harsha	Scherle
Celler	Hathaway	Schaeuer
Chappell	Hebert	Schmitz
Chisholm	Helstoski	Scott
Clark	Henderson	Shipley
Clausen,	Hungate	Snyder
Don H.	Hunt	Steed
Clay	Jarman	Stuckey
Cotter	Lent	Sullivan
Denholm	Link	Symington
Diggs	Lloyd	Terry
Dorn	McClure	Thompson, Ga.
Dow	McKinney	Vander Jagt
Dowdy	Martin	Young, Fla.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 16810, PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more vital to the Nation than a sound fiscal policy—a policy that must meet the needs of the country and be consonant with our national resources. For this reason the issue of fiscal responsibility has become so political in its nature as to lend itself to outright demagogery. The matter before us must be examined in this light.

This is by no means the first time this Nation has been confronted with crisis, fiscal and otherwise. Always before we have been able to meet the critical situations and solve them within constitutional and legal provisions. Certainly before, no suggestion has been made that Congress abdicate its constitutional authority and responsibility to placate the cries of those who have contributed so mightily to the problems at hand. In this respect, it is shocking and astounding that the same administration and the same committee of the Congress that brought us this very session the two greatest budget-busting and ceiling-blowing measures ever to be presented in the history of this Nation or, in fact, in the history of the world, now cry about fiscal responsibility.

I refer, of course, to the guaranteed minimum income and the so-called revenue sharing bills—the spending under which would be limitless. And yet as incredible as it is, the same administration and the same committee of the Congress that brought out these gems are now hitting the panic button and saying the Congress must abdicate its authority and responsibility to them if this country is to be saved financially. Why? So we can have an even greater guaranteed income? So we can share more of the revenue the country does not have? So we can have more deficit spending?

On the subject of deficit spending, bear in mind that this administration during its 3 years-plus tenure has accounted for a more than \$100 billion deficit—more than one-fourth the total national debt of the Nation. Fiscal responsibility is needed, but the credentials of this administration are most unimpressive. The record of Congress generally has been none too good, but it is no worse than the administration; and in one respect it has been quite good.

The Appropriations Committee has consistently and constantly reduced the President's budget requests to the amount of several billion dollars. Where we get into trouble is in the area of conflict between the authority of the various committees. If those of us on the Rules Committee had refused to let come to the floor any legislation infringing one committee on the others, we would not have permitted Ways and Means, for instance, to circumvent the Appropriations Committee with the revenue sharing bill—a

bill that would not have received 25 votes under a secret ballot or free of the pressures of the State and local subdivisions. So, Congress can do something to stop the spending—either in the Rules Committee or on the floor.

Also, more rigid and uniform application of the economic controls the Congress has given to the President could accomplish the curb on spending and inflation without abdicating to one-man government.

One-man government should be of extreme to the American people because the one man's decision is the course of the Nation. How the President would decide to spend the \$250 billion would dictate the course of the Nation in defense, welfare, education, health, and so forth. If the presidential election polls were reversed, how many of the proponents would still support the legislation? Probably none. And yet it would be a mistake to think you are going to have a Republican President forever.

The President already has the authority to control spending by either veto or by freezing funds. What he does not have is authority to change the law—that is, spend money appropriated for one purpose to another. For example, money voted for national defense could be directed for foreign aid; or welfare programs could be channeled only to large cities, and so forth.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual and customary 30 minutes to the very able and distinguished ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

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

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Speaker, the bill which we will be considering shortly, H.R. 16810, contains three separate titles. The first title has to do with increasing the debt ceiling. The present permanent debt ceiling of \$400 billion is retained. The present temporary debt ceiling of \$450 billion is increased by title I to \$465 billion, an increase of \$15 billion effective through June 30 of next year.

Title II is a little different approach than we have had before in a debt increase bill. It is an effort to place a limitation on the spending through the balance of fiscal 1973. As we all know, we are now into the fourth month of fiscal 1973 at the present time.

Title II will permit the President to cut spending in various programs so that the overall limit of spending in fiscal 1973 will not exceed \$250 billion.

Title III sets up another unique situation. It will set up a special committee consisting, I believe, of 30 individuals, seven members from the Committee on Appropriations of the House, seven members from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, seven members from the Committees on Finance and Appropriations in the Senate, and with one additional Member appointed by the Speaker and one additional Member ap-

pointed by the President of the Senate. They will report back to the House of Representatives and to the Senate not later than February 15, 1973, on any suggestions that they have as to the fiscal operation and the costs and expenditures and such relating to the operation of the Congress.

House Resolution 1149 contains another rather peculiar rule, and we have brought a lot of them before the House this year, but we are trying to place a rule before the House that can be adopted and under which we can proceed to consider the bill H.R. 16810.

The first thing it does is to waive all points of order, and that goes back to the Liberty Loan, again, where it originally waived points of order at that time, and in addition the Secretary of the Treasury has to pay interest on the bonds, and that is in order to get around the situation so that he can do so. That is why we waive the points of order.

The debate will be for 4 hours, controlled equally by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking minority member of that committee.

Usually these come in under a closed rule, but in this instance it is not entirely closed. Amendments will be in order offered by the Committee on Ways and Means to title I of the bill. As to title II of the bill, we made a special rule on that so that one amendment can be made, and that amendment will be in the nature of a substitute, and according to the rule it can be the complete text or a portion of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 713.

I do not know what the gentleman from Texas will offer, whether he will offer the entire text or not, but copies, I believe, are available on both respective desks. That will be voted on. The way that is handled is that when that is offered in the nature of a substitute the rule will provide 5 minutes for and against, and then a vote on that particular amendment.

In addition to that, the rule will provide for one amendment to strike out all of title III from the bill.

Neither of these two amendments are subject to amendment themselves and they will have to be voted up or down on the basis of the language therein.

As to this House Concurrent Resolution 713, I did not have a copy of it before the Rules Committee. However, I received a copy of the suggested language that the gentleman from Texas proposed to be included in his title II, if title II is stricken, and his language is placed therein.

It seems to me that the statement of the gentleman from Texas is correct, from the standpoint of politics. I happen to be on the other side of the aisle because I do not see how the Congress can operate and be effective in any way if the Mahon substitute is adopted because of the language in the amendment.

In the Mahon proposal there are a number of "whereas" clauses. I do not ever recall legislating on "whereas" clauses in laws. If we have a "whereas" clause to pay tribute to somebody in a State legislature or the like, we preface

them with "whereas" clauses, but there are two pages here of "whereas" clauses for or against things one way or another.

I would suggest that you all read these "whereas" clauses because I do not think they should be in any legislation.

Now when we get down to the resolving clauses, it says:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is hereby respectfully requested to advise the Congress not later than January 2, 1973, of the specific reductions in budget authority and budget outlays (by appropriation or fund), and changes in existing law affecting same, that in his judgment may best be made in order to limit budget outlays for the fiscal year 1973 to not more than \$250,000,000,000; and that it is the sense of the Congress that, upon receipt of the list of such specific reductions and modifications, the Congress shall consider legislation dealing with the President's recommendations.

That I fail to understand. I do not know what the Congress is going to do.

Is the Government Operations Committee going to come in and say: We approve or disapprove of the President's suggestion? Can the Committee on Ways and Means initiate legislation to approve or disapprove; or can the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Rules do that? I have no understanding of how that can be handled. Half of the fiscal year will be over by the time we get them and the effect, in my opinion, will be that no cuts will be made whatsoever.

If there are no cuts and the spending continues and the deficit goes up by the end of 1973 to \$15 billion or \$20 billion or some such amount, the first thing that will have to happen next year, early in the session, will be that there will have to be a large tax increase and in addition to that there will be more inflation.

At least, in my opinion, that is what will happen.

So far as I personally am concerned, I would answer the distinguished gentleman from Texas and say that I would support the Committee on Ways and Means language in their bill, if a Democrat were President or whoever were the President, because so far as I am concerned, I do not think any of us, either the Executive or the Congress, has really done the best job we possibly could in limiting expenses. We are going to have a big deficit if we go on, and that is going to be kind of hard on the taxpayers, in my opinion.

In any event, I am in support of the rule and in support of the committee provisions in title II, and I am opposed to the Mahon proposal. I hope the majority of the Members will support the position of the Committee on Ways and Means, particularly as to title II.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote for this rule nor for the bill—because \$70 billion of our national debt has been already paid once—and there is no question about that—but the debt has not been canceled and that \$70 billion is improperly included in the debt ceiling which you want to raise today.

If the Committee on Ways and Means would study the matter of the \$70 billion, the committee would find that the information I have given is absolutely true. It has been documented and nobody can deny it.

How should we feel—to vote for a bill that has \$70 billion padded in the bill? This is not an idle statement that I am making. I have studied and known this over the years. I have insisted on doing something about it. But, of course, the people who are affected just refuse to say anything about this argument—but this is \$70 billion that will have to be paid again if the Committee on Ways and Means does not perform its duty and make sure that the \$70 billion debt is canceled.

If it is not canceled, we will need a debt limit raise each time the debt increases. However, if we do cancel the \$70 billion indebtedness, it will be several years before we will need an increase in the debt limitation ceiling again.

A PRIMER FOR REDUCING THE DEBT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the legislation to raise the debt limitation under consideration today, I would like to point out that we might not be called upon today and at other times to periodically raise the debt limitation if Congress acted to have canceled the \$70 billion worth of bonds which are held by the Federal Reserve System through its Federal Open Market Committee.

I do not know if many of you realize how significant a portion of the U.S. debt is represented by these \$70 billion of outstanding obligations. Please think about the following facts for a moment—these \$70 billion of outstanding indebtedness represent a full 17 percent of the U.S. debt. That is right, 17 percent. Moreover, the annual interest paid by the United States on these obligations is \$4 billion. To me, these are astonishing statistics. At a time when the Congress is being asked to raise the debt limitation, at a time when the President is asking the Congress to grant him wholesale authority to limit the spending Congress has determined necessary for a sound and prosperous United States, at a time when a massive increase in taxes appears to be a distinct possibility in order that this country might finance its enormous deficits, at a time when our economy is so fragile and the problem of deficit spending so important—at such a time a full 17 percent of the public debt could be canceled and it is not, and as much as \$4 billion in annual interest payments could be eliminated and they are not. The \$70 billion has been paid by the United States but it has not been canceled, and the United States continues to pay \$4 billion in interest annually.

In my view, the most financially responsible action the Congress could undertake at this time of economic uncertainty would be to undertake to understand the nature of the \$70 billion of outstanding indebtedness held by the Federal Reserve System and to act so as to cancel that indebtedness, and along with it a healthy portion of our national debt.

For those of you who have little back-

ground on this matter, let me briefly review some of the more important facts surrounding these outstanding obligations.

At the end of April of this year, the Federal Reserve System held \$70 billion in U.S. obligations in the portfolio of the Federal Open Market Committee in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These \$70 billion worth of bonds are necessarily carried as a debt of the United States, and as I have already pointed out, at this point in time they represent a full 17 percent of the total U.S. debt. The fact of the matter is, however, that these bonds should not be held as outstanding debt of the United States since they have already been paid for once with the money or credit of the United States. The obligations should simply be canceled.

As a professor in law school once said, where the obligor and the obligee under a contract are the same person, the contract is effectively canceled. This is the same situation with the \$70 billion in bonds. The Federal Government is both the obligor and the obligee.

In my view, it is regrettable that time and again the Ways and Means Committee reports to the House legislation to raise the debt limitation and never does it give consideration to the \$70 billion bond portfolio and the opportunity on the part of Congress to cancel these obligations.

With respect to the interest paid on these bonds, the Federal Reserve System is paid almost \$4 billion annually in interest by virtue of its possession of these bonds, and now the Fed insists the bonds belong to the Fed. It is like a trustee of an estate who buys with the estate funds and claim the funds to be his own. That means of course that a full \$4 billion worth of U.S. debt is expended each year simply to finance the \$70 billion bond portfolio of the Federal Reserve System.

Imagine it, the taxpayers of this country turn over \$4 billion each year of their hard-earned tax dollars to the Federal Reserve System—a Government agency created by the Congress to serve in the public interest. But what has happened? What is the public interest that is being served? I am afraid there is none. Is the \$4 billion in interest being used to improve our cities? Is it being used to provide safe and sound housing for every American? Is it being used to eliminate pollution and make our environment the grandeur and the beauty that it once was? Is it being used to repair our torn and tattered cities? To all the questions the answer is a resounding "No." The \$4 billion in annual interest payment—a payment which continues to add to our spiraling debt—is used by the Federal Reserve System for whatever it desires.

The Appropriations Committees of the Congress have not acted to exercise their authority to either review or to control these expenditures in any manner. The funds are not audited by the General Accounting Office, and the Federal Reserve Board has engaged in a well-financed campaign to lock the GAO out of the entire Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System, with the

subsidy of \$4 billion annually of taxpayers' money, is free to spend like a child in a candy store with a year's allowance in his pocket.

Moreover, with little or no control over the financial activity of the Federal Reserve System, the Congress is almost wholly without the ability to affect in any meaningful way the administrative and other operations of one of the most important independent agencies in the Government. While the Federal Reserve Board acts like it assumes responsibility for a sound and stable economy, inflation knows away at the paychecks of our Nation's workers, the Federal Government falls deeper and deeper into debt, the dollar suffers assault in the international money markets, and the stock market sidesteps from one crisis of economic confidence to another.

Mr. Speaker, at a time such as now when we consider again the extent to which we are going to permit this Nation to add to its debt, I think the Congress would do well to resolve that before it again permits an increase in the debt ceiling and again gives its blessing to more and greater debt, it carefully consider the unparalleled opportunity it has to cancel 17 percent of the national debt and provide for the redirection of \$4 billion of annual would-be interest payments into programs which will provide worthwhile benefits to the people of the United States.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any question in the minds of any of us this afternoon in what we all hope are the closing days of this second session of the 92d Congress that we are faced with a very crucial vote.

I have had some very, very thoughtful Members of this body on both sides of the aisle come to me as recently as just before the time that we convened at noon today and confess to me some of the misgivings that they have. I listened with great interest to the remarks of my respected colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG). I suppose it is inevitable, given the season of the year that we are in, that there lurks in the minds of some the suspicion that we are somehow engaged in merely a political exercise here today. Yet I think there is a far more fundamental issue confronting this House, that is, are we going to display to the country the ability to act incisively and with determination and with effect on a very critical and important issue; or are we going to in effect by adopting the substitute of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, simply once again demonstrate a penchant for passing the buck to somebody else?

The Members to whom I referred earlier as voicing concern about this issue did so on the ground that we may perhaps be surrendering a vital legislative and constitutional prerogative; that we may, by the adoption of the commit-

tee bill reported out on a bipartisan basis by Mr. MILLS' committee, somehow be demeaning and further diminishing the role of the Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me say that I will not take second place to anyone in my regard and affection for the prerogatives of this body and in my very real concern that over the years we have seen a diminution of our authority.

Any poll that we consult will indicate that there is diminished regard and respect for the Congress as an institution from the standpoint of our ability to deal responsibly, and responsively with the Nation's problems.

I would submit that if we adopt the substitute to the committee bill, if we content ourselves with language that, after a long series of rather unusual "Whereas" clauses including—and I am quoting from Mr. MAHON's language:

Whereas the Congress is concerned about the fiscal plight of the country, especially in view of continued and mounting budget deficits and inflationary pressures;

If we accept that "Whereas" clause, and then go on and adopt a "Resolving" clause that means absolutely nothing, then this Congress will adjourn sine die and go home without having demonstrated its ability to the country that we can in a time of crisis deal effectively with the problem. Then I submit we have really lost esteem. Then I submit we have truly surrendered our prerogatives in the face of a difficult problem.

I would suggest that it was with great wisdom that they put a limit on this authority in the committee bill.

They said it will expire 8 months hence, on the 30th of June, 1973. Moreover, in title III they, in a very valuable and worthwhile provision of this bill, provided for the creation of a special and a new and a joint committee that can review the whole manner in which we have attempted ineffectively to deal with the fiscal problem in recent years. Without title III, very frankly, I would not be as solidly in support of this legislation as I am this afternoon, but I think if we adopt it, this is essentially legislating congressional reform. It is going to show the country that we recognize the deficiency in the present system of dealing on a piecemeal basis with the budget.

This is no criticism of the gentleman from Texas. This is no criticism of the great Appropriations Committee of this Congress. It is rather a recognition of the fact that with the growth of the Federal budget, with the growth of the complexity of the Government we simply have to have a new and better way of dealing with this very difficult problem.

I want to plead with those Members on both sides of the aisle who may be as yet, as of this moment, undecided as to the course they will follow, that by adopting the committee bill they are voting for congressional reform. They are telling the country that we can deal effectively with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have not the time now and I shall ask permission in the extension of my remarks to put in some very good tables to demonstrate to my liberal friends on this side of the aisle who may have listened to the charge that was made

recently that the spending ceiling, and I am quoting, "offers the administration a convenient way to eliminate or cripple programs relating to human needs without risking a politically unpopular frontal assault"—that this charge is without foundation.

If Members will look at the record and at what has happened between fiscal year 1969 and 1973, if they will look at what I am going to put into the RECORD they will see that on a detailed program by program basis, reductions of about 18.3 percent in constant 1973 dollars have occurred in national defense. They will see that there has been a 36.7-percent reduction in constant 1973 dollars over 1969 in expenditures for space. They will see on the other hand, again expressed in constant dollars, that we have gone up 16 percent in education, 30.5 percent in health, 170 percent in pollution control, and 103 percent in community development and in housing.

We are not going to starve these programs. We have not starved them the last 4 years, and by a spending ceiling \$18 billion over what we spent in fiscal year 1972 we are not going to be able to go out and convince anyone in the country that by enacting this ceiling we are somehow neglecting the very important—and I concede they are important—human resource programs in our Federal budget. I suggest Members take notice of what we have been doing and the manner in which we have reestablished new priorities within the Federal budget so they can see we are not going to harm these very important social programs if we vote responsibly as we should for a spending ceiling today.

Opponents of the \$250 billion fiscal year 1973 spending ceiling called for by President Nixon have charged that it is

designed merely to provide a pretext for cutting social spending and human resource programs. Senator HUMPHREY, for example, has charged, "It is clear that the spending ceiling offers the administration a convenient way to eliminate or cripple programs relating to human needs without leading a politically unpopular frontal assault on them." While some of these programs may undoubtedly be held in check or trimmed back if the spending ceiling is approved by Congress, it would be erroneous to hastily conclude that these programs are of low priority simply on the basis of short-term adjustments that may be made during the remaining 9 months of this fiscal year. The only proper basis for judging Nixon administration priorities is to examine budget trends for the entire fiscal years 1969-73 period.

The reason for this is simply that programs which have been growing at extraordinarily rapid rates are likely to be good candidates for a slowdown or cutback, while those which have grown very slowly or have actually experienced reductions will be quite difficult to cut even further. For example, if expenditures for program X have increased by 100 percent during the past 4 years and expenditures for program Y have actually declined by 10 percent, it could hardly be concluded that program Y has greater priority than program X if the latter is slightly reduced and the former is not in an effort to keep expenditures within the \$250 billion ceiling. Thus, the longer term budget context is a far more appropriate and valid guide for judging priorities than a mere comparison of the marginal dollar amount reductions that may be made in various program areas during the remainder of the fiscal year.

In order to provide this longer term

budget context, expenditure levels for various program areas have been compared for the fiscal years 1969-73 period. The former year represents the last Johnson administration budget and the set of spending priorities which that administration pursued. By comparing expenditure levels for that year with the levels recommended in the fiscal year 1973 budget, a fairly accurate measure of Nixon administration spending priorities can be obtained. In order to facilitate the analysis, all fiscal year 1969 budget figures were translated into fiscal year 1973 dollars in order to eliminate the effects of inflation. As is shown below, the Nixon administration has produced quite sweeping changes in the allocation of Federal expenditures.

The first table below divides various budget program areas into three broad categories: Those which have experienced actual reductions in real expenditure levels as measured by constant fiscal year 1973 dollars, those which have increased slightly slower or slightly faster than the overall real budget growth of 13.5 percent during the 4-year period, and those which have experienced very rapid rates of increase, some more than 100 percent.

Two conclusions are readily apparent from the table: First, expenditures for national defense, international affairs, space, natural resources—other than pollution control—and aid to agriculture have been reduced substantially in terms of constant dollars of purchasing power; second, most of these reallocated funds plus the new funds available due to real economic growth have been devoted to the broad area of human resources, especially community development, manpower training and employment, income security, and general revenue sharing.

TABLE I.—FEDERAL BUDGET CHANGES, FISCAL YEAR 1969-73 IN CONSTANT DOLLARS

[All figures in fiscal year 1973 dollars]

Budget category	Fiscal year 1969 (billions)	Fiscal year 1973 (billions)	Expenditure change, fiscal year 1969-73		Budget category	Fiscal year 1969 (billions)	Fiscal year 1973 (billions)	Expenditure change, fiscal year 1969-73	
			Amount (billions)	Percent				Amount (billions)	Percent
Reductions:									
National defense	\$96.37	\$78.30	-\$18.07	-18.3	General government	\$2.78	\$3.99	\$1.21	43.5
International affairs	4.06	3.83	-.23	-5.7	Subtotal	58.96	73.01	14.05	23.8
Space	5.04	3.19	-.85	-36.7	Rapid growth:				
Natural resources	1.94	.90	-1.00	-53.6	Pollution control	.57	1.54	.97	170.0
Farm prices and agricultural aid	6.79	6.70	-.09	-1.3	Community development and housing	2.86	5.82	2.96	103.0
Subtotal	114.20	92.92	-21.28	-18.6	Manpower training and employment	2.37	4.31	1.94	120.0
Moderate growth:					Income security	45.12	69.67	24.55	54.4
Education	5.47	6.36	.89	16.3	General revenue sharing	0	5.00	5.00	
Health	13.88	18.12	4.24	30.5	Law enforcement	.63	1.54	.91	144.4
Veterans' benefits	8.72	12.04	3.32	38.1	Subtotal	50.92	87.75	36.33	71.3
Debt service	18.73	21.16	2.43	13.0	Total budget change	217.18	246.46	29.28	13.5
Commerce and transportation	9.38	11.34	1.96	21.9					

Source: The budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal years 1969 and 1973. All figures represent outlays. Category subtotals do not exactly equal totals on bottom line because adjustments for

undistributed intergovernmental payments not shown.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION REORDERING OF EXPENDITURE PRIORITIES

While the above table gives some indication of the expenditure shifts from defense, international affairs and economic development programs to the broad domestic reform and social welfare area that have occurred under the Nixon administration, it does not tell the entire

story. In many of the budget categories listed in the table, a considerable portion of the expenditure increase is attributable to program outlays that are relatively uncontrollable. For instance, more than half of the expenditures in the commerce and transportation category are for airway and highway development financed out of trust funds, and the pre-

dominant share of those in the income-security category are attributable to social security, public assistance, and other income transfer payment programs. Since most of these expenditures are fixed by law or geared roughly to the level of trust fund receipts, the administration in power at any time has little direct control over the magnitude of out-

lays. Thus, in order to indicate the program areas over which the Nixon administration has exercised some real measure of discretion, these uncontrollable expenditures have been eliminated from each budget category.

As is shown in table 2 below, total Federal expenditures in constant dollars increased by slightly over \$30 billion during the fiscal years 1963-73 period. When the expenditure reductions for national defense and the other areas indicated in table 1 are added in, a total of nearly \$52 billion became available for new expenditures in domestic program areas. However, \$32.6 billion of this amount was claimed by more or less uncontrollable increases in the five categories indicated in the table, leaving a net amount of \$188 billion for real discretionary expenditure increases.

TABLE 2.—Derivation of discretionary expenditure increase

[All figures in fiscal year 1973 dollars]

Program category:	Change fiscal years 1969-73
Gross funds available for expenditure increases:	
Net expenditure growth	\$30,180
Expenditure reductions	21,280
Subtotal	51,460
Minus relatively uncontrollable increases:	
Transfer payments	22,540
Medicare/medicaid	3,440
Highways, airports, post office	890
Debt service	2,430
Veterans benefits	3,320
Subtotal 2	32,620
Net funds available for discretionary expenditure:	
Subtotal 1 minus subtotal 2	18,840

Table 3 below shows the manner in which these increases were allocated during the 4 years of the Nixon administration. The largest share of these funds, 34.3 percent, were devoted to human resource programs, principally a vastly increased level of expenditure for the food stamp and nutrition programs, and a similar large increase for employment and manpower. These expenditure increases provide tangible demonstration of the administration's commitment to end hunger and malnutrition and to equip those without jobs for gainful employment.

An additional 27.9 percent of the discretionary increases were allocated to the general area of community development. While the increases in each of the program areas in this category are modest in relationship to the total, they all represent very substantial growth from the fiscal year 1969 base, including a 170-percent increase for pollution abatement, a 101-percent increase for low- and moderate-income housing assistance, a 144-percent increase for law enforcement and a 310-percent increase for highway safety and rapid transit. Finally, nearly 27 percent of the available discretionary expenditure increase was earmarked for general revenue sharing to implement the administration's commitment to return decisionmaking power and expenditure flexibility to State

and local units of government. This left only 6.4 percent of the remaining funds to cover the increased costs of government overhead, and less than 5 percent for the economic development and business assistance and promotion programs carried out by the Departments of Commerce and Transportation.

Another way of viewing these figures is that all of the normal increase in expenditures resulting from economic growth during this period was claimed by relatively uncontrollable items like transfer payments, medicare/medicaid and various trust-fund-financed activities. Thus, only by substantially decreasing the level of real expenditures for defense, international affairs, space and the like, was it possible to produce the very rapid large expansion of outlays for pollution control, community development and human resources programs shown below. Had not this reallocation of budget priorities been made, these latter programs would have experienced almost no growth in real dollar terms.

TABLE 3.—DISTRIBUTION OF DISCRETIONARY EXPENDITURE INCREASES

[All figures in fiscal year 1973 dollars]

Program category	Amount	Share of total (percent)
Human resources:		
Food and nutrition	\$2,290	12.2
Manpower training and employment	1,940	10.3
Education	890	4.7
Health delivery, manpower and environmental health	750	4.0
Welfare and rehabilitation services	490	4.6
Health research and construction	100	.5
Total, human resources	6,460	34.3
Community Development:		
Urban and rural facilities and redevelopment	1,940	10.2
Low and moderate income housing	1,040	5.5
Pollution control	970	5.1
Law enforcement	910	4.8
Rapid transit and highway safety	440	2.3
Total, community development	5,280	27.9
General revenue sharing:		
Total, general revenue sharing	\$5,000	26.5
Other:		
General Government	1,210	6.4
Economic development and business aids	890	4.7
Total, other	2,100	11.1
Grand total	18,840	100.0

COMPARATIVE OVERALL BUDGET GROWTH TRENDS: NIXON ADMINISTRATION AND JOHNSON YEARS

While expenditures have grown quite rapidly for efforts like pollution control and for many programs in the human resources area during the Nixon administration, it must be emphasized that this was accomplished more by reallocation of priorities within the budget, as was shown in the previous section, than through rapidly increased overall Federal expenditures. As the table shows, in terms of constant dollars of purchasing power, budget growth during the Nixon administration has been reduced to almost one-third of the average annual growth during the fiscal years 1965-69 period.

Even more significantly, the overall budget growth rate has been brought nearly into line with the growth rate for real GNP during the last 4 years. By con-

trast, during the Johnson "guns and butter" years, the budget growth rate averaged almost twice the growth rate for GNP. The obvious implication of this trend is that the Federal sector was taking a larger and larger slice of total national income each year. During the last 4 years, however, this process has been reversed so that currently the budget is growing actually somewhat less rapidly than GNP:

BUDGET AND GNP GROWTH IN CONSTANT DOLLARS, FISCAL YEARS 1965-69 AND FISCAL YEARS 1969-73

[In percent]

Period	Average real budget growth	Average real GNP growth
Fiscal years 1965-69	9.3	4.9
Fiscal years 1969-73	3.4	3.2

Source: Economic Report of the President, 1972

As a result of this much lower budget growth rate, the Nixon administration has been able to keep its budgets within the discipline of a full-employment balance. This contrasts sharply with fiscal years 1965-69 periods in which a cumulative total of \$39.8 billion in full-employment deficits were incurred during a period when the economy was operating at near full capacity, and thus played an important role in the buildup of demand pressures that resulted in 6 percent-plus inflation rates during 1968-69.

As submitted in January, the fiscal year 1973 budget was calculated to produce a small \$800 million surplus, an appropriate target during a period of rapid economic expansion. However, upward revisions due to congressional legislative and appropriations actions and unexpected increased in existing programs could now turn this small surplus into a \$11.7 billion deficit if a spending ceiling is not imposed. Obviously, a full-employment deficit of this magnitude would be in the same range as the Johnson full-employment deficits shown below. While the spending ceiling proposed by the President would not entirely eliminate this deficit, it would certainly bring it back into a more manageable and less inflationary range.

Full-employment budgets, fiscal years 1965-69 and 1969-73

[Billions of dollars]

1965	+2.8
1966	-6.2
1967	-10.7
1968	-25.3
1969	-0.4
1970	+3.1
1971	+4.9
1972	-3.1
1973 January estimate	+.8
Current estimate	-11.3
\$250 ceiling	-4.5

Source: The Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1973.

THE FISCAL YEAR BUDGET: SOURCES OF UPWARD REVISION

The budget submitted by President Nixon in January projected \$246.3 billion in outlays, \$220.8 billion in revenues, and, consequently, a \$25.5 billion unified budget deficit during the current fiscal year. On a full employment budget basis, a slight \$800 million surplus was ex-

pected. Under conditions of a strongly reviving economy expected to be heading toward the full-employment range by the end of the fiscal year—June 1973—this deficit was believed by the administration to be sufficiently stimulative, but at the same time constrained by the discipline of a small full-employment surplus.

Since January, however, these budget projections have been revised substantially upward due to various appropriations and legislative actions by Congress, unexpected increases in outlays, and revenue revisions. As of October 1, the budget picture for fiscal year 1973 on the basis of measures already enacted or certain to be enacted is as follows: Outlays are now expected to reach \$256.8 billion in the absence of a ceiling, revenues have been revised upward to \$225 billion due to more rapid than expected recovery of the economy, and the unified budget deficit is now projected to be \$31.8 billion, nearly a 25 percent increase from the level projected in January. Even more significantly, these outlay increases and tax law changes in combination are expected to produce a full employment deficit of \$11.3 billion. During only one other year in the entire post-war period—fiscal year 1968—has the Federal budget incurred a larger full-employment deficit. The result of that large fiscal year 1968 full-employment deficit, in the context of a strongly expanding economy, was an inflation level of nearly 6 percent that took more than 3 years to correct.

In addition, measures with more than \$4.9 billion in added outlays for fiscal year 1973 have passed either one House, both Houses, or are pending in conference. These programs were not included in the above projection because enactment before the preelection adjournment is still questionable. However, should they be approved in a postelection session or next year, Federal outlays would increase to almost \$262 billion, with a unified budget deficit of \$36.7 billion and a full-employment deficit of \$16.7 billion. The table below shows the sources of these upward revisions in the fiscal year 1973 budget.

CHANGES IN FISCAL YEAR 1973 BUDGET ESTIMATES

	Receipts		
	Outlays	(billions)	Deficit
January budget	\$246.3	\$220.8	\$25.5
Net appropriations changes	-.2		-.2
Legislative changes	5.0	-1.6	6.6
Revenue sharing deferral	2.3		2.3
Estimate revisions	3.4	5.8	-2.4
Unified budget outlook:			
Programs enacted or certain of enactment	256.8	225.0	31.8
Potential additions ¹	261.7	225.0	36.7
Full employment budget outlook:			
Programs enacted or certain of enactment	254.8	243.5	11.3
Potential additions	259.7	243.5	16.7
Outlook with 350,000,000 spending ceiling:			
Unified budget	250.0	225.0	\$25.0
Full employment budget	248.0	243.5	4.5

¹ Approved by either 1 House, both Houses, or pending in conference.

² Less than actual outlays because full employment would involve smaller unemployment benefits and other income support expenditures.

Breakdown of changes in budget to date [In billions of dollars]

Receipts:	
Social security tax reductions	-1.6
Revision of tax yield estimates	5.8
Total	+4.2
Outlays:	
Appropriations:	
Defense	-1.50
Agriculture, environment and consumer protection	0.95
Relief	0.11
Foreign aid	-0.11
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	0.25
Miscellaneous	0.08
Subtotal	-0.22
Legislative (nonappropriation):	
School lunch program	0.20
Black lung benefits	0.97
Revenue sharing	1.00
20% Social Security increase	2.10
Veterans compensation	0.11
Disaster relief (SBA)	0.05
RR retirement benefits increase	0.07
Increase in social service expenditures	1.00
Miscellaneous (net)	0.03
Legislative inaction of miscellaneous spending reductions proposed in budget	-0.49
Subtotal	5.04
Other:	
Revenue sharing postponed from fiscal year 1972	2.25
Revision of estimates contained in budget	3.43
Subtotal	5.68
Total outlay change	10.50

¹ House passed version.

² House passed version. Senate bill has much larger increase.

³ Difference between January estimate of \$1.5 billion and \$2.5 billion ceiling included in the revenue sharing bill.

THE LONGER TERM BUDGET OUTLOOK

The imperative need to curtail the momentum of Federal spending growth was recently highlighted by a study issued by the American Enterprise Institute. On the basis of programs currently in the books plus the new expenditures for general revenue sharing, special revenue sharing, and welfare and health care reform included in the administration's fiscal year 1973 budget, the study projected a full-employment deficit of \$21.5 billion during the calendar year 1975. And this estimate assumes that no new programs would be added during the next 2 years and that larger than normal increases would not be made in existing programs. Yet a full-employment deficit of this magnitude, in the context of a full-employment economy, would almost certainly touch off a virulent new round of inflation similar to that initiated by the large Johnson full-employment deficits of fiscal year 1967-68.

If this expenditure momentum is not slowed down, the AEI study projects that an 11-percent surtax—on all individual and corporate taxpayers—would have to be levied in order to bring the budget into full-employment balance. For a

family of four earning \$12,000—which would be about the median income in 1975—an 11-percent surtax would mean a \$150 tax increase. Moreover, the study indicates that even as late as 1977 expenditures for current programs would exceed revenues by \$5.6 billion. Yet, considering the rate at which new programs and expenditures have been added to the budget in the last 10 years it hardly seems likely that 5 years could lapse without an additional penny being added to the budget, so the figure for 1977 must be taken as a bare minimum estimate of the size of the deficit absent tax increases.

The table below indicates the AEI projections for full-employment expenditures, revenues, and deficits for the 1975-77 period, as well as the surtax rates that would be needed to bring the budget into balance and avoid inflation, if current expenditure growth rates are not reduced.

FEDERAL BUDGET GROWTH AT CURRENT PROGRAM LEVELS 1975-77

	1975	1976	1977
Total revenues	\$292.0	\$315.3	\$339.7
Total expenditures	313.5	328.1	345.3
Full employment deficit	-21.5	-12.8	-5.6
Surtax needed to bring the Budget into Balance (percent)	11	6	3

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I returned to Washington today specifically to vote in favor of setting a spending limit of \$250 billion.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should go further. We should limit the amount of spending to the amount of income. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should live within our income and not pass spending programs that we cannot afford.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the very able and distinguished gentleman from the Appropriations Committee, my good friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we are all for responsible government and we are not opposed to congressional reform. To the contrary, we want to strengthen the arm of Congress. Most of us in my judgment, however, do not believe that it would constitute congressional reform to delegate to the executive branch authority to write law. That authority and responsibility is vested in the legislative branch under the Constitution. I do not see why we should delegate legislative responsibility for a moment, certainly not for 8 months.

I have supported expenditure ceilings in the past and expect to support expenditure ceilings in the future, but the one before us today is a different animal. The bill says that we will establish by law an expenditure ceiling of \$250 billion. It also says, in effect, to the President, "You change existing law in about any way you desire in order to achieve that objective."

That is the point that is involved here.

Shall we, in addition to departing from the traditional expenditure limitation concept say, as we do in this legislation beginning on line 20, page 2, "The amount available for obligation—as determined by the President—shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula."

There are no exemptions in the ceiling proposed and we do not tell the President not to change present law in regard to many programs. For example, in veterans' benefits, in revenue sharing, in aid to impacted areas, the law makes certain provision as to how the money shall be spent, but we say in this bill, in this proposed law, that the amounts available for obligation as determined by the President shall be substituted for the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by the application of the formula. There is no saving clause with respect to the so-called mandatory programs.

I think that some of the spending programs ought to be restructured. I would like to see some restructured, but under this proposal, in the impacted aid program for instance, the President could say, "I do not want any of this money going to category B. I want it all to go to category A."

Changing the law in this manner is not the type of authority which should be delegated to any President. That is my major objection to the proposal which is before us today.

The President will have a veto on 1-year funds as the result of such a ceiling and there are tens of billions of dollars involved in such funds. He can change the basic law with respect to many programs.

This is where I draw the line. Otherwise, I can support expenditure limitations and I have in the past. But the proposal which I make would require the President, if he wants to change the law, to submit to Congress what changes he recommends be made, and then the Congress can consider the whole matter in the light of the President's recommendations.

I do not wish to demean the Congress. We have not done an altogether bad job during this session or in previous sessions. Generally speaking, we do not exceed the total of the recommendations of the President. And certainly we have been under the budget in the aggregate in appropriation bills.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will probably pass a conference report for an education bill for Vietnam veterans amounting to about \$430 million.

Under this, what can the President do?

Mr. MAHON. The President would have the decision to substitute his authority as to how much shall be spent rather than the authority which would be carried in the legislation to which the gentleman refers.

In other words, if the executive branch is not satisfied with the real, or unreal, amount, it can impound money and can

also change the law by changing the application of the formula for expenditure.

Reverting again to the subject of what we have done in this session, we will have cut spending in appropriation bills at this session by about \$1.5 billion—a major sum. It is true that in revenue-sharing, in social security, in the black lung program and in other fields we are above the budget. But the proposal before the House today is not the answer to the fiscal problem confronting the country.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, some of the most difficult tasks which I have faced here, both as a longtime member of the great Ways and Means Committee and as majority whip, and now as majority leader, have been to obtain a majority for the many extensions of the debt ceiling that we have had to pass in the last several years.

First let me say I do not consider myself in any conflict with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) and I served together on the Ways and Means Committee for 22 years. That service was very valuable to me, and I hope was of some help to the Nation.

But I find myself today in total disagreement with what this legislation seeks to accomplish in writing in an expenditure ceiling of \$250 billion, which is a direct grant of absolute authority to the President of the United States on the control of the purse and the ultimate control of the legislative enactments of the Congress itself.

The Mahon amendment is a very reasonable amendment. It says, in effect, to the President, "Mr. President, send us down your recommendations, and we will look at them and we will consider them fully and we will vote on them as we should under the usual legislative procedures."

If the Mahon amendment is not adopted, speaking as the majority leader, and for the majority whip and for the Speaker and for the leadership, we intend to vote against the debt ceiling bill here today.

I am not impressed with the political arguments that have been made here. I am not impressed with this business I have been hearing in paid political broadcasts by the President about the so-called spendthrift Congress. In appropriated items we have reduced Mr. Nixon's budget requests by almost \$15 billion in the 4 years he has sent up requests. But he nevertheless has succeeded in building up the largest deficit of any President since the deficits that were necessary in World War II. He has built more deficits than all the Presidents of the United States put together up to the time of Franklin Roosevelt. He has built more deficits than Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all put together.

So talk about fiscal responsibility should not be coming from the White House, it should be addressed to it.

Where will the President cut if he gets

this authority? Well, the only way to judge a man's future is what he has done in the past. Let me just recite a list of his vetoes.

January 1970: Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare.

June 1970: Hospital construction.

August 1970: Office of Education appropriations.

August 1970: Housing and Urban Development appropriations.

January 1971: Federal employees hazardous occupations.

December 1970: Public health, family medicine.

December 16: Unemployment, low income, and unemployed persons.

June 29, 1971: Antipoverty program.

December 1971: Economic opportunity, or antipoverty.

August 1972: Labor, health, and education.

Just last week: Railroad retirement.

That is where the cuts will come. And, just as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said, in making these cuts, he in effect changes the law. He not only reduces the budget. The impacted schools money is a very good example. When he makes those cuts, he changes the formula. In changing the formula, he changes the enactment of the Congress of the United States.

I have followed the progress of this proposal with a great deal of interest, Mr. Speaker, and I have concluded that never in my career has a single piece of legislation deserved defeat on quite so many grounds.

We are told that the fires of inflation are consuming the living wages of our people, and this is true. Rising prices—particularly food prices—are licking at the heels of Americans of every economic level. Each month the statistics tell us of lost wages, lost savings, and eroded pensions. Consumer prices have risen 18 points since the beginning of 1969—more than in the previous 8 years combined—and there are few signs of their abating. Meat and poultry prices are up 23 percent. Hospital care is up 35.5 percent.

The Nixon deficits are a primary cause of inflation, and this, no doubt, is true. In the past 4 years, as I have said, budget deficits have exceeded the total deficits of the 16 years of the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations combined.

We are told that these unprecedented budget deficits are the result of wanton, reckless spending by the Congress, but this, Mr. Speaker, is not true. It is part of a cynical, election year scheme to escape responsibility for the worst economic failure in 40 years. Where there was a clear national need for funds—as in health, in education, in programs to protect the environment—Congress has met the President's requests and often exceeded them.

All of this, of course, was conspicuously absent in the President's presentation on Saturday—a presentation which was made on an altogether appropriate forum, a paid political broadcast.

In this paid political broadcast, the administration, which is the biggest deficit spender in American history, was

cloaked in the shopworn Republican costume of fiscal responsibility. The President, who bears responsibility for one-quarter of the national debt, told the American people that he was remaining in Washington to "hold the line" against a spendthrift Congress. He said that if Congress does not adopt this legislation—if Congress does not surrender its power over outlays—then the Congress will be responsible for compelling a tax increase.

The truth is—and this is supported by reputable economists within and without the administration—if a tax increase is inevitable, it is because of this administration's mismanagement of the economy.

The truth is, this legislation is part and parcel of an elaborate scheme to lay the blame for economic failure upon the Congress.

Now it is proposed that the Congress surrender its power over outlays. A \$250 billion expenditure ceiling will necessitate an estimated \$12 billion budget slash which, under this legislation, would be carried out solely by the executive branch, without the least review of consideration by the Congress.

We are asked to include in debt ceiling legislation a spending ceiling of \$250 billion and to delegate to the President power to determine where the cuts are to be made. We are asked to turn over to the executive branch the power to control budget outlays. The power of the purse, the power to determine national priorities, would be turned over to some nameless bureaucrat in the Office of Management and Budget—an individual, I might add, who is unelected and totally unresponsive to the electorate. Congress would be reduced to a debating society. There would be very little point to the annual debate over appropriations if our decision is subject to review by the OMB.

It has become very fashionable to speak of Congress declining power. Ralph Nader now speaks of Congress as the "broken branch." I do not subscribe to that point of view, but if this legislation is enacted, we will be lending credence to their allegations.

If there are to be further cuts in the Federal budget let it be people's representatives who decide when, where, and how much. This is our responsibility and duty under article I of the Constitution. We cannot abdicate it.

This President told a press conference on October 5, that he felt it was important for him to stay in Washington this fall and "fight the battle against bigger spending." Well, I suggest he start by taking a hard look at his own budget proposals. The very \$250-billion debt ceiling he seeks includes a \$32.4-billion deficit and an \$18-billion increase in Federal spending over 1972.

Since the \$250-billion spending ceiling the President seeks includes an increase of \$18 billion over the last fiscal year—and I emphasize that this is \$18 billion which the President's own budget estimate embraces—then obviously the President must either raise taxes or accept a chronic deficit.

Since he has said he will not raise taxes, why has he neglected to inform the American people that he now appar-

ently accepts the idea of chronic, growing, staggering national debt?

The President cannot have it both ways. If he himself accepts a \$18 billion deficit this year the only explanation for his announcement that there will be no tax increase is that he favors running this country even deeper into debt.

Why all this Nixonian rhetoric about a spendthrift Congress? Clearly the President is looking for a scapegoat for some of the most serious economic failures in American history.

Consider the fact that he has managed to produce:

The highest inflation in 20 years;
The highest unemployment in 10 years;

The worst trade deficit in 40 years;
The highest interest rates in 100 years;

and
The most certain prospects for a sagging economy since Herbert Hoover.

Let us hear what others have said about this Nixon power grab:

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) has pointed out to this body that the President already enjoys ample power—the power of budget requests, budget amendments, and the veto—to assert himself very effectively on the matter of Federal spending.

Senator HUMPHREY told the Senate on October 4 very correctly that this Nixon power play could "prove to be the domestic equivalent of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution—a license for the administration to attack and make war on health, education and other programs benefiting the average citizen without congressional approval."

Treasury Secretary Schultz, Nixon's own chief fiscal adviser, is on record as saying that a spending device of the type the administration is now seeking would lead to "chaotic reductions in essential programs."

Hobart Rowen, respected financial columnist for the Washington Post, has detected that the White House attempt to fix blame on Congress for irresponsible spending requiring tax increases was a "phony issue" and that the administration "ought to quit playing politics."

Are we, in the twilight of the 93d Congress, witlessly about to undo that for which our spiritual forebears of the Continental Congress risked their lives and liberty?

The Declaration of Independence cries down to us through nearly two centuries against "repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over the States."

And the very first charge leveled against the King of Great Britain in that historic document is this:

He has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

This is an old and venerable Chamber. It has known great moments. Few, in my opinion, are as memorable as that moment when Alexander Hamilton indicated the House Chamber and announced to a visiting foreign guest, "Here, sir, the people govern." Passage of this infamous abdication-of-power legi-

slation would make a mockery of the great truth Hamilton spoke. It could then accurately be said that here, in this House, the representatives of the people gave over to the Chief Executive the unhampered and exclusive power to decide how the people's moneys were to be spent. Mr. Speaker, this is no less "taxation without representation" than the insulting levies which inspired the Boston Tea Party, and fired our Founding Fathers to move against the British Crown.

The impoundment device alone has enabled the Nixon administration to refuse expenditure of some \$25 billion as directed by the Congress over the last 2 years. And it is nonsense to think that this represents a \$25 billion "savings" to the taxpaying public. The fact of the matter is that through accounting gimmickry and budgetary sleight-of-hand the administration can and does divert funds from their intended purpose to expenditure for items which would not have congressional support if considered on their merits by the Congress.

Some 185 years ago, James Madison writing in "The Federalist," warned that when "the whole power of one department is exercised by the same hands which possess the whole power of another department, the fundamental principles of a free Constitution are subverted."

What Richard Nixon has proposed, Mr. Speaker, is nothing short of fundamental altering of the constitutional balance of powers. He would reduce the U.S. Congress to political impotency.

Throughout American history, our democracy has been vulnerable to the aggregation of excessive powers in the executive. Once again, we may turn to Madison for a clear understanding and exposition of this danger. He said:

Power "is of an encroaching nature, and . . . it ought to be effectually restrained from passing the limits assigned to it. After discriminating, therefore, in theory, the several classes of power, as they may in their nature be legislative, executive, or judiciary; the next and most difficult task is to provide some practical security for each, against the invasion of the others."

James Madison served in this body in 1798, Mr. Speaker. Is there any doubt that today he would cast his vote and raise his voice against this Presidential assault on the constitutional powers of the U.S. Congress?

This issue is as clearcut and as important as that. This business of wondering about tax increases and dollar expenditure amounts pales before the constitutional issue involved here.

Now, let me turn to the concurrent resolution. It is clearly and demonstrably an intelligent and responsible alternative, and it deserves our unqualified support.

This resolution recognizes that both Congress and the Executive must give the closest attention to mounting Federal spending.

It provides a mechanism for sensible cooperation between the Congress and the President in keeping spending within proper limits.

The resolution contemplates a spending ceiling of \$250 billion for the current fiscal year. But since a ceiling at this

level will require very substantial cuts in Federal expenditures, the resolution rightly demands that the President indicate specifically to the Congress just where he would make those cuts.

Are we going to put the fate of those in poverty, those who are sick and cannot pay the bill, those who are out of work, those whose education, and housing are inferior, and whose environment is corroding—are we going to put the interest of these Americans in the hands of an administration which has shown itself incapable of solving their problems because it is too busy serving the interests of the wheat speculators and the corporate conglomerates?

Mr. Speaker, we are greatly indebted to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has formulated in the concurrent resolution a mechanism, which permits the President to analyze and recommend whatever spending cuts he believes necessary. His resolution rightfully preserves in the Congress, however, the power—and the responsibility—for spending reductions and modifications.

It should not be necessary to add that I oppose H.R. 16810 regardless of which party occupies the White House in January. For Members of this body the issue should not be one of partisanship.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I have to say this. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that regrettably it is my intention to vote against this bill if the Manon amendment is not adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I was back in my district over the weekend, and the only criticism that grew out of the widespread Nader publicity with respect to Congress, the only publicity that took hold of the people back there was when he charged the Congress with the abdication of its power to the President.

I say to the Members that on this bill today—and I have voted for it every time the President asked to raise the debt ceiling—I will not vote for it today unless the Manon amendment is in there.

If this passes without the Manon amendment, it will be the most abject abdication of power in the history of this Republic, and no Member of Congress can go home and say, "Well, the Congress is doing its job"; we can just go home and say, "We have turned it over to the Executive."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, and hopefully so, this may be my swan song. I say, "hopefully," because I am very much in hopes that this House will carry out the target date for adjourning this Congress on this weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I must

find myself in disagreement with some of my very closest friends in this House. I hate to find myself in disagreement with the gentleman who sits in the chair up there, the distinguished Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and the very able gentleman, the very close friend and neighbor of mine who has his office across the hall from me, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. Speaker, if I did not support the bill, and particularly that provision of the bill drawn up by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. MILLS), I would certainly be out of cast, and I am sure that there would be eyebrows raised around here, because of the many times that I have appeared in the well of this House for the past 25 years arguing that we had to curtail spending, that we had to retrench, we had to tighten our belts, and that we had to get some sense of fiscal responsibility in the operation of this Government or everything was going down the drain.

I recall that back in those early days when I was hoisting the danger flag of inflation, I made the remark that I was not concerned so much about the future of the Democratic Party or of the Republican Party as I was about the future of the Communist Party or the man, the strong man on the horse, who would take over when we had destroyed this country from within and the wheels of industry had become silent, when jobs were not here and the credit of the country had gone.

It was then that the siren song of the Communists would sound very pleasant to the hungry bellies that existed in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I mention these things not for self-serving purposes, I hope, but again to remind you that I am running true to form here when I support this provision that would give the President of the United States the power—yes, delegate to him the power—let me say to my friend from Texas, to control expenditures to a limit of \$250 billion. How much? \$250 billion.

Yes, it is a delegation of authority; it is a temporary delegation of authority. Some people say that it would make a dictator out of the President. Well, I repeat my theme—I would rather have a temporary dictator for 8 months than to have a permanent one, which is what is going to be the result of the confusion and the chaos that will come about when the value of our dollar has gone down the drain, down to the bottom. And it is going down all the time.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for one debt increase in my years here. I am going to vote for the second one today, because it has this provision in it. I will be equally frank with my friend, the majority leader, about what the humble position of this Member is going to be. He told us what the position of the leadership is going to be, but this humble Member is not going to vote for the debt-limit increase without some provision in it that would give this authority to the President.

Now, let me, if I may, ask this ques-

tion: Where are we? I said a moment ago at the risk of sounding self-serving that I had been waving the danger flag here for these many years. We are raising the debt limit now to \$465 billion. I do not care whose responsibility it is. We are hearing a lot today about it being the responsibility of the man down at the end of 16th Street. We hear a lot about the fact that it is the responsibility of the Democratic-controlled Congress. I do not give a hoot whose responsibility it is; the fact remains that it is here. While I have been crying "wolf" all these years and saying that the crisis was coming someday, I am so happy to recognize that there are some people here today who do recognize that the crisis has been reached.

It is here now. It is not coming, and both sides of the aisle say that something has got to be done about it.

Let us take a look at that debt that is \$450 billion now—and I just had this sum broken down this morning. Do you know what the interest on that debt is? For the fiscal year 1973 it will be \$23.1 billion—the interest. That is four times what they were spending to run the whole Federal Government when I came to Congress. And I am talking about interest, I am not talking about expenditures.

Do you know what that amounts to per day—and I am still talking about interest—it is \$63,287,671. That is what you are paying for interest per day on the national debt.

Since we started the debate on this bill, and by the time I will have concluded, the cost for funding the national debt, for paying the interest on the national debt for 1 hour, will be \$2,636,986.

Let us break it down to minutes. It is costing \$43,950 to pay the interest on the national debt per minute.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 4 minutes of my time, and I hope that I will not use the entire 4 minutes.

It is costing \$732.50 a second to pay the interest on the national debt.

Now, you go home next week, I hope, those who are running for office, who cherish these seats, and you tell your people that you are unwilling to give the President of the United States the authority to hold the spending down to \$250 billion for the next year, and you explain to them how much we already owe and how much it is costing in the way of interest on the national debt.

You explain to them how much we already owe and how much it is costing in the way of interest on the national debt. Or you might go farther than that—if you want to be perfectly honest with them—you tell them that we owe \$450 billion now—and that we have raised it \$15 billion—or we will have—and that prudence would suggest that we start tightening the belt and started economizing and started retrenching and reduce this national debt by \$500 million a year.

How long would it take to retire the national debt at that rate? Oh, just a matter of 900 years. Who is going to

pay it? Talk about your grandchildren—you had better talk about your great, great, great, great, great grandchildren—if this Republic lasts that long.

The crisis is here. Those taxpayers at home—and there are some people at home who are conscious of what is happening to their Government—do not think they all are just trying to get their hands in the till. They understand what is going on. Reason with them. Do not tell them that you voted against giving the President this power—and it is unusual—I almost abhor it—I do not like it.

You would think that the Congress could do it—but the Congress has demonstrated that it will not do it—it will not discipline itself. The appeals of the organized minority groups—and I am not talking of any racial thing—I am talking of the organized groups back home—the demands are so strong that the Congress just does not feel equal to meeting the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I want to talk about the politics of this thing at the moment. There are some people who feel in this election year that the politics of this thing is on refusing the President this authority. If I understand the situation, I think the politics of this thing is that the President—the people—are worried—they are concerned about inflation that results from all of this excessive spending—this deficit spending.

I think the politics is with the President. Now from his point of view, frankly, I do not understand—if he is a political animal as he is charged with being, and I am sure he is or he would not be there—it is a question of understanding—we are all political animals.

I cannot understand why, from a political point of view, any man would want to ask for this kind of authority. Who is going to be hurt politically? Is it going to be my Democratic brother or my Republican brother, or both?

If you give this authority to the President and he cuts back on some of these popular programs, it seems to me that he is the man who is going to be hurt.

My friends, finally permit me in all the earnestness that I possess and in all the sincerity I possess—I do not see how this Congress in this crisis, at home and abroad, can refuse to pass this bill with this limitation of \$250 billion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 309, nays 65, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]
YEAS—309

Abbitt	Erlenborn	McKevitt
Abernethy	Esch	McMillan
Adams	Eshleman	Macdonald,
Alexander	Evins, Tenn.	Mass.
Anderson	Fascell	Madden
Calif.	Findley	Mahon
Anderson, Ill.	Fish	Mailliard
Anderson, Tenn.	Fisher	Mallary
Andrews, Ala.	Flood	Mann
Andrews, N. Dak.	Flowers	Mathias, Calif.
Annunzio	Flynt	Mathis, Ga.
Archer	Foley	Mayne
Arends	Ford, Gerald R.	Mazzoli
Aspin	Ford,	Meeds
Aspinall	William D.	Melcher
Baker	Forsythe	Michel
Barrett	Fountain	Mills, Ark.
Begich	Frelinghuysen	Mills, Md.
Belcher	Frenzel	Minish
Bennett	Frey	Minshall
Bergland	Fulton	Mizell
Betts	Fuqua	Mollohan
Bevill	Garmatz	Monagan
Boggs	Gaydos	Montgomery
Boland	Gettys	Moorhead
Bolling	Goldwater	Morgan
Bow	Goodling	Murphy, Ill.
Brademas	Grasso	Murphy, N.Y.
Brasco	Gray	Myers
Bray	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Brinkley	Griffin	Nedzi
Brooks	Griffiths	Neisen
Broomfield	Grover	Nichols
Brotzman	Gubser	Nix
Brown, Mich.	Hagan	Obey
Brown, Ohio	Halpern	O'Hara
Broyhill, N.C.	Hamilton	O'Konski
Broyhill, Va.	Hammer-	Passman
Buchanan	schmidt	Patten
Burleson, Tex.	Hanna	Pepper
Burlison, Mo.	Hansen, Idaho	Perkins
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.	Pettis
Byron	Harvey	Peyser
Cabell	Hastings	Pickle
Camp	Hays	Pike
Casey, N.Y.	Hébert	Pirnie
Carlson	Heinz	Poage
Carney	Henderson	Powell
Carter	Hicks, Wash.	Preyer, N.C.
Casey, Tex.	Hillis	Price, Ill.
Cederberg	Hogan	Price, Tex.
Chamberlain	Holifield	Pryor, Ark.
Clancy	Horton	Pucinski
Clark	Howard	Quile
Clausen, Don H.	Hull	Quillen
Clawson, Del	Hutchinson	Railsback
Collier	Ichord	Randall
Collins, Tex.	Jarman	Rangel
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes
Conover	Jonas	Riegle
Conte	Jones, Ala.	Robinson, Va.
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Robison, N.Y.
Crane	Jones, Tenn.	Rodino
Curlin	Karth	Roe
Daniel, Va.	Kazen	Rogers
Daniels, N.J.	Keating	Rooney, Pa.
Davis, Ga.	Keith	Rostenkowski
Davis, S.C.	Kemp	Roush
Davis, Wis.	King	Rousselet
de la Garza	Kluczynski	Roy
Delaney	Kuykendall	Runnels
Dellenback	Kyl	Ruppe
Dennis	Kyros	Ruth
Dent	Landgrebe	St Germain
Derwinski	Landrum	Sandman
Devine	Latta	Sarbanes
Dickinson	Lujan	Satterfield
Donohue	McClory	Saylor
Dorn	McCloskey	Scheuer
Downing	McCollister	Schneebeli
Duiski	McCormack	Schwengel
Duncan	McCulloch	Sebelius
Du Pont	McDonald,	Seiberling
Edwards, Ala.	Mich.	Shoup
Ellberg	McFall	Shriver
	McKay	Sisk
		Smith, Calif.

Smith, Iowa	Talcott	White
Smith, N.Y.	Taylor	Whitehurst
Snyder	Teague, Calif.	Widnall
Spence	Terry	Wiggins
Springer	Thompson, N.J.	Williams
Staggers	Thomson, Wis.	Wilson, Bob
Stanton,	Thone	Winn
J. William	Tierman	Wright
Steed	Udall	Wyatt
Steele	Ullman	Wyder
Steiger, Ariz.	Vander Jagt	Wylie
Stephens	Veysey	Wyman
Stratton	Vigorito	Yatron
Stubblefield	Waggoner	Young, Tex.
Stuckey	Ware	Zablocki
	Whalley	Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—65

Abzug	Giaimo	Podell
Addabbo	Gibbons	Rarick
Ashbrook	Gonzalez	Rees
Baring	Hall	Roberts
Biester	Harrington	Rosenthal
Bingham	Hawkins	Shipley
Blackburn	Hechler, W. Va.	Sikes
Burke, Mass.	Heckler, Mass.	Skubitz
Burton	Hicks, Mass.	Slack
Celler	Jacobs	Stanton,
Chisholm	Kastenmeier	James V.
Cleveland	Koch	Teague, Tex.
Collins, Ill.	Leggett	Van Deerlin
Conyers	Lennon	
Coughlin	Long, La.	Vanik
Culver	Long, Md.	Walde
Danielson	McDade	Whalen
Dellums	Miller, Ohio	Wilson,
Dingell	Mink	Charles H.
Drinan	Mitchell	Wolff
Eckhardt	Mosher	Yates
Edwards, Calif.	Moss	
Fraser	Patman	

NOT VOTING—56

Abourezk	Evans, Colo.	Martin
Ashley	Galiifanakis	Matsunaga
Badillo	Gallagher	Metcalfe
Bell	Green, Oreg.	Mikva
Biaggi	Gross	Miller, Calif.
Blanton	Haley	Pelly
Blatnik	Hanley	Purcell
Burke, Fla.	Harsha	Reid
Byrne, Pa.	Hathaway	Roncalio
Caffery	Helstoski	Rooney, N.Y.
Chappell	Hungate	Royal
Clay	Hunt	Scherle
Cotter	Kee	Schmitz
Denholm	Lent	Scott
Diggs	Link	Sullivan
Dow	Lloyd	Symington
Dowdy	McClure	Thompson, Ga.
Dwyer	McEwen	Young, Fla.
Edmondson	McKinney	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. McEwen.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Lloyd.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Young of Florida.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Schmitz.
Mr. Link with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Abourezk.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Royal.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Galiifanakis.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. MOSS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Ms. ABZUG, and Mrs. MINK changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MINISH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2280, CONVENTION FOR SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2280) to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances, with House amendments thereto, insist on House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, JARMAN, DINGELL, HARVEY, and SKUBITZ.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 4018, OMNIBUS RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT, UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tomorrow, Wednesday, October 11, 1972, to file a conference report on S. 4018, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas if the conference has completed its deliberations?

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the conference completed its deliberations at 1300 hours.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16810) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16810, with Mr. ABERNETHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are times here in the House when we consider measures which of themselves may not appear to be very important measures, but which nevertheless tend to influence the course of events for many years to come. In the area of fiscal policy, I believe the bill we have before us today is of such importance. In fact, I characterize this bill as being perhaps the most important bill that the Congress will consider in this session—or perhaps one of the most important bills that the Congress has considered in many, many years.

This bill is one of a series which we considered over the years that has had some impact in stemming the tide of the ever-rising level of Government expenditures. The Members will recall that in meeting the problems of an anemic economy with the Revenue Act of 1964, we took the road of "freeing up" the private economy rather than the road of stimulating the economy through increased Government spending.

You will recall that we did not stay on that track very long. But the Members will also recall that this act was effective in providing the growth in that private sector of the economy which we then so badly needed.

Again in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, Congress dealt with this problem of ever-rising expenditures in a period of inflation by imposing a limitation on spending by the Government. That ceiling was only partially effective, in no small part because of the many exceptions that we provided to the ceiling. In 1969 programs covered by the ceiling were reduced by the President by \$8.4 billion. However, expenditures excepted from the ceiling increased by \$6.9 billion, with the result that we actually had a savings of only \$1.5 billion instead of the \$6 billion that we had originally planned.

Despite this, let me point out, the fiscal year 1969 was the only year since 1960, up to the present time, in which the unified budget has shown a surplus. This was the result of a ceiling and the 10-percent surcharge.

During this period of time, our Appropriations Committee has fought valiantly to slow this rising tide of Government spending. Many examples could be pointed out where they had success in this regard.

Despite these efforts to control spending, Government expenditures have kept on rising. From 1968 to 1969 expenditures rose by nearly \$6 billion. From 1969 to 1970 they rose by \$12 billion. From 1970 to 1971 they rose by nearly \$15 billion and from 1971 to 1972 they rose by slightly over \$20 billion, and even with the \$250 billion ceiling provided by this bill, from 1972 to 1973 expenditures would rise by slightly over \$18 billion.

The question is whether we are to hold the increases in the current year to this \$18 billion or whether we are to have an increase in spending which could rise anywhere from \$24 billion to hopefully not more than \$30 billion above prior year. This kind of expenditure increase is what we must look forward to if we do not control expenditures by the ceiling in this bill.

In pointing out this rising tide in expenditures, I, of course, do not intend to imply that expenditures should not rise at all. They must, of course, rise because of price increases. They must, of course, rise as the Government meets its obligations to provide additional services sought by our citizenry.

The basic problem, however, is whether this spending is to continue rising in the uncontrolled manner which has occurred in the past few years. The deficits in the fiscal years 1970 through and including 1973, even if the expenditure limit in the bill is accepted, can be expected to amount to \$104 billion, or almost one-quarter of our current total outstanding debt. In 4 years, this is almost one-quarter of our total outstanding debt.

Nor does there seem to be any evidence of the change in the pattern of spending for the period ahead. Two independent research organizations, Brookings and the American Enterprise Institute, have recently released studies which show approximately the same outlook for the period ahead.

The Brookings study, prepared by Charles Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates that the full employment budget, if we reach full employment by 1975, and even if we do not adopt any new Federal programs other than those already recommended in the budget for 1973, will show deficits of \$11 billion, \$17 billion, and \$6 billion respectively, for the years 1974, 1975, and 1976. I call your attention to the fact that these are deficits on the full employment basis. This means much larger deficits will show up in our actual accounts.

The American Enterprise study, making its projections on a similar basis, shows full employment deficits until the fiscal year 1978. Its estimates indicate deficits on a full-employment basis of \$5 billion in 1973, \$14 billion in 1974, \$22 billion in 1975, \$13 billion in 1976, and \$5 billion in 1977. I am talking about deficits over and above full employment receipts. Also do not forget again that

this assumes no new Federal programs and only the expansion of existing programs along the normal patterns of growth. Are there any among us who believe that there will not be new programs added to the list to make deficits much larger than these estimates? Of course not, we add them every year.

The need to control spending is particularly great now because many economic indicators again show signs of excessive rising inflationary pressures. These signs have reappeared even though wage and price controls remain in effect, and phase II controls are now approximately 11 months old. The alarming aspect of the reemergence of these signs is that they come when the economy still has a substantial level of unemployment. Although unemployment has fallen slightly from the 6-percent level which persisted for more than a year, unemployment seems still to be on the high plateau of around 5½ percent.

Listen closely to this information, if you will, please. In the third quarter of this year, wholesale prices rose at a 6.7-percent annual rate. This can be contrasted to a 4.9-percent rate of increase in each of the two prior quarters. These wholesale price increases, in the normal course of events, will be transmitted into retail price increases in a period of 3 to 6 months from now.

Increasing accumulation of inventories by business is another sign of rising inflationary pressures. Retail stores inventories, for example, in the second quarter of this year, on an annual rate basis, increased by 7.4 percent over the first quarter. In the second quarter, all business inventories also increased by 4.9 percent over the level in the first quarter. More recently, manufacturing inventories from August to September have risen by 7.9 percent, on an annual rate basis, as contrasted to a 4-percent increase of the August level over that in July.

Still another measure of increasing inflationary pressures is the rise in outstanding consumer credit. Total consumer credit increased by 12 percent from July 1971 to July 1972. In the last 3 months, however, consumer credit has increased at an annual rate in excess of 16 percent. Similarly, bank loans in the last 3 months have increased at a rate of 15.6 percent, which again is higher than earlier rates.

As might be expected with this increase in the use of consumer credit, there has also been a decrease in the savings rate. During 1971, the savings rate was 8 percent or more. In the second quarter of 1971, for example, it was actually 8.6 percent. By the first quarter of 1972, the savings rate had fallen to 7.2 percent and by the second quarter, to 6.4 percent. All of us know the rate for the third quarter will be less.

In recent months there has also been a rise again in interest rates. This is true both of short-term and, more recently, of long-term interest rates. In the case of 3-month Treasury bills, for example, the rate has risen from 3.2 percent in February of this year to 4.6 percent on September 22, 1972. The rate on prime commercial paper has also risen

from 3.9 percent in February to 5.1 percent on September 15.

In longer term issues the rate has only quite recently started to rise again. Much of this is of great interest to the housing industry. In the case of taxable Federal securities, the rate has risen from 5.57 percent in the middle of August to 5.68 percent by the middle of September. The interest rate on high grade municipal bonds in the same period rose from 5.23 percent to 5.37 percent. The interest rate on AAA corporate bonds rose from 7.16 percent on the first of September to 7.23 percent by the middle of September, 15 days later.

These factors which I have been discussing place increased pressure on the money supply, a pressure made far worse by the ever-increasing borrowings of the Federal Government. From October 1971 to August 1972, the basic money increased by about 5 percent. But the estimated increase between August and September of this year, however, is at an annual rate of 7 percent.

Our concern for the renewal of inflationary pressures cannot, however, be restricted just to the domestic economy. A renewal of inflation will increase the prices of our production relative to the prices of imported articles and will also make us less competitive in our sales abroad. If we permit a renewal of this type of inflation in this country, it could well completely offset the expected gains by readjustment of international exchange rates under the Smithsonian Agreement of last December.

So far this year, the change in our balance of goods and services has continued to worsen. The deficit in our overseas merchandise trade, in investment, travel, and other services has continued to grow worse. In the first half of this year, for example, the deficit in merchandise trade averaged \$7.2 billion on an annual basis as contrasted to the average deficit of only \$2.7 billion last year.

For a while after the exchange rate adjustment, a worsening of our balance of trade is to be expected, but this could continue and bring about a new crisis if we allow the rate of price increases to rise further. Under these circumstances, it would, indeed, be foolhardy for us now to permit a resurgence of greater inflationary pressures that are already strong.

Up to this point I have tried to emphasize how important it is for us to control our spending because of the impact on the economy and our international situation as well as because of the impact on Government operations for years to come. I realize that many will say, "Yes; we must control the spending but let us do it under our regular procedures by exercising restraint when appropriation bills or other measures are before us." I would love to see that happen.

Unfortunately, in the current year, at least to July, we have not so recommended.

Talk about reducing the budget, let me tell you what has happened, my friends. When we started fiscal year 1973, there was in the pipeline due to previous and prior congressional authorization, authority to spend \$266 bil-

lion, including 1 year of payments from the social security trust fund and the civil service trust fund, which would add something like \$50 or \$60 billion to Federal funds money.

What did the President ask? The President asked for an additional oblique authority to be voted by the Congress of \$276 billion. If the Congress cuts it, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said, by \$2 billion, we will add to that pipeline of spending, \$274 billion. We add that to the \$266 billion, and what do we come up with? About \$540 billion that Congress will put in the pipeline for spending purposes.

Once the Congress authorizes, the Congress has no further control of any rate at which that money is spent. Who says how fast it is going to be spent? The President's budget is the only document we can look to in order to get any idea of what the total that will be spent in any one year will amount to. He says—the Congress does not say—"I am going to spend \$246 billion when he presented the budget last January."

That has been adjusted upward because of the increase in social security payments and because of the enactment of the black lung program, from \$246 billion up to \$250 billion. But, that is what he says is going to be spent. The Congress has not said it.

Do not hide behind that argument. The Congress has not said anything except that \$540 billion could be spent in this fiscal year, even if it is humanly possible to employ enough people and let out enough contracts—thank God, nature takes care of that—it just cannot be done.

Let us not talk about the fact that we have control over spending. We do not have control of spending in the present situation. We have control of how much we will put into the pipeline for future spending; yes, \$540 billion in the pipeline.

I shall never forget a conversation I had in the White House with a former President one time. I told him that if he made a recommendation to Congress he was then considering making, that in my opinion, humble as it might be, the Congress would undoubtedly defeat his request for additional authority to spend in the field of foreign aid. He said—

All right, let the Congress do it; I have got \$17 billion in the pipeline that I can spend.

Now, this is the way we operate this Government. This is the way we operate. Do you think that any of our people at home can have any confidence in the way we run this situation? They do not have it, and you know it.

Do you think of those people abroad who have so many excessive amounts of our dollars, far more than they need to reserve against their own currency, can have any confidence in the way we run this Government?

Is it small wonder that the value of our dollar abroad is in question? That we face one crisis after another in our international affairs? Is it small wonder, the way we run this Government, that there is a crisis in every area that your Committee on Ways and Means hears when it conducts hearings?

Concerning the crisis in fiscal policy, Mr. MAHON's resolution admits that. After all of those many "whereases"—whereas we are all for doing something and whereas we want to do something—finally we get down to the resolution. It reminds me of cotton candy that I used to eat as a kid, and more recently with my grandchildren; it tastes good, but after you take a bite, you find nothing substantial in it.

I do not find anything in Mr. MAHON's proposal except subterfuge, members study it. What does it do? Mr. MAHON says not later than the 2d of January—he initially had it the 15th of November—the President is to tell us where he thinks reservations ought to be made if expenditures were to be held to \$250 billion.

What would the Congress do with this report from the President? We would consider it. We have to organize in the next Congress. It would not be before March, at the very earliest, or probably April or May, even, when the Appropriations Committee might decide what consideration it will give to the President's recommendations.

But any saving which is made would have to occur in the last quarter of this fiscal year. That just would not happen.

If Members are going to vote for the substitute, let the people back home know that they are not going to stand up for fiscal responsibility, that they are not going to stand up to do something about this growing, penetrating inflation that we have, that will destroy this country in not such a long period of time if we do not do something about it.

Yes, every crisis we have is attributable to this rising tide in Federal spending from one fiscal year to the next, which so far outstrips any increase in our revenues.

Think of the predictions for the future by these two organizations that all of us have a high degree of confidence in. Not until 1978—according to one of them—without adding one additional program, will we be able to contemplate a balanced budget even on a full employment basis.

Now let me tell the Members what I believe. I believe the American people are aware of what is going on. I know the American people want something done about it. If they cannot expect to get it out of this Congress, my guess is that they are going to elect a Congress on November 7 that they think will work in the direction of containing inflation, of containing Federal spending.

Yes; that is what is going to happen, if the Members buy this "pie in the sky" that my good friend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is offering.

Label it for what it is, just cotton candy, with no substance to it. There is nothing within it that means for 1 minute there will be any reduction in the rate of spending for 1973.

And if there is not any reduction, then the \$465 billion limit this bill sets for debt will not be sufficient. If we are not going to control expenditures we will have to come back either with a determination to avoid inflation by increasing revenues, or else have inflation with a debt ceiling

of \$475 billion or \$480 billion before we get to the end of the fiscal year.

What do we want in this country the most? Do we not want a strong economy, with prices which do not increase at the rate they have been rising in the past? Is that not what all of us want?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The key to it is in this spending limitation.

Bear this in mind if anybody argues about being cut back: There is \$18 billion allowable under this ceiling for spending in 1973 over and above the \$232 billion that—on the unified budget basis—we spent in the fiscal year 1972.

Oh, yes; there are people who do not even want their appetites for spending reduced in any way. There are those who would have us spend twice this amount, if it could be done.

Yes, we believe we have reached a reasonable compromise here. Those who believe in fiscal integrity will vote down the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) what we have got here is virtually identical with what his committee reported in 1967, in subsection (c) of section 201 of the bill. If Members will go back and read it, that is where we took the language, out of one of the appropriation bills.

Do you remember that your committee almost unanimously, along with the Committee on Ways and Means, also supported the spending limitation that we imposed on President Johnson in the calendar year 1968? What is different now? Is it just the name of the President?

Some place along the line there has to be confidence reposed in the Chief Executive of this country. He is no fool; he is not going to use this authority in a way that would make it impossible for his party to have a chance to win in 1974 or a chance to win in 1976. As the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) said, he is too good a politician for that.

So I do have to repose confidence in him, because that is all that is left. There is no other way we can get a handle on our present rate of runaway spending and thus runaway inflation. If the Members want to stop both, they should vote with the committee and vote against the substitute of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I will yield to my friend from Texas; yes.

Mr. PATMAN. All right.

Now, this national debt contains \$70 billion that has been paid once. Is that not right?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Why does the gentleman not just tell his colleagues what he wants to do?

Mr. PATMAN. I have just asked the gentleman—

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I know what the gentleman wants to do. He wants to cancel the debt, held by the Federal Reserve System. The gentleman wants to cancel it but this does not reduce the real

debt of the country. The gentleman wants it canceled so we can force the Federal Reserve to come to the Congress of the United States to get its appropriation for the cost of its own administration—

Mr. PATMAN. To make it non-interest-bearing.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No; answer my question. Is that not the gentleman's reason?

Of course, it is the gentleman's reason. The gentleman wants to get the Federal Reserve into the politics of the House of Representatives, and I do not want that. It is run badly enough as it is.

Mr. PATMAN. I will say to the gentleman that this entire debt—

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. We could cancel it all right here.

Mr. PATMAN. The amount is \$70 billion that has been paid.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I say, we could cancel it all.

Mr. PATMAN. And we pay \$4 billion in interest a year on a debt that has been paid for once.

I think it should be pointed out we are paying \$4 billion in interest a year on a debt that has been paid once.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I understand the argument of the gentleman, but it comes down to this one thing: That the gentleman wants to have the Federal Reserve come to Congress to get its appropriation to administer its own, internal programs.

Mr. PATMAN. I understood the gentleman to say he would yield to me.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I do yield to the gentleman from Texas. I would hope, though, that the gentleman would ask me something else.

Mr. PATMAN. I know that is true, of course, because the gentleman cannot answer that.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Oh, I have answered the gentleman. I knew exactly what he was asking.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is asking us to pay \$4 billion a year interest on a debt that has been paid.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman knows that all of the interest the Federal Reserve receives, except the amount of interest that is used for its own administrative costs, is returned to the Treasury.

Mr. PATMAN. But it is violation of the Constitution. The Constitution says the Congress shall appropriate the money, and Congress has not done it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman has got jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve. Why does he not exercise that jurisdiction?

Mr. PATMAN. We have exercised that jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Why does the gentleman ask the Committee on Ways and Means to do that? Why is it not done through the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. PATMAN. We have voted in committee by a vote of 16 to 7 to have the GAO audit the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. All right. It is under that committee's jurisdiction and ought to be submitted in that way.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute at this stage

simply to compliment my chairman for, I think, one of his most outstanding speeches before this body.

All of his remarks are always well received, but I do want to compliment him from the bottom of my heart for the remarks he has just made.

I yield, Mr. Chairman, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI).

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 16810, increasing the public debt limit to \$465 billion through June 30, 1973, providing an overall limitation on Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1973, and establishing a joint committee to review the operation of the budget ceiling and recommend procedures improving congressional control over the budget.

This is the third time during the present session of Congress that the House has been confronted with the unhappy task of acting to either increase or extend the public debt limit. The present debt limitation is \$450 billion, consisting of a \$400 billion permanent ceiling and \$50 billion in temporary borrowing authority which will expire on October 31. The debt subject to limitation was \$435.3 billion on September 29, already far in excess of the \$400 billion ceiling that would be applicable at the end of this month unless Congress acts responsibly.

In view of the likelihood of congressional adjournment in the very near future, it is imperative that we act promptly. I should briefly remind the House that if prompt and responsible action is not taken, the Treasury will be unable to pay its bills as they fall due after October 31. In addition to the hardship imposed on those affected—employees, veterans, social security beneficiaries, farmers, and those who have sold merchandise to the Federal Government—the integrity of Federal finances will be severely damaged. Having voted for the expenditures, Congress must now provide the necessary borrowing latitude to make up the differences between tax receipts and anticipated expenditures.

In this regard, it is essential for Congress, recognizing the fiscal crisis we face, to enact an overall expenditure ceiling of \$250 billion as recommended by President Nixon. We have made significant progress in holding down inflation, increasing employment and raising the level of economic activity. It has not been an easy task and has called for sacrifice and cooperation on the part of all of our people. We must build on this progress and the cooperation of the Congress with the executive branch is required.

The budget figures plainly demonstrate the fiscal crisis we face. In both fiscal 1971 and 1972, we ran deficits of \$23 billion on a unified budget basis. If expenditures are held to \$250 billion for fiscal 1973, as would be required by the expenditure ceiling imposed in this bill, we would incur a \$25 billion deficit on a unified budget basis and a \$4.5 billion deficit on a full employment basis. Increased expenditures above the \$250 billion figure will enlarge the full employment deficit for fiscal 1973 to dangerously high levels. If we are to avoid renewed inflation, creating an expectation

of higher prices that reverberates throughout the economy in wage-price decisions, that makes American goods less competitive in international trade and aggravates our already severe balance-of-payments problems, and that will in the final analysis require significant tax increases, we simply must act responsibly to hold Federal expenditures to \$250 billion during fiscal 1973. As Secretary Schultz has remarked, a budget of a quarter of a trillion dollars, which provides for an increase of \$18 billion in expenditures over fiscal 1972, is not exactly a starvation budget.

Congress has been consistently reminded of the need to establish overall budget priorities that will not require expenditures in excess of the \$250 billion proposed by the President for fiscal 1973. We have been made aware of our fiscal problems in acting on the debt on three different occasions this year. It has been several months since the President recommended a firm and comprehensive expenditure ceiling of \$250 billion.

In spite of this urgent request, congressional action to date, according to the most recent estimates of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, would result in outlays of \$256 billion in fiscal 1973—\$6 billion above the \$250 billion level recommended by the President and included in the expenditure ceiling in this bill. According to material received by the Ways and Means Committee and included in our hearings record, when final congressional action for this session is completed, this figure could be \$12 billion above the \$250 billion figure. This would result in an intolerable deficit on a full employment basis that would be inviting severe economic dislocations.

Responsible action, therefore, requires that we adopt the expenditure ceiling included in the committee bill. Some have expressed understandable concern over the delegation of authority to the President to make budget cuts in order to comply with the ceiling we are imposing. However, we are simply recognizing that the Congress has been unable to establish overall priorities itself for fiscal 1973 and is thus providing the only effective means by which this can be done for the current fiscal year.

In this connection it should be noted that the spending authority requested relates only to this one fiscal year. Additionally, the bill, through the establishment of a joint committee to review the operation of the budget ceiling and recommend improved procedures for budgetary control by the Congress, will lay the groundwork for providing meaningful congressional control in the future. Title III of the bill establishes a joint committee consisting of 15 Members from each the House and Senate to exercise legislative oversight over the operation of the spending ceiling and to recommend procedures to the Congress for maintaining coordinated overall control of the budget, including both outlays and receipts, in the future.

In view of the fiscal crisis we face, the imminence of adjournment, and the inability of Congress to deal effectively with this issue to date, we really have no other alternative consistent with fiscal respon-

sibility. The fact that the authority delegated to the President is limited to fiscal 1973, and that a joint committee is established by the bill to enlarge congressional input into overall budgetary control, should relieve fears about the authority delegated to the President in connection with this ceiling.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important and urgent piece of legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the time has come, obviously, to call a spade a spade, and that is certainly what the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means just did.

Another fact that needs to be laid plainly on the table is that the Congress itself does not set priorities for Federal spending. At no point in the course of the year do we adopt a budget for the Federal Government. Instead, we take up the President's budget requests, and deal with the requests piecemeal.

The truth is we do not have a single Committee on Appropriations for the House of Representatives. What we have is 13 Committees on Appropriations for the House of Representatives, each virtually separate and independent. The full committee, by tradition, treats each subcommittee as a separate authority—very rarely altering subcommittee recommendations.

The appropriations process is thus fragmented for all practical purposes. This is the basic fact that makes so difficult—indeed so absent—the control of the Federal budget by this body, despite the fact that the Constitution very plainly places in our hands the responsibility for such control.

One way that the House could regain this responsibility—one way that this House could avoid the necessity of going through the exercise that we are dealing with today, which transfers to the executive branch the power to set priorities to cut back here and there to bring things into balance or more closely into balance—one way we can do that is to have one single appropriation bill for the entire Federal Establishment all at once. Do I see smiles? Is this really such a ridiculous idea?

The last time we really had a Committee on Appropriations fully in control of all appropriations bills—therefore functioning as a committee was when Clarence Cannon was chairman of the committee and the committee brought to this body one single appropriation bill for the entire Federal Establishment for the ensuing year. That was several years ago.

Now it was quite an ordeal, so they say, I was not here—but it did happen—we did that year have one, single appropriation bill. By that exercise, this body was able effectively to establish priorities for that year. Never since has this occurred.

I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI). He is one of those who cosponsored a change in the rules of the House of Representatives. That proposal provides one other way in which this body could regain au-

thority over the budget. That proposed change in the House rules would provide that no appropriation bill can be considered until the House has first adopted a resolution providing a comprehensive budget for the Federal budget for the next year.

If that discipline were established, we would have some hope of regaining this very important control of the purse-strings of the Federal Government. We would not need to look to the executive branch for budget discipline.

Mr. Chairman, here is the text of the proposal sponsored by Mr. SCHNEEBELI and other distinguished Members of this body:

H. RES. 1020

Resolved, That the rules of the House are amended by adding rule XLV as follows:

“HOUSE AUTHORIZED FEDERAL BUDGET

“1. The Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after due study and review, including consideration of the annual budget message of the President, report to the House a resolution containing a House-authorized Federal budget for the ensuing fiscal year not later than ninety days after the President's message has been received.

“The proposed budget shall include:

“1. Estimated overall Federal receipts from all sources;

“2. The maximum aggregate amount to be granted in obligational authority for all purposes, together with a maximum amount for each appropriation bill or resolution;

“3. Specific recommendations as to adjustment in revenue measures and/or public debt level necessitated by a deficit or surplus, if such is shown by budget figures on aggregate expenditures and receipts.

“When the Committee on Appropriations and Ways and Means have jointly reported the House resolution adopting such budget, it shall be in order, after the report on the resolution has been available to the Members of the House for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays), for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to). Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote.

“After general debate on the resolution, which shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, one-half of such time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and one-half of such time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee of the Whole shall rise and report the resolution back to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

“2. No bill or resolution carrying appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year shall be in order for consideration by the House until the House-authorized Federal budget for such year has been approved.

“The report on each such bill or resolution must include a statement in one of

the following forms: ‘The provisions of this bill (or resolution) conform to the requirements of the House-authorized Federal budget for fiscal year 19 and will not cause it to be unbalanced in any respect. The bill (or resolution) as reported will appropriate \$, and when this amount is deducted from \$, the maximum amount for this appropriation bill (or resolution) under the House-authorized Federal budget for fiscal year 19 , the remaining balance is \$,’ or ‘The provisions of this bill (or resolution) do not conform to the requirements of the House-authorized Federal budget for fiscal year 19 . The bill (or resolution) as reported will appropriate \$, and when this amount is deducted from \$, the maximum amount for this appropriation bill (or resolution) under the House-authorized Federal budget for fiscal year 19 , a deficit results in the amount of \$.’

“Any bill or resolution carrying appropriations whose report fails to include a statement in the first form, or which, in its amended form, fails to comply with the requirement as stated in the first form, shall require the approval of two-thirds of those Members present and voting, a quorum being present. This requirement shall not be waived or suspended.

“3. The joint statement of managers to accompany a report made by a committee of conference on a bill or resolution carrying appropriations shall include a statement in one of the following forms: ‘The provisions of this conference report conform to the requirements of the House-authorized Federal budget for fiscal year 19 and will not cause it to be unbalanced in any respect,’ or ‘The provisions of this conference report do not conform to the requirements of the House-authorized Federal budget for fiscal year 19 .’

“A conference report on a bill or resolution carrying appropriations which fails to include a statement in the first form shall require the approval of two-thirds of those Members present and voting, a quorum being present. Motions to dispose of amendments remaining in disagreement following adoption of a conference report on a bill or resolution carrying appropriations shall require the approval of two-thirds of those Members present and voting, a quorum being present, if the effect of the adoption of such motion would be to appropriate an amount in excess of that contained in the House-authorized Federal budget for such year.

“The requirements of this rule shall not be waived or suspended.”

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have heard my name bandied about in the House of Representatives this afternoon in connection with the spending programs of the Government by people who are largely responsible for the plight that we now find ourselves in.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to make a statement in regard to the facts of the situation that confronts us today.

Realizing that Members would not all be on the floor during the discussion today, I put in the RECORD yesterday, and it appears on the second page of the RECORD of October 9, a statement setting forth my views in detail, which in my opinion give adequate support for all those who wish to support the position which I have taken. This information is available to you.

Now if you go to the man in the streets

and you ask him if he thinks the Government is spending too much, he will say—yes. And so would I. If you ask him whether he thinks the Government should reduce spending—he will say—yes. So would I but I am not arguing about that point. That is what we all say. This is what I have been shouting from the roof tops for many, many months.

But that does not mean that we can embrace in toto the bill that is presented here today. This should not be interpreted as a matter of economy so much as it is a matter of principle and relates to the preservation of the American form of government.

There are those on the floor today who have said, “Well, Congress cannot do the job, let us abdicate.” That is what has been said in other countries and we all know what the result has been. We cannot afford to abdicate, even to any President, regardless of his interest in the public welfare.

I cannot go along with those who would admit failure, who say that we have failed in our job and, therefore, we must abdicate. It is true we have made some mistakes.

In the first place, I do not admit that we have utterly failed in our job.

Now some representations have been made as to large sums of money amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars that have not been spent. These funds in the so-called pipeline are all tied very tightly. They are tied down with legislation as to how the funds can be spent. For example, certain funds could be spent only for new submarines, for roads, for public works, for aid to rural and city areas, and otherwise. Yes, these funds that have been made available are tied down for certain purposes and the President, unless we pass this bill, could not dip down into them and use them for any other purpose because the law controls that.

But let us put that subject aside and return to the immediate subject.

We say that we are confronted with a long-range fiscal problem. This is not a temporary emergency; it is an emergency that has been with us for a decade. We have to do something. We have to adopt a system to take care of the situation, enabling us to get better control of the actions of Congress and the Executive with respect to spending.

Title III of this bill provides for setting up again a committee made up of the leaders of Congress who would wrestle with this problem. We have had such efforts before, but never have we had quite an emergency like this before. So I have hope that something of long range and something of immediate value would come as a result of title III of this bill which sets up this special joint committee.

I would say that if the President is so inclined—and he does not have to do it until after the election under this proviso—he could submit to the Congress the changes which he thinks should be made in order to achieve the \$250 billion ceiling. He has withheld them so far. He could just submit to the Congress the changes which he thinks should be made in appropriations and other legislative action and say to the Congress, “I think

you ought to make the following changes."

This, I would hope, would create a situation to help bring about a long-range remedy to some of the fiscal problems which confront us. In the meantime, there is nothing to prevent the President from making whatever savings he reasonably can under existing law.

We talk about cotton candy, and I would not say that title I of the bill is cotton candy. It says that the debt ceiling for this year shall be \$465 billion, and this figure assumes a spending level of \$250 billion during the current fiscal year. Within perhaps 2 percent this is the level at which we would be without the ceiling. So this spending level is inherent. If the Members vote for title I, they are voting for economy and for cutbacks. It ought to be very clear that this bill packs a tremendous punch in title I.

Title II is a different proposition. It abdicates legislative authority to the executive branch. All right, what has brought us to this occasion? The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says that the Mahon substitute is cotton candy. If taken in conjunction with title I, of course, it is not cotton candy, and it surprises me a bit that my good friend from Arkansas would speak so fervently about economy and a balanced budget when he has led the fight to bring about the condition with which we are confronted today. Yet he talks about economy and points the finger at the Appropriations Committee, and yet the gentleman from Arkansas has led the fight over the last 10 years that has reduced the revenues of this Government by the equivalent of \$50 billion for the forthcoming fiscal year. Except for those reductions, we would be in the black, provided the economy would have behaved as it has.

Yet the gentleman points his finger at the Appropriations Committee. This is not where the problem is. The cutting of revenues and the increasing of spending through the Committee on Ways and Means, through the leadership of the gentleman from Arkansas, have helped bring us to this day of crisis.

Why would he point the finger at the Appropriations Committee with respect to the problem of expenditures when the gentleman led the fight for the \$30 billion revenue sharing which has to a very large extent brought us to this moment of distress.

The President has tried to keep the Congress from providing a 20-percent increase in social security, but he was overridden with the help of the economy-minded chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the 20 percent prevailed.

Yet he talks about how much it is the fault of the Appropriations Committee that we have a fiscal problem. But the Congress under the leadership of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees will have cut the President's spending program for this year by approximately \$1.5 billion and will cut new obligational authority by about \$4 billion.

So it seems very clear to me that there

is a great deal of cotton candy in the remarks of my friend from Arkansas and a great deal of wishful thinking. He was not talking this way when he brought the revenue sharing bill out, in which we grasped a tiger by the tail and will never be able to let him loose. That is where our problem is. It is in the non-appropriation bills that mandate spending where the problem has arisen and that is where our major problem lies. We just must not continue reducing revenues and approving accelerated spending programs.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, my beloved friend with whom I seldom disagree.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to publicly apologize to the gentleman from Texas for having aroused his ire on the social security bill which we have passed in the House. I am sorry he is not in agreement with that. I want to apologize to my friend, whom I have apparently angered as a result of the social security increase.

Mr. MAHON. If we had provided the revenue for the social security increase, I think it would have been thoroughly defensible, and I would have been in favor of the social security increase, but the failure to bring in the revenues to provide the funds to finance the program is the only complaint I would have on the social security problem. The increase was justified.

But what about revenue sharing that the gentleman opposed as early as just a little over a year ago but which he then embraced? That has helped propel us into this situation also.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Again I hope to bring up that conference report on Thursday if the Speaker and the minority leader are agreeable.

Mr. MAHON. And that conference report for this fiscal year is more than \$3 billion over the President's budget for the current fiscal year.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is true. The President has not budgeted it in this 1972 fiscal year, but again if the gentleman is opposed to that program he will have a chance to vote against it and maybe the House wants to kill it, maybe it does, I do not care.

If the gentleman will yield again, will the gentleman not admit that the funds over which the Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction, such as social security and the highway trust fund and others are operating in the black and not in the red? If the funds over which the gentleman's committee has jurisdiction were in the same shape we would not need this bill at all.

Mr. MAHON. I would say this. We do not have control over the entire situation because we do not have the authority in the Committee on Appropriations to recommend increased revenues for the general fund of the Treasury. That power rests with the Ways and Means Committee.

We are operating under a unified budget, and when the President talks about spending \$250 billion he is talking about social security and railroad re-

tirement, other trust funds, and all manner of accounts, and it is not appropriate to say that, well, the trust funds are in the black because revenues this year exceed payments and therefore, the Ways and Means Committee bears no responsibility for the \$30 billion increase in spending brought about by the revenue sharing program and programs otherwise. The budget projected a larger surplus in the social security program but that surplus has now dwindled and it impacts adversely on the budget. With the ceiling then, these increases such as that in social security must come out of the hide of other programs.

I just hope that as a result of this debate we may do what we can in holding down spending in the future years and that the committee set up by title III of the gentleman's bill will be effective. I just hope that never again will my friend from Arkansas bring in a bill in which authorization is given to the executive branch to amend existing law. Congress should not surrender the power to legislate or the power of the purse. We should not abdicate the authority of the legislative branch, our power of the purse. That is the way we find ourselves under the gentleman's bill. On page 2 it says:

The amount available for obligation (as determined by the President) shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula.

I am sure the President will do the best he can. I am not attacking the good faith or the good will of the President. He will do his best to administer this bill well, but we give him authority which should not be given to any President. We ought to control the legislation.

I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If it is the fault of the legislative branch, whomsoever's fault it is, would the gentleman not admit with me that we have a crisis in our fiscal situation?

Mr. MAHON. I think we do.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Would the gentleman—

Mr. MAHON. Just one moment. I think we have a crisis. We have had one for quite some time, but the Secretary of the Treasury, in the August 28 issue of U.S. News & World Report, was asked, "What is your opinion of the state of Government finances?"

He said "Good, at this point."

I still think we do have a crisis, but according to the Secretary of the Treasury, it was not so frightfully bad at that time. I hope that after the election a more realistic approach can be taken.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman may, I think, take that statement with a grain of salt, because we are in an election year. Would the gentleman not say so?

Mr. MAHON. I completely agree.

It is said that we will have a tax increase if we do not vote for the Mills bill. But, under the Mills bill, we will have, according to estimates, a deficit in Federal funds of \$32 billion. What would happen otherwise if \$5 billion more—

2 percent additional—is spent we would have a deficit of \$37 billion? Why is it so assured that we will not have a tax increase if the deficit is \$32 billion, but we will have a tax increase if the deficit is \$37 to \$38 billion; I fail to follow this rationale.

I am grateful for the generous amount of time allotted me. I have not spoken in anger, and I have the greatest respect for my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), with whom I have often agreed. I believe the frank discussion of the problem before us will be helpful in clarifying the issues before the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it is most heartening to note the inclusion of title III in the measure pending before us, H.R. 16810, which establishes a Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget with a direction to report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate not later than February 17, 1973.

The 30-member committee, comprised of members of the House Ways and Means Committee and Committee on Appropriations, as well as the Senate Committees on Finance and Appropriations—plus one additional Member from each body—appears to be a most appropriate and workable committee which can help fulfill the fiscal responsibilities which the Congress should assume and exercise.

Mr. Chairman, my concern as a Member of the House of Representatives for our Nation's economy—and for our prerogatives as keepers of the Nation's pursestrings—dates from the time of my first election to the House. The support and encouragement for the concept of a Joint Legislative Budgetary Committee came from such distinguished Members of this body, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) who has long supported this proposal, the late Representative Clarence Brown from Ohio and our former colleague from Missouri, Mr. Tom Curtis.

I was encouraged to introduce legislation along the general lines of title III in the 88th and 89th Congresses. Later, I authored that chapter in the Republican volume recommending reform of our legislative branch and was proud to have my article included in that volume, "We Propose: A Modern Congress."

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings which have preceded the Reorganization Act of 1970, I testified before the Joint Reorganization Committee in behalf of a Joint Legislative Budgetary Committee. Accordingly, it is easy to understand that I am most heartened by the provisions which the Committee on Ways and Means has included in this bill.

While the authority granted to the joint committee is very modest, it does indeed represent a giant forward step—particularly in that part of the title which mandates the joint committee to study and report on procedures for improving congressional control of budgetary outlay and receipt totals.

Mr. Chairman, the uncoordinated and

sometimes irresponsible manner in which this body acts on appropriations—with out regard to the revenues which may be needed—and furthermore, the absence of any order of priorities—about which there is so much rhetoric and so little action—suggests the timeliness and importance of supporting title III by our votes here today.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 16810. I believe firmly that we should establish an overall ceiling on expenditures, and I feel further and even more firmly that we should establish here and now a Joint Legislative Budgetary Committee—and thus make a new and dramatic start on a responsible, coordinated, and extremely valuable agency of the legislative branch of our Government which can enable us to act with intelligence and with confidence in behalf of the economic welfare of every man, woman, and child in our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee on bringing this proposal—at long last—to the floor of the House of Representatives and I urge its favorable passage here and in the other body.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to impose a ceiling that gives the President budget-cutting discretion, but I believe we have gotten beyond the point in this country where we have very many options left.

Any housewife knows that any meaningful budget must establish a ceiling on expenditures. But we here in the Congress have failed to face up to that reality. We are responsible ultimately for our fiscal situation today. We are responsible because we failed to establish the mechanism for budget control in the Congress of the United States.

We abdicated, long ago—not in this bill, but long ago we abdicated to the executive department. The only place where a budget is put together is in the Office of Management and Budget downtown. When they send their recommendations to us we go through a few motions of raising or lowering the spending requests, but we have lost the capacity to decide our own priorities in this Nation of ours. That is where the responsibility really is.

Until we face up to that basic responsibility and establish the kind of mechanism whereby we can establish priorities and put an annual limit ceiling on expenditures, then we do not have many other alternatives than to take palliatives like this, and let the President choose among the options.

Somewhere we have to devise the vehicle to put it all together. Do not tell me the Appropriations Committee puts it all together, because it does not. One hand does not know what the other is doing.

We hear all this talk that, "Well, in the appropriations process we have not exceeded the budget." Let me tell the Members the only thing that counts is the total expenditure level, whether it comes from within or outside of the appropriations process. Until we can devise a vehicle for putting those nonappropriated funds into the same basket and

coming up with an overall limitation we have not faced up to the issue at all.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is speaking very wisely in saying that we do need to look at the whole package. While we do cut appropriations, if increases outside appropriations come into the picture, as they have, then we are in difficulty.

So the gentleman feels that we ought to take a look at the whole package, and I agree.

The gentleman, as I understand it, was one of the sponsors, if not the chief sponsor, of title III which would bring about the organization of this committee and thus bring the problem into better focus. In this we could consider both appropriation and nonappropriation bills and expenditures as well.

Does the gentleman think there is some merit to that?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am saying essentially the same thing.

I do not think you have necessarily done as well in the appropriation process as you believe. All you do is take a look at the priorities they have established downtown and add a few things and take away a few things. But the Congress itself does not have any mechanism for devising its own priorities and cutting up its own pie; we just work some adjustments on a budget that is put together downtown; we do not put it together in any way whatever.

I would say to the gentleman that certainly we have backdoor spending, we have all these matching grants, and we have all the automatic spending, but what I am also saying is that they have just as much impact on inflation as these other items, appropriated or nonappropriated.

Until we can put all of them together in one package, until the Congress can put its will in the total spending program, then there is no way we can get this country back to sanity in the area of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making a most important statement with respect to where we have really failed in the Congress in terms of addressing ourselves to fiscal affairs, and I would ask the gentleman if it is not correct that really the Congress never considers expenditures as such; we consider only obligational authority.

That is all the Committee on Appropriations deals with; it does not establish the level of the spending in any given year with a specific figure. It gives obligational authority.

The gentleman is so right when he says that we have to focus in on looking at the whole picture, but also we have to focus in and look at what is going to be spent in a given year. There is no budget of expenditures except the one we get from the President, and then that

is more or less forgotten after it is sent up here; is that not correct?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He could not be more correct.

Members of this body do not even have an opportunity to be fiscally responsible. We vote for appropriation bills that continue the obligatory authority for programs that extend over a period of years, but where do we ever have a single opportunity to vote on the essence of fiscal responsibility for any given year, what it is spending when put all together?

We do not have that opportunity, Mr. Chairman. It is our own fault, because we have lost the process, and that is the No. 1 challenge in my judgment in this Congress of the United States.

People talk about congressional reform, and certainly there are a lot of areas where we need reform. But all of the reformers are ignoring the primary reform that this Congress should be undertaking if, in fact, we are going to exercise our responsibility wisely, if we are in fact to keep this country solvent, so we can go ahead and establish all of the great programs we need.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the gentleman would take note of the fact that the Constitution says the duty of the President is to see to it that the laws are faithfully executed. Is not an appropriation bill enacted by the Congress and signed by the President into law?

Mr. ULLMAN. Well, that is correct, Mr. Chairman, except this: I am pointing out that the Congress is irresponsible in its appropriation process and in its authorization process.

Mr. Chairman, let me go on. Let us look at the situation we have today. Even with this ceiling, this \$250 billion ceiling, we have a full employment deficit of \$5 billion. Now this full employment deficit involves a Federal funding deficit of some \$32 billion, and the Federal funding deficit is the only thing we ever used to talk about until 4 years ago, when we started to use the unified budget concept, which in my judgment is not the best way to analyze the deficits when we come on the floor of the Senate and talk about Federal spending.

I think the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows that the trust funds are not only in balance but they are putting a surplus into the unified budget. We have made the unified budget look better because we have a surplus in our trust fund accounts, and so we have covered up a lot of our own mismanagement in that process of using the unified budget.

Now, we also refer to the full-employment budget, and that is something this administration now uses to obscure the massive deficits in our economy. We Democrats are not totally without fault, and at times when the economy was slow, we spent more than we took in. But at least we did not invent a theoretical rationale that makes it all look good.

But now this administration comes in with a full-employment budget which

is not really sound because it is based on a 4 percent unemployment level, and it means until you get down to the 4 percent unemployment level, you are going to have a deficit. We cannot run this country on that kind of a theory.

But even on that kind of false premise this ceiling will give us a \$5 billion full employment budget deficit. When you look at the Federal funding deficit this ceiling will leave now a \$32.4 billion Federal funds deficit in fiscal 1973.

That is on top of back-to-back deficits in the past 2 years—Federal funds deficits—of \$30 billion in fiscal 1971 and \$29 billion in fiscal 1972. They all add up to almost \$100 billion.

If you do not put this ceiling on, the minimum Federal funds deficit will be \$40 billion, and if some of the bills we have in the pipeline go through before we adjourn, it could be \$45 billion or \$48 billion.

All I am saying is that this country has a crisis. Believe me, if you do not think it has a crisis, just talk to some of the international bankers. You take a look at some of the statistics and the pressures that exist for another wave of inflation in this country. This ought to be the No. 1 campaign issue in this election and the No. 2 campaign issue should be the status of our balance of trade—our deficit in our balance of payments and balance of trade—but neither one is being talked about very much because people seem to like these charismatic issues that do not really face up to the gut problems of our country.

The time has come, believe me, for this Congress to restore to itself the mechanics of budget control. It is time we gave ourselves the opportunity to be fiscally responsible, because we are depriving ourselves of that opportunity under the present processes of Congress. That is why I propose title III to this bill.

Title III, an amendment I sponsored in the committee, sets up a joint fiscal study group consisting of members of the Appropriations Committee and members of the Ways and Means Committee, together with a Member appointed by the Speaker from the House membership without regard to his committee assignments. This group, acting together with similarly appointed Members from the Senate side, is to make a full study and review of procedures which could be adopted by the Congress to improve congressional control of budgetary expenditures and receipts, especially procedures for coordinating expenditures and revenue totals. It is important to emphasize that this is a temporary study group which will be in existence only through next year and that it only can make recommendations for action by other committees of Congress.

The recurring fiscal crisis which we have faced in recent years, in my view has reached the stage where we must not postpone dealing with the problem any longer. While, of course, the study group may reach conclusions quite different from those I entertain, it is my view that we need a committee with legislative responsibility to look at the budget as a whole. I think it would be appropriate to assign to such a committee the task of determining each year the expendi-

ture ceiling which is appropriate in view of the status of the economy, our social needs, the status of our national defense, and any other considerations which it determines should be taken into account. Since the main thing that such a committee would have to consider is the interrelationship and coordination of revenues and expenditures, to me it seems wholly appropriate that the committee should draw its membership largely from the appropriations and revenue committees.

Much of the difficulty with our present arrangement arises from the way we are organized. At one time the Ways and Means Committee and Appropriations Committee were one committee, but this was ended more than a hundred years ago because the work was too much for one committee. Nevertheless, the splitting of the committees into two, ended our opportunity to coordinate spending and taxing policies. We need a mechanism to restore this coordination feature.

I recognize that in the past, in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, an attempt of this type was made and that it failed. A study of the experience under the 1946 action suggests the reasons for failure at that time. First of all, the committee was a joint committee consisting of all of the members of the two Appropriations Committees and the two tax committees, a group of approximately 100 members. Clearly, this was too large a group for effective committee action. Secondly, this group had no legislative jurisdiction. It could recommend an expenditure ceiling, for example, but it had no legislative authority to make such a decision effective. This unfortunate experience from the past I hope will not be repeated in the recommendations of the study group to be appointed in title III.

I hope also that in the future it will be possible to work out an expenditure ceiling at the first of a congressional session. The advantage of this lies in the fact that Congress itself can then make its own plans as to expenditure priorities, deciding among competing priorities to the extent this is necessary to live with its own ceiling. This will be far better than to continue to be forced to turn this authority over to the President, as events in effect have done for this year.

It is, of course, important to maintain with Congress the right to determine the purposes for which funds shall, or shall not be spent, but I think it is far less significant, if we yield the President a minor amount of control in this respect in the current year, so long as we set up in the Congress a procedure to develop real control over the purse for all years to come.

I believe that history will demonstrate that the changes this committee will recommend will turn out to be of great importance in restoring a balance of power between the Congress and the executive branch over fiscal activities.

This could be, in my judgment, the most significant action that this Congress takes in this whole session, because for all too long this problem has been building.

What I am saying is that we had better establish the mechanics for Congress to

put all of the spending totals together again, because if we do not we are going to do one of two things—we are either going to go further down the road in abdicating these responsibilities to the President, or else this Nation is going to fall because of fiscal insolvency.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is on the Committee on Ways and Means, and if I may say so I am sure he must know as much about the Committee on Appropriations as I do about the Committee on Ways and Means. But I have a great respect for the responsibilities of the Committee on Appropriations, and I know that they do have the right to be fiscally responsible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield to me, I am sure the gentleman will recall that in 1959, I believe it was, that the President vetoed the public works appropriation bill, and spelled out the projects to which he objected. He vetoed that bill, and it came back to the Congress, and I happened to be the one to send it back with those projects, but in doing so we cut the bill 2.5 percent so we could save the money, so we overrode him. And that is what the Constitution requires.

Now, if we turn over to the President the entire Federal money responsibility, that responsibility that the Congress by the Constitution has been given, and that the people themselves have the right to retain, that authority through us as their representatives under the Constitution.

And I would respectfully point out that I have served on that committee since 1943, and I state that there is ample authority in that committee to decide that which is necessary to be done, and that what we should be doing here is not giving that authority to the President in the White House.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the facts seem to speak a lot louder than words, and that, if we do not do this, then we have a \$40 billion Federal deficit staring us in the face. We really cannot tolerate that, and it could easily be \$45 billion if we pass the rest of the bills in the pipeline.

If the Committee on Appropriations has the mechanics and the authority to exert this control, why are we in this kind of a situation?

All I am saying to my friends—and my dear friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN)—and he is one of my dear friends—all I am saying is that I am trying to protect the gentleman from the blame as to the situation we are in by pointing out to the Members of this House that the Committee on Appropriations does not have control over all the spending in this Congress, and that we have to get an overall Budget Committee that does impose that kind of control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The gentleman from Mississippi well knows that every appropriation bill has obligatory authority, and does not have an expenditure ceiling for any given year. That is what we have to do. In my judgment, this is fundamental, and I hope that the Members of the Congress will go along with the establishment of this committee. And I hope then that early in the next Congress we can establish the kind of budget procedure that can again restore to the Congress of the United States the basic priority-making functions that we long ago lost, and restore to the Congress of the United States the mechanism for setting a ceiling on annual expenditures. And until we do that, this country, believe me, is in trouble.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is to be congratulated for developing the idea which is in title III, and because I have such high regard for him, if that committee is established I would want him to be its ranking Democratic member from the Committee on Ways and Means. Because I know that he has dealt in this field at length, I would want him to be the leading Democrat from the Committee on Ways and Means on that special committee.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to thank the gentleman, but I hope he will reconsider that because I think this committee is of such fundamental importance that we need the fiscal experience and sense of responsibility that the chairman has always shown. I hope he will remember, if this is enacted, and agree to serve on that committee.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend and do agree with the points he made about this overall committee. I do appreciate his giving me the opportunity to point out that it is within our control if we on our committee would accept it.

Mr. ULLMAN. Let me say this. The folks back home are not satisfied that we have jurisdictional problems here. They do not know that we do not have the mechanics for being fiscally responsible. But let me suggest that they hold you, and they hold me, responsible and, believe me, if we are going to survive, we had better establish the kind of mechanics that allows us to be responsible here or else the folks back home are not going to understand it at all.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute just to announce to the Members, and so that the Chairman will understand, that we do not intend to use our full 2 hours.

I do understand that we just do not have that demand on our time to that degree. I understand that the majority side does have a considerable amount of demands for time. I certainly will yield

time, Mr. Chairman, but I hope Members will bear with us, with the idea that we would like to retain some speakers for the latter part of the debate and that we will not be using all of our time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield at this time 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE).

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), has spoken forcefully and truly—heroic action is necessary.

The upsurge in the private economy cannot stand soaring Government expenditures as well, because of the probability that price instability of damaging proportions will result.

We should not spend our time here today pointing the finger of shame at each other and assessing blame. This is a sterile and even a puerile performance, if that is all we do.

The question now before the House should be given the conditions—what do we do about it?

It is foolish to pretend that we are going to control expenditures by controlling obligatory authority in the short term. Indeed, our appropriations are going the other way and even if they were not, the pipeline already contains enough to whet the appetite of the biggest Government spender among us.

A spending ceiling is not the final solution. It is only a necessary stop-gap. The necessity for it should sober us and make us work for a longer term answer within the framework of a purely congressional approach. This ceiling applies only to the fiscal year 1973 and we are challenged not to leave ourselves in a position where we have to depend on the President, whoever he may be, for the fiscal year 1974, if we are to continue to seek the confidence of the American people in Congress as an institution.

Hopeful as I am that we will address this problem through some basic reform of our congressional fiscal mechanism, it will not be possible to do this for fiscal year 1973. Unless we address the present fiscal crisis by doing what is necessary now, before the 92d Congress adjourns, we can be sure that we will be unable to resist the twin economic disasters of inflation and higher taxes.

Frankly, I am not sure even in the short term that what we are doing here is enough to protect us, but I am sure that it is the bare minimum. The roughly \$6 billion that we are asking the President to cut out of a spending rate of a quarter of a trillion is modest in comparison to our capacity so frequently demonstrated in the past to think of new ways to invest the public treasure in swelling public programs. I hope this House will support the expenditure ceiling without exception and that we will here resolve to follow a course in the future making such unhappy devices unnecessary.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Whip on this side, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that this Congress and this country is facing an economic crisis.

We have the highest unemployment in a decade.

We have the highest inflation in two decades.

We have the highest budget in four decades.

We have the highest trade deficit in eight decades.

We have the highest interest rate in a century.

In 1969, when Mr. Nixon became President of this country, we had a balanced budget. Mr. Johnson turned over to Mr. Nixon a balanced budget, from which Nixon cut \$8½ billion. Why did he do it? Because there were only 3 million unemployed Americans. President Nixon thought he could curb inflation if he added another million to the unemployment level.

What happened? It is an incredible record. During the 4 years of the Nixon administration one quarter of the \$465 billion public debt has been incurred, twice as many are unemployed, and twice as many are on welfare. We have a trade imbalance for the first time in history. Inflation has gone up 18 percent. The dollar of the year 1969 is now worth 86 cents.

The gentleman is asking me to vote to abdicate the powers of the Congress of the United States to a President who lacks the fiscal discipline necessary to control the Nation's economy.

Mr. Chairman, the pivotal issue in this debate is whether Congress is voluntarily going to abdicate its constitutional responsibility in controlling the purse strings or whether Congress is going to take a firm stand in retaining its rightful oversight review of Federal Government spending.

My distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. JAMES BURKE, has called the spending provision of this bill the "Gulf of Tonkin resolution of 1970 in domestic affairs." Mr. BURKE could not have chosen a more appropriate epithet.

Mr. Chairman, if you vote to put a ceiling on spending without specifying where the cuts are to be made or where they are not to be made, then you are voting to abdicate all congressional control over Federal Government spending. You are creating a new banker of America—a new czar in the executive branch.

If you vote for the spending ceiling, you can return home to your congressional district this fall and campaign for re-election on the slogan "Write to the OMB to see how much money will be available for the problems of this district. I supported the measure which gave to the President the authority to determine which programs would be fully funded and which ones would be reduced."

If you support this spending ceiling, President Nixon, who has already impounded congressionally authorized funds, will be able to make expenditure cuts in the areas of social security, aid to blind, child welfare, health, and veterans benefits. When a senior citizen in your district asks you about increased benefits to help meet the cost of living, you can tell him that it is up to the capriciousness of President Nixon to decide whether the 20 percent social security benefit increase will be funded this year.

Can you honestly look this senior citizen in the eye as his Representative if you vote for this spending ceiling? Do you really want to create a new czar in the executive branch? As responsible Members of this body, can you vote to abdicate constitutional responsibility in controlling Federal Government spending? Are you willing to vote for a domestic Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which you will most certainly regret by this time next year?

I believe that Congress has already surrendered too much leeway to Government departments in determining priorities within certain areas and in permitting funds to be allocated as deemed appropriate by the various Government agencies. A vote for a spending ceiling without guidelines is a vote for a further erosion of congressional responsibility.

The President has said that a vote against the spending ceiling is a vote for higher taxes. He claims that Congress lacks the discipline and machinery necessary to hold down spending. I charge that the President lacks the discipline and machinery to hold down spending. In the past 4 years, the administration has run budget deficits exceeding the total deficits of the 16 years of the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations combined. In fiscal year 1973 alone, it is estimated that the deficit will be \$27 billion. Is this an example of fiscal responsibility?

I say as responsible Members of this House that you cannot and will not give up congressional responsibility in controlling Government spending. I say that you will support the Mahon substitute to require the President to tell Congress what programs he intends to cut before receiving congressional sanction of a spending ceiling. Then his proposals would be subject to strict congressional scrutiny and Congress would retain its rightful oversight review and responsibility in controlling the purse strings. I say you are willing to do this, because a vote for the Mahon substitute is a vote in the public interest; it is a vote for fiscal responsibility. It is a vote against higher taxes. It is a vote in the best interests of the Nation.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. The gentleman was here when the gentleman from Arkansas spoke, and he seemed to indicate to the House that if we passed this bill, which he designated as one of the great pieces of legislation of all time, that we would be making a fight against inflation.

Is the gentleman persuaded that if we pass this bill that we are not going to have inflation in this country? Is the gentleman persuaded that this is the bill that is going to stop inflation?

Mr. O'NEILL. We have to look at the record. The record shows an inflationary increase of 18 percent in the last 4 years. The answer to the gentleman's question is, of course not. Can a bill of this type stop inflation? No. As a matter of fact, I wonder, without reporting back to the people of America or reporting back to

this Congress, where President Nixon will make the cuts.

The gentleman and I know where the cuts will occur. They are going to affect the little man in America who has suffered under the last 4 years of this administration.

Mr. HANNA. I think the gentleman is completely correct. The administration would engender its own answers by saying Congress should stop handling its own affairs. In the last 2 years the administration has raised the price of flour by a dollar. It had previously raised the price of milk. I cannot see how putting more power in the hands of this administration is going to cut inflation where it hurts the common man the most.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am in agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, if we pass this piece of legislation, I wonder if there is one person on the other side of the aisle, or the gentleman from Arkansas who is urging this passage and the abdication of our powers, who would predict that prices will not be higher next year than they are this year? If there is one person who believes this will stop inflation and that prices will not be higher next year than they are now, let him stand up right now or put it in the RECORD.

Mr. O'NEILL. Furthermore, may I say we know President Nixon has had 13 or 14 vetoes during the course of his administration. Each veto has been either against education or against the person who has depended upon America to help him along. He is the one who has suffered. And President Nixon will make the same kind of cuts between now and the time we come back if we do not make him responsible and answerable to the Congress.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out we are talking about a ceiling that affects \$6 billion beyond the debt ceiling. Outside of the debt ceiling we are borrowing \$28.2 billion not affected by this legislation and not controlled by this Congress. This heavy borrowing fuels inflation without controls or restriction. His kind of borrowing must also be included in legislative controls.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose this bill in its present form.

This legislation constitutes a complete abdication of one of the few powers which remain in the Congress—to fix priorities and to limit expenditures.

The Congress of the United States has already become the weakest part of the tripod which constitutes the American Government. The courts have exercised extraordinary powers—to almost tell us what we can discuss and how we should legislate. The immense

powers of the Presidency, which can spell the difference between one person's success or failure, or a corporation's profitability or survival. This power already extends to doomsday.

The power of the Presidency is extremely close to its safe outer limits. We are dangerously close to complete rule by the President. We are moving rapidly away from the rule of law on which this democracy so critically depends.

This is a movement which dangerously threatens the form and substance of American Government.

This bill says in subsection b of title II:

The President shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligatory authority heretofore or hereafter made available, such amounts as may be necessary to provisions of subsection (a), which is the expenditure ceiling.

This language provides the President with authority to act notwithstanding any other law enacted by 91 previous Congresses in the history of the United States.

This bill would provide power—which the President says he will not use—to cut social security and veterans benefits. But there are no stated limits or restraints of this power. The outer limits of this power are undescribed—unknown to and unsuspected by most of us today.

This power could be used geographically for areas of America which curry the President's favor and be denied to those areas of America which politically resist or deny the President support. These powers could be used to continue preferential spending for those segments of the economy which support the President and have made appropriate contributions in one kind or another and be denied to those who have not supported or contributed.

In this bill, we are overlooking the fundamental purpose of those laws over which we have labored. They were designed to provide equality, to provide help or stimulation based on established criteria. What we do in this bill of simple language is undo an entire body of carefully studied and reviewed legislation which established priorities of action and criteria for their determination. For this we substitute the discretion of the President. Discretion is no substitute for the rule of the law based on equality and national purpose.

This extraordinary request should be denied any President—whoever he may be and whoever becomes his successor.

The President has all the power he needs to control and limit Federal expenditures. He has already demonstrated his power in "freezing" billions of dollars in Federal programs. He has already demonstrated his capacity to "red tape" to extinction any program which he dislikes.

If there is one dollar of waste or error in Federal contracts—and there are billions—the President's man signs the contract. If there are drones on the public payroll—and there are hundreds of thousands—the President's men hired them and can fire them. If there are disgust-

ing subsidies paid to the undeserving, the President's men order it done.

Congress can develop appropriate measures to control inflation and hold down expenditures of the Government and the Federal deficit. Congress must put an end to "inflation" by Executive decree—through which untouchable forces in America can raise prices at will.

Controlling Federal expenditures within the debt ceiling will have little effect unless it is accompanied by a control on Federal borrowing outside the debt. In 1972, Federal borrowing outside the debt will total \$28.2 billion. Total Federal borrowing outside the public debt will total \$224.5 billion at the end of fiscal 1973. Federal borrowing along with Federal spending compound to make the debt and fuel the inflationary spiral.

Congress can act and adopt an appropriate control of expenditure, the public debt, and inflation. This should be done by a new Congress with a fresh mandate from the people. As for now, I refuse to sink another coffin nail into our system of constitutional government.

I refuse to yield another iota of the dwindling capacity of this Congress to do anything about the crucial activities of our Government. I refuse to give any President the right to set aside not only the work of this Congress—but all of its predecessors—since the beginning of our Union.

If it is the will of the American people to abolish the Congress let them change the Constitution.

I do not believe we should take it upon ourselves to abolish this institution or to reduce what usefulness remains from our earlier transfers of congressional authority.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the able gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact that in history, wherever legislative power has been lost to the executive, or to the executive authority, it has not been by a sudden coup but most of the time by the long and gradual erosion of the power of the legislative body?

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman, with his long experience in the Congress, can speak with greater authority on that point than almost anyone else in this Chamber. He is absolutely right.

We must also remember that when the President has this power, Members of Congress will be marching over to his office to try to get needed programs for their communities. Each one of these requests will be a mortgage, a mortgage on the very independence and freedom of the individual Member.

This bill will make the individual Member of Congress subservient and obedient to the will of the executive. It could demoralize the legislative process.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio, my distinguished colleague.

I would like to ask the gentleman, I

do not know how much he remembers of his reading of Roman history, but I am sure he remembers that when Rome got to the point of recurrent crises, one of the things the Roman legislature did was to give the consul dictatorial powers.

That is exactly what the President is asking the Congress to do. I do not need to remind the gentleman in the well what happened to the Senate and the democracy of Rome when they started that practice. That was the end of their democracy, and they never got it back.

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman makes a very pertinent point.

There are grave dangers to our democracy in this grant of powers.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. We hear a great deal of historical comment today. I happen to be one Member who is still troubled about which way to go. I recognize we do have a fiscal crisis and I want to vote in the best interests of the people. The gentleman says that we are abdicating our powers.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GIAIMO. The gentleman has stated that we are abdicating our power. Is it not a fact that we do not have power over spending, and that is what we are talking about today? Spending is new obligatory authority which we have voted in this fiscal year and in prior fiscal years, and the President in fact does have the power, by withholding and impounding, as the gentleman has said, to fix a ceiling on spending.

What we must do in the Congress, in supporting the resolution, would be to cooperate as to the overall amounts of money which will be spent in any fiscal year. I do not see it as an abdication of power.

Mr. VANIK. Except that we lose the right to establish priorities; we lose the right to decide as an equal; we lose the right to decide what should be in the national interest. We lose the right to establish program criteria.

The President can make a geographical or preferential treatment. He can spend where it serves his interests rather than the national interest as determined by the Congress.

If there is a bad contract, his man signs it. If there is an unnecessary public employee, his man hires him. If there is an unlawful or wrongful subsidy paid out, his man pays it out. He can control waste and unnecessary spending if he sets himself to the task.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, President Nixon in his request for a \$15 billion increase in our national debt is asking Congress to give him authority and control over governmental expenditures which, under the existing law, belongs to the Congress of the United States.

Members must realize when they vote

on this outrageous and unreasonable request of the President's that they are contributing toward undermining our system of government. The President is in fact pointing a political pistol at the Congress of the United States and threatening them, that if they do not cooperate with his request there will have to be a tax increase. He tells the American people that if we do not pass his spending ceiling proposal with his special spending authority there will have to be a tax increase. This threat, coming from the President of the United States within a month of a presidential election, is a brazen attempt to blackmail the Congress into giving the President this authority on the threshold of a congressional election or he will go out and accuse the Congress of being flagrant spendthrifts.

This political blackmail is typical of numerous unprecedent and unethical political practices that the Nixon campaign for reelection has resorted to for victory on November 7, 1972.

This political maneuver threatens the constitutional power and responsibility of the Congress to control appropriations. If the Congress supinely submits to this unheralded political maneuver it will mean that the President can divert money from health, education, antipollution, housing, hospitals, and other necessary programs into increased military expenditures, foreign aid, or any other expenditure that might suit his desire and personal satisfaction.

On the other hand, the record of the Nixon administration shows and demonstrates that our national debt has increased approximately \$86 billion since he was inaugurated. Billions of tax money have been diverted from the Treasury by reason of his welfare program for industry and big business in recommending a 10-percent tax credit on the argument that it would restore prosperity and curb inflation. The Congress reduced his request from 10- to 7-percent tax credit bonanza but the President's proposal should have been rejected entirely. No effort has been made by the President to curb inflation after the Congress gave him complete authority to curb any rise in wages, prices, and so forth, in January 1969—11 months after he assumed office. This bill was signed by the President and lay dormant in his office for 22 months. Almost 2 years later, in August 1971, the President announced his celebrated 90-day freeze which was a failure. He then substituted phase II, which has been a failure in curbing inflation up to the present time. His failure to curb inflation and the increase in unemployment has greatly curbed the inflow of Federal taxes which also contributes toward his request for increasing our national debt authority.

When you consider the billions we have sent to Southeast Asia in the last few years, that money could have reduced our Government expenditures by untold billions, had he carried out his campaign promise of 4 years ago to terminate that unfortunate and unnecessary war in Southeast Asia. You must recollect that he specifically told the American people

in 1968 that "an administration that did not terminate that war in 4 years should not be given another chance." The American people believed him, and had he followed through with that promise there would be no request today for a \$15 billion increase in the national debt.

I predict that any Member of Congress who will vote today, and submit to the President's indirect threat and give the unrestricted and blank check power of expending Federal taxpayers' money to the President of the United States, will eventually have to answer to his constituents for this unheralded and unnecessary change in the laws now governing the expenditure of the Federal taxpayers' money.

Congressman GEORGE MAHON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee is sponsoring an amendment to this legislation requiring the President to submit a "line by line" report to the Congress on any changes he desires on appropriations by January 2, 1973. I will support the Mahon amendment.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) a member of the committee.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have never made a career in this house of being obstreperous or obstructionist. My philosophy has always been to try to work within the legislative process particularly in committee where the principal elements of any major piece of legislation are determined. Needless to say, I have probably ended up voting for more legislation out of a feeling that it was the best I could expect during any particular Congress rather than out of unbounded enthusiasm. In other words, legislation is the result of compromise and by definition one is understandably not satisfied with the results in every detail.

So I rise today not as one who relishes playing the role of crusader but because after considerable soulsearching, I find myself with no other alternative but to oppose my own committee, a majority of whom has reported favorably H.R. 16810. Included in this measure to raise the debt ceiling of the Nation to \$465 billion is a provision which has made this one of the most controversial bills of this session of controversial bills. I am referring to the provision which would impose a spending ceiling of \$250 billion on Federal outlays this fiscal year.

Let me make it crystal-clear, if I do nothing else this afternoon, that no one is arguing against the need for a spending ceiling. Where we do disagree and should disagree is on the manner in which this ceiling will be implemented. If H.R. 16810 were to pass in the form in which it was reported out of committee this, in effect, would be the last thing Congressmen would have to say about the ceiling. The President, or perhaps worse still the Office of Management and Budget, would then make all the decisions as to where the necessary cutbacks will be made.

Much has been made of the fact that the word cutback is somewhat inappropriate since what would be affected are reductions in moneys which have only

just been appropriated and the increases which would be affected are increases over last fiscal year's level of spending. In other words, there would be no reduction below last year's level but rather in this fiscal year's. To me, this is nothing more than hair-splitting. To a Congress which has just spent months going over hundreds of items in countless appropriation bills both in subcommittee, full committee and then before the full membership of both Houses, making the painful decisions as to which programs should receive increased funding, which programs can continue at last year's level, or what programs should be reduced or eliminated—all part of a process of addressing the attention of Congress to the needs of this Nation here and now, not last year—to this Congress any reductions are in effect cutbacks in what people and agencies throughout this Nation have been counting on as a result of bills signed into law by our President.

Furthermore, there is nothing in the bill as reported out of committee which would prevent these bureaucrats from reducing the level of spending in any programs below last year's level of spending. Nothing whatsoever. And there is the rub. There are absolutely no restrictions whatsoever on the use of executive department discretion throughout the Federal Government's spending program. There is no penny which the President cannot touch under this legislation. There is no program which can be considered safe from the most drastic cutbacks.

It seems to me that what we are doing is putting every ongoing program in this country on very shaky ground indeed, if this were to pass. Added to all the other uncertainties facing any program dealing with the needs of people would be the added uncertainty that their budgets are subject to review at any moment and reduction if an official or officials at the Office of Management and Budget feel differently about the merits of those programs than Congress and presumably the President when he signed the appropriations into law. This kind of uncertainty can play havoc with whatever success might come to any number of programs. Rather than diminishing my fears for the worse, statements by administration officials in support of the ceiling to the effect that the ceiling would be used to cutback or eliminate manpower training programs, housing programs, health care programs, and various aid to education programs have confirmed my worse suspicions.

Simply expressing its feeling that \$250 billion should be the upper limit on Federal outlays this fiscal year, as the House Ways and Means Committee has done in H.R. 16810, is to leave it to others to make the tough decisions we in Congress were elected to make under the Constitution. Admittedly, the decisions will be difficult, but that is hardly reason to "pass the buck" to the bureaucracy. There is already too much government by decree and backroom bureaucrats in the OMB in this country today. Congress has already abdicated enough authority in foreign affairs; now we are being

stampeded into abdicating what authority we still possess in domestic affairs.

For decades, the White House has sought an item veto without success, unless it was through impounding of funds. I, for one, cannot condone Congress' legislating its approval of either of these practices in the name of balancing this year's budget. For me, H.R. 16810 is a veritable trojan horse which anyone in favor of representative government will live to regret in the years ahead. Some of the greatest harm to our institutions in years past has occurred in the name of some of the most laudable goals or direct emergencies.

Thus, which I agree on the laudable goal of reducing the budget deficit and agree on the need to act now, I find myself disagreeing on the approach and the method. Let the Congress stipulate where the reductions will be made or the President use his Constitution-given veto, as he already has on this year's labor—HEW appropriations bill, but did not with either defense or foreign aid bills.

Fellow colleagues, it is not too difficult to read between the lines of some of the editorials screaming for this ceiling at all costs. Many of these same publications opposed the programs most likely to be cut back when they passed and every time they have been funded. But in a democracy a majority is supposed to govern and editorials do not always reflect majority opinions about what programs are important and which are not. Perhaps the editor of the *Wall Street Journal* might sleep more comfortably at night feeling that these decisions will now be for the White House to make—or some bureaucrat at the Office of Management and Budget—instead of for Congress where the people are represented.

Yet these same people will be the first to criticize Congress for abdicating increasingly larger chunks of its authority once the implications of H.R. 16810 are fully appreciated. I make no apologies to any one for having been the first to liken this grant of authority to the "Gulf of Tonkin resolution of the Seventies in domestic affairs," in dissenting views to the committee report. If there are those who want to be so blind as to refuse to see similarities between events in our foreign affairs and this event in our domestic affairs, then I can only assume that they choose to ignore the lessons of history and the tragic events of the last 10 years have been totally lost upon them.

If the prospects of a \$30 billion deficit are all that alarming now in October it was just as alarming in January when it was first proposed. It was also just as alarming a year ago when the President first announced his conversion to Keynesian economics, at least as far as deficit spending was concerned. Now we are being told the planned deficits are coming home to roost, and then some, and our economic managers instead of being criticized or removed for the advice that they gave are being used as an excuse for another helping of power. This Congress has the responsibility for exercising control of the purse strings according to the Constitution.

If a deficit is the worst thing we have

to fear here and now, then this is where the soul searching should begin and the necessary cutbacks made. To me, it is the epitome of hypocrisy for the same administration to pressure us on the need for cutbacks that only a few weeks ago was working with us to add another \$5.3 billion to the deficit in the form of revenue sharing.

I supported revenue sharing then because I felt there was a need for fiscal relief to our cities and towns. But everyone knew it would add to the deficit and no one seemed to object, least of all the administration. It would indeed be the height of irony if our local cities and towns around the Nation were the first to feel the effects of the executioner's axe on their long-awaited revenue sharing checks.

But none of this begins to compare with the hypocrisy of the most blatant case of political blackmail I have witnessed in 14 years in Washington. Now we are being told that if Congress does give the President exactly what he wants and passes H.R. 16810 as reported, then the President is going to have no choice but to raise taxes next year. First of all, it has been no secret that the Treasury has deep within its confines under loose wraps a master plan for a value-added tax. The administration has been looking for an excuse for months now to foist this latest form of regressive tax on the American people. I suppose this bill is as good an excuse as any. Needless to say, it will not come before November. We could never expect that much honesty from this administration. But moreover this administration is beginning to sound as though the final word on a tax increase rests with it. This is letting the arrogance of power go too far.

The fact is that we in Congress will have the final say on any such recommended tax increase and under the same constitutional authority which is being challenged here today. Or perhaps the administration has mistakenly assumed that the proposal before us today would also give it power to raise and collect taxes without congressional authority. I, for one, would welcome the administration bringing up the matter of taxes early next session. It would provide an excellent opportunity for some long overdue tax reform. After a few loopholes were closed around here, you might find that an across-the-board increase in taxes or a value-added tax were not necessary at all.

So I hope no one will be stampeded before leaving for home this week into signing any more blank checks to this administration. I am sure we have the leadership in Congress to make the necessary decisions if they must be made. I, myself, may vote against this bill if the Mahon amendment fails. Even the Mahon amendment I support reluctantly because it seems to me that the President, in requesting authority to make cutbacks should be requested to inform Congress before the elections where these cutbacks will be made, not after. Surely the President had to have some idea of what areas would be cut back before he requested the authority. Thus, I do not think this would impose any kind of burden on the OMB and would make sure

that the people have a chance to consider the wisdom of these cutbacks before they vote in November, not only for the next President, but for Members of Congress.

As I see it, this is one of those times when a Congressman finds it necessary to respectfully disagree and stand firm when he feels a vital constitutional principle is at stake.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, history is strewn with the ruins of popular governments which have failed and refused to exercise financial restraint.

A Congress jealous of its responsibilities should be—and, to legitimately justify its jealousy, must be in fact responsible. To date we have not been, and we should not seek to wrap round our shame the cloak of constitutional theory in order to hide the naked fact of our demonstrated irresponsibility.

We discover today, on this vote, whether we in this body have any claim to fiscal responsibility at all.

I wish, indeed, that the Congress, long since, had put its own house in order and had done the necessary job.

I rejoice that, in title III of this bill, which creates a joint committee to review the operation of the budget ceiling, we—hopefully at least—are taking the first step to that end. But in the meantime it is, in my judgment, essential in the public interest that we limit expenditures for the fiscal year 1973 to not more than the huge sum of \$250 billion.

Gentlemen may orate as they will in order to placate the insatiable demands of the various self-centered special interest groups which are destroying this Republic with the assistance of easy spending politicians; but I am not going home and tell the people I represent that Congress—with my concurrence—has proved to be both incapable of managing this country for 1 year on less than \$250 billion of the people's money, and unwilling to allow the Executive—for 1 year—to do the necessary job which a responsible Congress would have done.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLESON) a member of the committee.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if I thought for a minute, or even had hopes that this Congress would place a limitation on expenditures for this fiscal year, I would be for the change proposed by the amendment to title II of the bill pending before us.

The President sent his formal proposal to the Congress in July. The Congress has done nothing about it. There has been an opportunity for the committees of this Congress to come up with something and I think it would have been very appropriate that the Appropriations Committee do this job. Finally, when it is necessary to increase the debt ceiling, this becomes the time to place an expenditure ceiling on the executive department.

Mr. Chairman, looking at this situation in a manner in which I think is realistic, the President has the Congress over the barrel; and you know who made the barrel? The Congress. I see no other

way, effectively, to curtail spending except to put the obligation on the executive department, on the President, and then support him in it. I know that there are voices raised here in what I really believe to be a somewhat biased attitude, that cuts will be made in the programs which are dear to us—social security, veterans' benefits—these things which tend to raise a fear in our hearts that some drastic action of this sort will be taken. I cannot imagine that the President of the United States is going to be looking to some of these essential programs such as these mentioned and apply any meat ax. Of course, parenthetically, he could look to revenue sharing which we are likely to pass in the next day or two. If we, the Congress, should turn down or even postpone until January 1 the effective date of revenue sharing, we would just about have this problem licked. In other words, the difference between the cost of revenue sharing in this fiscal year, 1973, by making the effective date January 1, 1973, instead of going back to the first of January 1972, would almost pay for the sums which are calculated to be cut to bring the expenditure ceiling to \$250 billion.

But this is neither here nor there. In all likelihood this House will finally approve the revenue sharing proposal. The President could find no more appropriate expenditure to cut than these first year funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, no doubt it would be more correct, and more in keeping with the legislation processes if the Congress assume its responsibility and try to look at these huge expenditures and reduce these programs, many of which have proved to be wasteful, extravagant, and not reaching the people they are supposed to help. It seems we are just unable to get hold of the handles to do that. Now here is opportunity to do something, and if you want to really reduce expenditures it seems to me it is the only way.

Look at the whereases in the resolution that would change title II of this bill. The whereases in the proposed amendment render any reduction to death. It talks about congressional constitutional responsibility, and I respect that highly. I wish we had the mechanism to make it effective. The third "whereas" says that Congress is concerned about the fiscal plight of this country. Well, of course, it is. But I repeat, we have not done anything effectively about it. We have not limited expenditures. And then there is another whereas referring to all the deficits which will be occurring. Over \$32 billion deficit for this fiscal year 1973, and yet we continue to pass huge expenditures over and above the budget. And then there is the "whereas" that the President has not advised Congress on specific reductions and budget authority. But it seems to me the very onus of the responsibility which the President is requesting can be granted with credit to each individual of this body, and the Congress as a whole, to say to him, "all right, you have asked for it." We have got to do something about this desperate fiscal situation in which we find our-

selves. Now, we can "resolve" all we want on the request of the President to advise Congress not later than January 2, 1973, of specific reductions in expenditure outlays and changes in existing law affecting same, that in his judgment may be best made in order to limit budget outlays for the fiscal year 1973 to not more than \$250 billion but who really believes this Congress will approve the President's action? This in the face of warning from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and some of the foremost economists in the Nation that we are rapidly approaching a fiscal crisis. The amendment provides that it is the sense of Congress that, upon receipt of the list of such specific reductions and modifications, the Congress shall consider legislation dealing with the President's recommendations. Now, the interpretation of this resolve clause is, as I think most of us know, not to agree with cuts the President will make. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in the precarious situation which this country faces in its financial matters, when today we are raising the temporary ceiling on the debt to \$465 billion, it is time that we try to do something effectively.

Mr. Chairman, it is provided in title III of this bill that a joint committee of the Congress shall try to find ways and means to really place an expenditure ceiling, an appropriating ceiling, for the fiscal year 1974. Remember, this measure before us now is only applicable to this fiscal year 1973. It is an experiment in a way—granted. And granted that it should be otherwise desirable I repeat, here is a prospect of nothing being done and that the huge deficits now already running \$70 billion over the last 3 to 4 fiscal years and the prospect of another one well over \$30 billion; how long can we expect this to go on? It can have no other effect but feed inflation and contribute to the necessity of raising taxes. The two are inseparable and unless we are willing to do something here now and not wait until half the fiscal year is over and then say to the President, "You send up the cuts and we will see whether we like them or not." We could just as well say today that we will not like whatever it is.

Now there is not a Member of this body who does not know that some of the vast spending programs which are now in effect could be reduced without doing real damage and harm. There are a lot of these programs which we all know are wasteful, extravagant, and are not reaching the people they are supposed to benefit. There has got to be a limit somewhere on what this country can do. And even if it was accomplishing the purposes for which it was intended, there are still areas of fat that we all know can be reduced. In these areas where the program is ineffective, they should be cut, they should be reduced to manageable proportions and then we will have opportunity to take action in the 1974 fiscal year to try to correct and reform many of these programs that have gotten out of hand and have caused this Nation to be in a precarious condition today in its fiscal affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I see no other way than

to grant the President this authority, which is not unlimited authority as it has been stated here. Some appear to want to make this a panic situation, and it is insofar as our budgetary affairs here are concerned, but it is not one to push the panic button because we are jealous of prerogatives. There are some jealousies among us here too as to who should do what in meeting this problem, but we better put away these little jealousies and this competitive attitude right here in the Congress and try to get on with the people's business.

The people of this country are aware of the threat of more inflation and higher taxes and they don't like it. I say to you as individuals and to my Democratic colleagues of this House, that you cannot make "Brownie points" by voting for this amendment which I think you know is weak, meaningless, and ineffective in limiting Government spending.

There is really only one issue involved here. It is whether you want a spending curb or you do not. The smokescreen is heavy but it finally comes down to the simple proposition of trying to put our financial house in order.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) disposed a most patent question to a previous speaker. His question made the point of where responsibility lies in this situation.

Finally I refer to the observation of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) who recited a bit of history of the Roman Empire. He calls attention to the abdication of power of the Roman Senate to the Emperor. Yes, that evidently hastened the end of that great government but it was only the result of their irresponsibility in their fiscal affairs. They were taking care of everyone and even entertaining the people in the afternoon. Those who furnished the taxes became hawkers and mendicants on the street.

We have opportunity right now to take necessary action to bring this Government back to the highest trust, both among our people and other nations of this world with whom we must deal. This is the opportunity to reassure our integrity and responsibility.

I urge the defeat of the amendment to be offered to title II of the bill before us and then passage of this necessary measure.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Seventy-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 419]		
Abourezk	Cotter	Green, Oreg.
Anderson,	Denholm	Gross
Tenn.	Dow	Haley
Aspin	Dowdy	Halpern
Badillo	Drinan	Hanley
Baker	Dwyer	Hansen, Wash.
Bell	Edmondson	Hastings
Blanton	Edwards, Calif.	Hathaway
Blatnik	Eilberg	Hebert
Bow	Esch	Hełstoski
Byrne, Pa.	Evans, Colo.	Hungate
Caffery	Flowers	Kuykendall
Carey, N.Y.	Fraser	Link
Clark	Frey	Lloyd
Clay	Gallagher	McClory
Conable	Gray	McClure

McDonald	Powell	Schmitz
Mich.	Preyer, N.C.	Staggers
McKevitt	Pucinski	Steiger, Ariz.
McMillan	Purcell	Sullivan
Martin	Rees	Symington
Matsunaga	Heid	Teague, Tex.
Metcalfe	Roncalio	Thompson, Ga.
Mikva	Rooney, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Murphy, N.Y.	Rosenthal	Wilson
O'Hara	Rostenkowski	Charles H.
Pelly	Rousselot	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. ABERNETHY), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 16810, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 353 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROTHILL).

Mr. BROTHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time during the 92d Congress—and the third time this year—that we have had to face the necessity of increasing the statutory debt limit.

But there is a major difference this time around. The bill before us today includes a provision for a spending limitation. And if we are really serious about being fiscally responsible, the addition of this provision should be welcomed, because it makes our always bitter debt increase pill much easier to swallow.

If we act on a spending limitation as well as a debt ceiling increase, we are saying in effect that we not only recognize our economic problems, we intend to do something about them.

Beyond the symbolism, however, the debt and spending ceilings are tied together in a very practical way. The proposed \$465 billion statutory debt limit was calculated on the basis of budget outlays totaling no more than \$250 billion in fiscal 1973. A spending ceiling of \$250 billion is absolutely necessary if that outlay total is to be maintained. And the debt ceiling increase is absolutely necessary to keep the Government's fiscal engine running at this predetermined pace.

So the two actions are interdependent, and it has been said that they are inseparable as well; that we cannot have one without the other.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation's economy is expanding nicely now. And a recent poll of businessmen as to their outlook for the year ahead indicated the strongest optimism in a decade. The rate of unemployment has declined to 5.5 percent and indications are it will go down further in the coming months. At the same time, total employment in the country has risen encouragingly to more than 82 million. Total output gained 6.2 percent from the second quarter of 1971 to the second quarter of the current year, and the Industrial Production Index this past August was 8.2 percent higher than it was a year earlier.

Yet amid all this expansion, the rate of inflation has been dropping substan-

tially. During the past fiscal year, consumer prices advanced at a rate which was 1.4 percent lower than the rate for the preceding year.

The signs of solid progress, then, both in keeping the economy rolling and in keeping inflationary pressures down, are very much in evidence today. And if we follow a prudent policy, we can continue to move forward, enjoying economic expansion without having it accompanied by soaring inflation.

Dr. Herbert Stein, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has charted our present position graphically. We are, he has pointed out, at a fiscal crossroads. Along one path lies the very real possibility of reasonable price stability and high employment. Along the other lies the real probability of another inflationary spiral, similar to the one we experienced from 1965 to 1968 but more dangerous in that we would be starting from a higher inflationary rate.

The road which we will take as a nation depends, of course, on what we do here. If we clamp a \$250 billion lid on spending, we will assure a full employment deficit for fiscal 1973 that will be approximately the same as that for fiscal 1972. Under these conditions, the budget would support the rise of the economy, but the main push would come from the private sector. On the other hand, if we acted to increase the full employment budget deficit for fiscal 1973, this would combine with the strong forces from the private sector and result in a total expansion which would almost certainly be highly inflationary.

So we really do not have much more of a choice with respect to the spending limitation than we do with respect to the debt ceiling increase. We can go through the motions of debate, but fiscal responsibility requires that we take affirmative action on the bill combining these provisions.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

The President of the United States has delivered a simple message to the Congress of the United States. We must move quickly and decisively to control government spending or be faced with "higher taxes, higher prices, and a cut in purchasing power for everyone in the Nation."

Over the years lip-service has been given to "balanced budgets" and "fiscal responsibility," but the fact is, the liberal majority of the U.S. House of Representatives, as managers of the Public Treasury, has done an appallingly bad job. So bad has been the majority's performance that were the Congress to exchange places with the board of directors of General Motors or any other corporation, they would bankrupt the business in short order by their profligate spending policies. Fortunately or unfortunately the U.S. Treasury has a greater capacity to absorb debt than any private enterprise. And the liberals in Congress have not lost any time in piling up that debt upon debt by adding millions upon mil-

lions of dollars to almost every program that comes before the Members for a vote. From fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1971, outlays—expenditures plus net lending—have increased from approximately \$111 billion to about \$211 billion. During the same period, receipts increased from \$106 billion to \$188 billion. Only once during that whole period, in fiscal year 1969, did receipts exceed outlays—\$188 billion as opposed to \$185 billion—for a budget surplus of about \$3 billion. And even then the budget was only in balance when the collections of the trust funds were incorporated into the total for Government revenues. In every other year since 1963, outlays were greater than receipts, resulting in budget deficits which ranged from somewhat less than \$2 billion in fiscal year 1965 to an alarming high of \$23 billion in fiscal year 1971. The almost continual annual deficits of course have led to substantial increases in the gross Federal debt. The debt increased from \$311 billion in fiscal year 1963 to \$408 billion in fiscal year 1971, the highest in American history.

Estimates for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 are very disturbing. The most current data available for fiscal year 1972 indicate an outlay level of \$233 billion versus anticipated receipts of \$207 billion, for an expected budget deficit of \$26 billion. Initial forecasts estimated an even greater deficit of almost \$39 billion. The expected reduction in the deficit is fortuitous rather than planned. A deliberate policy of expanding Federal outlays was adopted; only the inability to spend money fast enough—the incapacity to translate plans into on-going programs—prevented outlays from reaching the intended level. With lower outlays, and higher receipts than originally estimated, the fiscal year 1971 budget deficit is now projected at \$26 billion—less than expected but still the highest since the peak deficit years of World War II. Furthermore, the deficit for fiscal year 1973 is expected to be even higher: \$27 billion, with outlays programmed at \$250 billion and receipts anticipated to be \$223 billion. Several non-government economists, however, predict that the eventual fiscal year 1973 deficit will be significantly higher than the official \$27 billion. Because of the continuing deficits, the growth in the public debt will persist; the debt will be about \$436 billion for fiscal year 1972 and is expected to reach \$477 billion at the end of fiscal year 1973. Interest on this debt is presently costing the taxpayers billions of dollars per year.

Some economic theorists have advanced the proposition that fiscal policy—the management of outlays and receipts to create desired budget surpluses or deficits—is a useful tool to counter the ups and downs of the business cycle. Implementation of such a countercyclical policy would in theory result in the creation of surpluses during periods with high levels of business activity and low rates of unemployment, and in the creation of deficits during times of depressed business activity and high unemployment. Budget surpluses tend to inhibit the economy whereas deficits serve to stimulate economic activity. Pursuit of

this policy would, in addition, operate to increase the public debt during depressed periods but to decrease the debt during prosperous times. The history of the past few years indicates that there has been no consistent attempt to follow such a countercyclical policy and there is good reason to question the basic premises of the theory. Deficits have been produced both in depressed and prosperous years. Failure to control the increase in expenditures, combined with failure to increase taxes in prosperous years, have, as I have already noted, added to inflationary pressures on the economy.

Overall Federal expenditures continue to increase even though costs for the Vietnam war have been declining. Vietnam war costs reached their peak in fiscal year 1969 when the incremental costs of the war—costs over and above what would have been spent for defense in peacetime—reached \$19.8 billion. War costs since then have declined to an estimated \$6.8 billion in fiscal year 1972 and an expected \$3.5 billion in fiscal year 1973. These latter estimates do not take into consideration the current expansion of the bombing program. But this decline in Vietnam costs has been accompanied by increases in income maintenance and Great Society programs. A recent study by the Brookings Institution indicates that from fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1973, defense and defense-related expenditures dropped from 53 to 34 percent of the total budget, while civilian outlays grew from 47 to 66 percent. Furthermore, the study concludes that many of the numerous social programs, costing billions of dollars, has failed, indicating that money and good intentions alone cannot provide solutions to social problems. Nevertheless the Brookings experts predicted that Federal expenditures for existing programs will increase in the future and that there will be demands for new services from the Government. With the tax reductions effected during recent years the Federal Government will be hard-pressed to find the resources needed to finance these increased demands.

The continued increases in expenditures, in budget deficits and in the national debt have fortunately led to renewed interest in proposals to reduce or control Federal expenditures, to balance the budget, and to limit the growth of the public debt.

We must recognize that, despite the control over the Federal purse strings given to Congress by the Constitution, in practice, the Executive exercises extraordinary control over spending. However, the President frequently cannot take the most desirable action in the public interest when Congress enacts appropriation bills in excess of budget requests. His only recourse may be to veto the entire appropriation bill, which in many cases will be impractical. It has therefore been suggested that the Chief Executive be given the item veto power, whereby he could prevent specific increases which he considers without merit or of low priority.

Several critics believe that there is presently too little coordination between expenditure and revenue decisions by Congress. Congress now views the budget

largely as a series of separate and unrelated acts, with decisions on taxes and expenditures made independently by separate committees in each House. I believe that some way must be found to insure that Congress considers the budget as a whole and relates revenues to expenditures. One attempt to accomplish these purposes was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which established the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. The committee was to meet early in each session of Congress, consider the President's budget proposal in relationship to economic conditions and efficiency, set an annual ceiling on appropriations, and coordinate taxes with expenditures. This committee did not live up to expectations. It was probably too large to be effective, and the overall expenditure limit was difficult to implement. At any rate, the committee died after it was unable to agree on a ceiling in 1947 and after its 1948 ceiling was not enforced.

The Committee for Economic Development has recommended creation of a "joint budget policy conference," to include congressional leaders, majority and minority representatives from the revenue and appropriations committees of both houses, and members of the Joint Economic Committee. This conference would study the budget as a whole, and would provide communication among the revenue and appropriations committees of the two houses and the Joint Economic Committee.

There appears to be much room for improvement in the coordination of appropriations decisions. At present, appropriations are determined in some thirteen separate appropriations bills, with little consideration given by the subcommittee responsible for each bill of its effect on total new obligational authority, total obligations to be incurred, or the likely level of expenditures. The costs of the programs considered in each of the individual bills are not considered in relationship to the costs associated with the other bills. Thus, Congress does not look at appropriations and other expenditures as a whole and compare alternative programs. The omnibus appropriation bill, associated with the fiscal 1951 budget, was an attempt to introduce the necessary coordination, but this proposal met the same fate as the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget.

It is apparent that the Government has not heeded the advice of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

Over the years, many Members of Congress have proposed various methods to bring to the attention of responsible Federal officials the need to restrict expenditures to available receipts and thus to assure a balanced budget. Unfortunately, as the record testifies, these efforts have not been successful. Expenditures keep climbing, deficits continue to occur, the national debt continues to increase. The time for positive and drastic action has long since arrived.

This is why I introduced a constitutional amendment several months ago that contains the following provisions:

Total appropriations as well as total expenditures for any fiscal year cannot exceed total expected revenues for that year. There is to be no permanent increase in the national debt.

The existing debt is to be redeemed.

The above provisions may be suspended only in times of war or national emergency.

If the Congress were to adopt legislation such as I have proposed, the charge could not be made that Congress has abrogated its responsibility over the purse strings of Government. However, the record of the past several decades amply proves that Congress has no intention of meeting its responsibility to the taxpayers and citizens of this Nation.

Whether or not we as a nation should live within our means is not at issue here. Since the Congress has proven that it shall not meet its responsibility in managing the treasury, the question then becomes whether or not we shall cooperate with the President in dealing with this matter.

I believe that the liberal majority has attempted to sabotage a critically important piece of legislation by tying the spending limit authorization to a proposal to increase our national debt. These are and ought to be incompatible provisions and the welfare of this Nation ought to have been given highest priority instead of being relegated to a back seat position merely for the sake of political expediency. Although I and other Members of this Chamber have been deprived of the opportunity to fully represent the views of our constituents on this legislation, I want to make it absolutely clear that I strongly oppose a further increase in the national debt and I strongly favor placing a ceiling upon expenditures of the Federal Government.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

Mr. COLLIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Faced with increasing the debt ceiling for the 14th time in less than a decade, it is eminently clear that we can no longer as a Congress escape the responsibility of doing something positive about the consistent deficit in our Federal spending.

Obviously, if we are to keep taxes at the present level, it is incumbent upon us to see that Federal expenditures do not exceed that which the revenues produce.

We all know very well that it is the spending habits of the Congress in recent years that have done more to fan the flames of inflation than any other single factor in our economy. It seems to me that we have reached the point where we have no alternative but to enact the legislation before us today.

I recognize, as most of us do, that one of the fundamental constitutional responsibilities of the Congress lies in its power to raise and collect revenues and its authority to determine how those revenues are spent. For this reason, when this bill was being considered in our com-

mittee, I did make an effort through offering an amendment, which was defeated, which would have required that cuts be made in appropriations in the ratio of the percentile of the total excess.

In other words, if appropriations exceeded the \$250 billion ceiling by 7 percent, then each bill would have to be cut by 7 percent. In this way we would have retained the authority of the Congress, to establish its own priorities but recognizing those priorities within the spending ceiling.

However, since that proposal did fail, I think we must today take the alternative open to us, and that is to establish the ceiling of \$250 billion.

On the second of October, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after having done some considerable research, a list of bills which have been introduced in this session of Congress and the price tag on each of them. These bills, if they were enacted into law, called for the spending of an additional quarter of a trillion dollars—and I repeat—a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Fifty-one of these measures carry a \$1 billion price tag or more. In other words, each of them would cost that much more for every year of the program. Forty-one other bills would each cost \$1 billion by the time they have been in effect 2, 3, 4, or 5 years.

For example, in one bill alone there were the following words: "such sums as may be necessary," and they appear in that one bill 14 times. Now, how in the world can you control spending with legislation introduced wherein in 14 instances in one bill alone it is simply established as "such sums as may be necessary"?

While most of these measures will fortunately die in committee as far as this Congress is concerned, you can be sure that many of them will go back into the hopper after the first of the year. As time goes on perhaps a lot of them will become law and become a burden on the American taxpayers.

So I implore this body today to take the first meaningful step—and I believe it is the first meaningful step—in the direction of returning some fiscal sanity to our processes here.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I might say the American people should know as we look at this deficit and look at the anticipated deficit for this fiscal year that not one single dime of that money was spent without the approval and the authorization of this Congress. So you cannot put the responsibility any place else but on the actions that have been taken in this Chamber over the years.

I support the bill before us notwithstanding the fact that I would feel better if the amendment I offered in committee had been adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill today.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friends for yielding me this time for I truly believe we face a real responsibility here that goes to the very heart of our Constitution of our country.

The President has already been exercising the power of holding up funds for projects and programs. He has held up funds for rural electrification, sewerage and water grants, public works, soil conservation, for housing, and now even anti-pollution, funds for REAP, and many others, while releasing funds for foreign aid and many other programs which I consider less important.

This measure if passed invites the President to do what he likes or wants to do. We extend to him an invitation. I say should we do that, we will be failing to meet our responsibility as fixed in the Constitution.

When the Constitution was written to set up a government, it was for the people. Uppermost in the minds of the Convention Members was the need to protect the people from that government. That is the reason the major part of the Constitution deals with the peoples branch, the legislative branch, the Congress.

Now I for one agree we need to do something to protect the fiscal integrity of our Nation. I have voted that way.

The Mahon provision does not go as far as I would like. It is not what I advocated. I advocated and thought I had an agreement that we call on the President to send up official requests to rescind such appropriations as he thought should be repealed. Under my suggestion, Congress could act on such Presidential requests. Had we followed that course we would not be abdicating our responsibility.

I repeat we must meet our responsibility. Our Committee on Appropriations needs to hold our total action in line. We can do that.

What we must not do is turn over to the executive branch the right to select projects and programs to go forward and those to be killed. If we do that there is no further need for the Congress, for the Congress will have given up its place as the peoples branch whose prime responsibility is to look after the people.

I know the Committee on Appropriations can meet and agree upon remedial action to hold the line because it has been done before. It can be done again.

The President signed the appropriations of which he complains in general. He could have vetoed them. President Eisenhower did veto the public works bill in 1959, saying that we were asking for far too much money, and designating the projects that under his order would not be built. When the Congress failed to override his veto the bill came back to the Committee on Appropriations. When the members of the subcommittee would not act, I offered a motion in the Appropriations Committee—to reduce the money in the bill 2½ percent, back to the level the President thought wise, but my motion at the same time restored or retained all the new projects, so necessary to protect our Nation. We cut the money out so that we were fiscally responsible, even as called for by the President.

Among the projects saved was the harbor at Pascagoula, the hometown of my friend and colleague, chairman of the Rules Committee, where we had built

two submarines which under the President's veto we could not get out to sea. I may say, too, we saved the Memphis and Greenville harbor projects. The late Clarence Cannon said this was the first time in history this had ever been done. Mr. Chairman, it is time for a second time.

All I am saying to you—and that is all I am trying to say—is that we in the Congress should get busy and meet our responsibility.

There is one other thing that has to be done. Other committees must join the Committee on Appropriations for we have cut appropriations by about \$1.5 billion, or it appears that we will. And we need some help from the Committee on Rules, and from the legislative committees, because our deficit is caused through back-door spending where the Congress has forced spending into the legislation passed. That is where the deficit is now. It is aggravated by the so-called revenue-sharing bill which was passed a short time ago, providing expenditures of \$5.3 billion for the first year and a total of \$30 billion in 5 years, without supervision or requirement of results. That is where our deficit comes from for there is much other legislation where the money is appropriated in the authorization.

That is beyond the reach of my committee but not the Congress. I, for one, assure you that I will go the limit on regaining fiscal responsibility.

We must do so here in Congress, however. To turn all this authority over to any President is to fail to carry out our responsibility to our people, the people of the United States.

I do not blame the President for wanting to withhold funds at his will. It is our responsibility, a responsibility which we owe the people who have elected us to the Congress, to retain this right for the people. We must decide what shall be done with their funds.

My friends, this bill, if passed, would be another step in the destruction of our form of government, of three equal and coordinate branches, legislative, executive and judicial.

We made a great mistake in following the dictates of the Supreme Court, when it took unto itself the right to determine congressional districts, thereby leaving each Member of Congress, duly elected by his people on a teeterpole of uncertainty each 2 years. It, too, violates the Constitution which says the House of Representatives shall be the sole judge of the qualifications of its Members.

In that case we should have thanked the Court for its advisory opinion, agreed that it had merit and given it our sincere consideration but decided for ourselves how far to go.

That is what we need do here. Thank the President for his recommendation, admit we need to do something and do it.

We must not give up to whoever may be President the right to play favorites with projects and programs.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise

in support of the imposition of a \$250 billion spending limit and in opposition to the Mahon amendment.

It is clear that the congressional authorization, appropriations and budgeting procedures have become a hodgepodge, resulting in our inability as a legislative body to grasp and act on the overall spending and deficit picture. There is no denying that we have failed in this task. There is also no denying that, at least temporarily, we are going to pay for that failure.

What we are faced with today, is, in a sense, a judgment day—where we are going to be judged for the fact that Congress has abdicated its responsibility for the purse strings. As a result of this abdication, we have lost much of our say over the setting of priorities and over spending and deficit levels.

What price will we pay? It seems to me that we have only three basic choices, none of them pleasant or ideal.

First, we can leave things just as they are. We can leave the hodgepodge of procedures untouched and make no move toward setting an enforceable ceiling on spending in fiscal year 1973. If we choose this road and in effect defeat both the Ways and Means bill and the Mahon amendment, we and the Nation will pay a very dear price, indeed. If we sit on our hands, there is no question that we will seriously overspend Federal dollars in this fiscal year. This could bring two results, both bad. It could mean that inflation gets worse instead of better—perhaps going back up to the intolerable levels of 6 or 7 percent per year. It could and probably would also mean the necessity for a Federal tax increase, and any way an increase in taxes is approached, it could seriously disrupt the current recovery that our economy is enjoying. I must reject this first alternative.

Second, we can adopt the Mahon amendment, which purports to set a meaningful ceiling on fiscal 1973 spending, but which fails to set up a workable mechanism which would guarantee that the spending ceiling could be adhered to. While the Mahon proposal would keep the power over spending decisions on Capitol Hill—where this power assuredly belongs—it does nothing to guarantee that the end result would be other than a deadlocked battle between the President and Congress as to where and how deep spending cuts should be made.

By leaving it to Congress to approve by affirmative vote each and every decision to reduce spending, the Mahon amendment merely programs a rerun of the present budgeting and appropriations procedure—where the President sends up his budget and the Congress amends and approves or disapproves it.

While I strongly believe Congress should and must have a say over all spending decisions, and I have offered my own ideas as to how this can and should be accomplished, I strongly doubt that adoption of the Mahon proposal would provide any more meaningful spending ceiling for this fiscal year than would the alternative of setting no ceiling at all.

The third alternative is to adopt the

debt ceiling increase bill, together with the enforceable spending ceiling of \$250 billion for fiscal 1973 as reported overwhelmingly by a bipartisan majority of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Again, Congress will pay a heavy price, at least temporarily, if this bill is adopted, but it is a far lesser price than a return to inflation or a cooling of our economy by higher taxes—both of which could be ordained by the first two alternatives.

There is a good and bad side to the Ways and Means language. On the good side, we will be assured that a reasonable spending ceiling will be adhered to, and our constituents will be assured that it will still be possible to hold inflation and taxes in line.

The bad side is a direct result of congressional abdication to date of its responsibility to act efficiently and responsibly to setup workable budgeting and spending procedures. This bill would officially give over to the Executive, by statute, the power to set spending priorities for the 8 remaining months of this current fiscal year. For many of us it will mean that programs we favor will be curtailed and their funding levels reduced. I would hope that no mechanism such as this would ever have to be instituted permanently. But I believe that the current fiscal crisis is serious enough to require that we take this painful step for the coming 8-month period.

There may be a brighter side to the judgment day we are all faced with now. If we adopt the Ways and Means Committee bill, we will, in effect, be putting a gun at our own heads, at the head of Congress, to place top priority on reforming our own appropriations procedures before the end of June 1973, so that never again will we have to stand up and admit to the American people that we are ill-equipped to responsibly handle the task of allocating their tax dollars. The committee bill sets up a special committee to review the present procedures of congressional budgeting, and to recommend comprehensive improvements.

For my part, I have been calling for over 4 years for a reform in the timing of the Federal year. Two years ago, I called for the Congress to set a yearly budget or spending ceiling which would be realistic, flexible, and enforceable so that we in Congress could take back the powers over spending priorities which have, in effect, been abandoned for many years. The very fact that almost every President in recent times has acted to impound funds appropriated by the Congress is testimony to the *de facto* abandonment of our power and responsibility to decide which needs and purposes should receive the most tax dollars, and which should receive the least.

This year, I helped author the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act which would require such a spending ceiling each year, would require that any cuts made by the Executive must be pro rata cuts—taking the same percentage cut from every Federal program, and would require that nonpro-rata cuts targeted at a particular program area would be subject to a veto by either House of Congress within a given time period.

The formula in my bill would give us a far more workable spending ceiling than the Mahon substitute provides, and it would retain in the Congress full power and authority for setting priorities, as the committee bill does not do. To my mind, it combines the best of both approaches, and I will work diligently for its early consideration in the 93d Congress, and will personally bring this formula before the special committee setup for this purpose.

We cannot, however, postpone this judgment day until an unnamed time in the next Congress, Mr. Chairman. We must today choose one of the three roads I have outlined. Forced to choose between three painful courses, I feel we must put the interests of the Nation and the economy above the interests of the Congress and above any further need to make believe that the failure of Congress up to now can somehow be overlooked or swept under the rug.

Faced with this choice, I must choose the only one that offers any immediate prospect of putting controls on Federal spending in this fiscal year. That is why I will cast my vote against the Mahon substitute and for the Ways and Means Committee bill.

By voting for this measure, I am not forecasting or promising my agreement with each and every Presidential decision that will be made to cut Federal spending. I feel certain that I, like every Member of this body will disagree with some of these choices—perhaps even vocally disagree.

But I do agree that cuts must be made in the current fiscal year's budget, and I know that we, in Congress, will not be able to take these steps ourselves.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in my judgment made two of the strongest and most effective speeches that I have ever heard on the floor of the House in a good many years.

There have been other fine speeches on the very crucial issue that this House of Representatives faces today. I happen to agree wholeheartedly with the viewpoint and the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Arkansas—they were entirely right—they were completely accurate when they said that the public—if a public referendum could be held—would insist on a spending limitation.

Now maybe the special interest groups that want a little extra spending here, and a whole lot more spending somewhere else, would not support a public referendum because they know that the results would be contrary to their desires.

Let me put it this way. If there was a public referendum, and the public knew what the alternatives were—either a tax increase or more inflation—the public would support a \$250 billion spending

limitation, a limitation that is \$18 billion more than the Federal Treasury poured out in the last fiscal year. An increase of \$18 billion in the fiscal year 1973 over the fiscal year 1972 is not a limitation that is going to hurt or harm the proper management of our Federal affairs or any program on policy. It is a reasonable limitation and the public would support it.

I think the public will demand this kind of limitation. They want the President to hold the line on spending. They want this Congress to do it. They want Democrats and Republicans to do it.

I subscribe to the observations made earlier by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means who said that a failure to put this lid on would lead to some political difficulties and to some political problems for any of us on either side of the aisle, because the issue will be well drawn—and do not think it will not be.

Even those who oppose a spending lid and even those who favor the Mahon amendment admit that we are faced with a crisis of considerable magnitude. When you have a crisis of this size and magnitude, you do not have any good choice. You have nothing but difficult decisions—hard choices. The choice is here—on the one hand, as some put it, an abdication of congressional authority over the spending process or the obligation authority process.

But I hasten to add that abdication, if it is one, according to the bill, is not a permanent abdication. It is for 6 months. It is for the remainder of this fiscal year until June 30, 1973, when the authority expires under the bill before us.

The other choice is the hard one—but it is a choice of our own making. It is a choice we have forced upon ourselves by our failure to stand up and be responsible in a fiscal way for the last 6 months—for the last 12 months—for the last 18 months. When we fail in that fiscal responsibility, as we have, then we have to grasp at something that will bring results even though it does result in a temporary or 6 months abdication of legislative authority.

The Mahon amendment is too little and it is far too late. The Mahon amendment will not come into effect until January of next year.

As has been pointed out in some of the previous parts of this debate, by the time the next Congress gets organized, it will be at least February and closer to March. By that time it will be far too late for anything to be done effectively to hold the lid on spending during the current fiscal year which terminates June 30, 1973. Furthermore, if we look at the wording of the Mahon amendment, it tells the President to send the Congress a list of where he wants to cut. Then it adds in the postscript.

We may go along.

"We may go along," which, in effect, means there will not be any real lid on spending in this fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a crisis. When a government is in a crisis, drastic action has to be taken. When a person is faced with a financial crisis, that individual,

if he wants to straighten out his financial affairs, goes into bankruptcy. He does not like to do it. He does not like to turn over to other authorities the management of his financial affairs, but the pressure of the crisis itself forces him to take that drastic action.

When a business, whether it is a corporation or otherwise, gets into a financial crisis, what does it do? It goes into chapter 10 or chapter 11 in order to get some breathing space to straighten out its circumstances and get back on a profit basis.

I do not say these are total accurate analogies, but I think they do point out that when either a person or a family or a corporation gets into financial trouble, they have to do something they do not want to do and it is drastic in its implications.

Here we are today after going along blithely forcing more spending, either by authorizations or increased obligation authority—and now we know that we are going to have a bigger deficit of \$7 billion or more or which means increased inflation or more taxes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when we look at the hard realities, we have to step up and take a point of view that is different and unusual, but it is necessary.

I should now like to read a letter to all Members—but I would give particular emphasis to my Republican friends. I think all Members ought to listen. I think all Republicans ought to listen and follow the advice. Let me read a letter from the White House dated October 3, 1972:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1972.
Hon. GERALD R. FORD,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: On the floor of the House of Representatives, you will soon be considering a \$250 billion spending ceiling as part of the Debt Limit Extension.

I recommended this rigid expenditure ceiling to Congress and feel it is one of the most important issues to come before the House of Representatives this year. The results of uncontrolled spending—either higher costs of living or increased taxes, or both—are unacceptable to the Congress, the Executive, and I am sure the American people.

Over the past months, the Administration has been engaged in a determined effort to squeeze inflation out of the economy. This effort has had substantial success, and we are now enjoying a reduced rate of inflation and rapidly rising employment. However, excessive spending or greater deficits than planned to stimulate the economy would only fuel another punishing round of inflation and especially penalize those who can afford it the least. It would inevitably be followed by another economic slow-down and rising unemployment.

Therefore, I hope the House will join me in maintaining fiscal responsibility and tight Budget control by supporting the \$250 billion ceiling as reported by the Ways and Means Committee 21-4, and voting for the expenditure ceiling without crippling restrictions.

With my best wishes,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill is passed and the Mahon amendment is defeated.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield

5 minutes to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to make any remarks on this matter but the minority leader has brought to us a statement from the President of the United States and his own position on this important subject, and since he has, I think it might be of interest to the House for me to read something that I read not long ago.

In my judgment, today we find an erosion of the power and prestige of the Legislative Branch, a change of the intended direction of the Judiciary and an awesome build-up of strength and use of this power in the Executive arm.

If I may repeat, "an awesome buildup of strength and use of this power in the Executive arm." That statement was not made by Ralph Nader. That statement was not made by Mr. John Gardner. That statement was not made by any of the press who have been criticizing the Congress. That statement was made by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan who has just spoken.

It is true he made it on another occasion, during another administration. But does a change in the White House make his position any less consistent? Would he say the same thing in January if, as I think he will be, GEORGE McGOVERN is sworn in as President of the United States and undertakes to get his own priorities on the books? I do not believe the gentleman would say that.

I saw the gentleman from Michigan operate when Kennedy and Johnson were Presidents, and I will submit the record to any examination. If I have not supported President Nixon more than the gentleman from Michigan supported President Kennedy and President Johnson, I will eat my words. And the gentleman knows that is true.

Why all this crying and why all this delay? We all know when the last bills are coming up. The two last bills are nearly always the supplemental appropriation bill and the debt limit bill. There are reasons for that, and we need a debt limit bill and undoubtedly we need to curtail spending, but it is less important in my judgment that we make a mistake in the fiscal policies of this country than it is that we transfer to the Executive the authority that the Constitution of the United States bestowed upon us.

No one has more respect than I for the outstanding work performed by the Ways and Means Committee, and by its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas.

But I think that the implications of this bill go far beyond the question of spending; they have to do with the integrity of the entire congressional system.

The question before us is whether we will knowingly and willingly abdicate not only our powers—but our responsibilities—to the executive branch of government.

The President is asking for an unprecedented delegation of legislative authority to the executive branch which could change laws already enacted and pro-

grams which have been on the books for many years.

He is asking us to give to the Chief Executive powers never contemplated by the Founding Fathers—and specifically prohibited by the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for such a measure.

Let us clear away the confusion that surrounds this question.

Unfortunately, the President has attempted to turn this into a political issue. He is using it as a diversionary tactic to shift the focus of public attention away from his massive failures here at home: his failure to bring the economy under control—his failure to put unemployed Americans back to work—his failure to halt inflation—his failure to make good his pledge of 4 years ago to bring fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government.

Under this diversionary tactic, the President has repeatedly told the American people that a tax increase is riding on our refusal to grant him the sweeping powers he demands.

But we are not opposed to a spending ceiling per se.

If we need to cut spending, then let us do it—but let us do it in the manner prescribed by the Constitution, not in the manner prescribed by the President of the United States.

This is not a partisan issue, despite the President's public utterances. I would oppose any President of any political party who asked us to abdicate our duties in such a way.

Nor is this a question of narrow jurisdictional jealousies. This is a question that goes to the very heart of our system of government. At a time when many citizens have expressed concern over the concentration of power with the Chief Executive, it would be irresponsible for this body to increase that power for no reason at all. And at a time when others have criticized the Congress for failing to live up to its responsibilities, it would be tragic for us to turn our backs on the most basic responsibility of all.

In my judgment, we should support the Mahon amendment. This amendment is in line with our traditional way of doing things. It calls on the President to make specific spending cut proposals to Congress by next January 2. Then the Congress can make its own determination of what should be cut, based on its own sense of priorities and its own judgment of where the national interest lies.

If we fail in this task, then the American people can judge us on our failure. But at least they will not judge us on our failure to live up to our historic duties as an independent and responsible branch of Government.

If this matter is so crucial, talking about living from crisis to crisis, why did not the President tell us about it so that we could put the proper committees to work on it and get the proper debt ceiling within the proper time so that the Congress itself could exercise its constitutional obligations in doing this job?

I say that this is wrong. I say that this is in violation of the oath of office. It is not a question of what the public expects.

We are not bound by what the public expects. The oath that we take when we take our offices is to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That is what I intend to do today.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, like our distinguished Speaker, I oppose the pending bill to establish an inflexible ceiling on expenditures.

While this proposal, on its face, appears to have merit—as we all favor economy in Government—the fact is that this is simply another effort by the Office of Management and Budget—the Budget Bureau—to induce Congress to surrender more of its constitutional authority and responsibility to the executive branch.

The proposal amounts to an item veto on appropriations—and I oppose this—I am opposed to an item veto in any administration, either Democratic or Republican. As a matter of fact, I did not think I would ever see the day when an unconstitutional item veto would be proposed to the Congress. With this proposal—we have gone down the road a long way—the wrong way.

Over the years we have legislated away many powers of the Congress. We have seen too much erosion of congressional responsibility to the executive branch.

A line item veto over congressional appropriations should not be approved.

The expenditure ceiling resolution should be defeated. I support the substitution resolution—which is much preferable—not an abdication of congressional power.

Passage of this bill will mean giving to the executive branch—the Bureau of the Budget—authority to pick and choose at will—the right to select “pet projects” for funding—while denying others.

This expenditure proposal would negate the right of Congress to set any priorities through the appropriations process.

This is another effort by OMB to take unto itself the rights and responsibilities of the Congress.

Much of the press has inveighed against this proposal—the Members understand the issue—the surrender of more congressional authority to the executive branch.

When these bills—to chip away at the powers of Congress—are presented, there is always some rationale advanced by the administration in power, as to why it is necessary. But, the overall pattern is one of diminishing legislative power and increased Executive power. The constitutional system of checks and balances is threatened.

This proposal, which we are considering here today, has been called—“a fiscal Gulf of Tonkin resolution”—a blank check—a give away of power.

After Congress has gone through the lengthy and laborious process of hearings—making cuts and reductions through the appropriations process—we should not now say to the administration in power—you make the cuts—you set the priorities.

Should we surrender on this issue, the work of committees of Congress—both legislative and appropriations—would become, to a large extent, academic exercises—exercises in futility and frustration.

Now is the time to stand firm and say “no” to this further grab for power by the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, others have pointed out some of the reductions which Congress has made in the budget during this session—but, I should like to repeat for the record some of the cuts made by the Appropriations Committee this year.

The President's budget submitted to the Congress called for \$176 billion in new appropriations for fiscal year 1973. All the annual departmental appropriations bills, for this year, have been passed by the House. The Appropriations Committee and the House has cut the President's budget by \$6.3 billion.

The Senate has increased these bills by \$2 billion making net reductions of \$4.2 billion. I repeat, the appropriation committee's have cut and reduced the President's budget by \$4.2 billion.

Contrary to what we hear in some quarters, that the Congress has not exercised any restraint on appropriations bills, I insist that the Congress has made cuts and reductions as indicated.

Overall \$4.2 billion cut in new appropriations. Net: \$2 billion foreign aid; \$5 billion defense spending, and others.

Let me list some cuts made. In foreign assistance—foreign aid, for example, the administration proposed more than \$5 billion—\$5,163 million, to be exact, in new appropriations.

The House cut the foreign aid request by almost a billion dollars—\$967.8 million.

The Senate cut this request by \$2.3 billion. Differences are yet to be resolved in conference.

Concerning the Defense Budget—the House cut and reduced defense spending by \$4.3 billion.

The Senate has reported a comparable cut of \$5 billion.

More than \$300 million was cut out of the military construction budget.

In the Housing-Independent Agencies and Public Works Appropriations bills, on which I serve, the House cut \$506,026,000.

Does this sound like a lack of fiscal restraint?

These are but some of the major cuts and reductions—other economies have also been effected by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is the administration has inflated spending with its own pet projects—such as revenue sharing which is in reality deficit sharing.

Revenue sharing to the tune of \$30 billion was approved at the administration's insistence, approved by the same legislative committee that is now advancing a firm and inflexible ceiling on expenditures. Revenue sharing will cost \$5.3 billion this fiscal year and \$30 billion over the next 5 years.

The administration finds nothing wrong in recommending \$250 million for the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and \$100 million for the Pennsylvania Central

Railroad, but the Bureau of the Budget does not hesitate to withhold funds for school lunches, veterans' hospitals, programs of education, rural electrification, or other programs of human needs.

Based on OMB's proposal to cut these programs plus cuts in public works—plans to dismember the Department of Agriculture, terminate the Appalachian development program—this I say is not a very comforting prospect.

We all remember the experience of the Budget Bureau in freezing funds for public works projects and impoundments, without exception, of all projects added by Congress.

What we are really seeing is a sophisticated fiscal shell game.

If we provide the administration with this authority—what we will see will be cuts for basic programs for our people, while with great fanfare checks for revenue sharing will be mailed all over the country at election time.

In other words, the administration through manipulations of the Budget Bureau will be in a position to give with a flourish with one hand and quietly take away with the other.

If the Budget Bureau has a heart, it is well distinguished, thoroughly concealed, and seldom beats in the public interest.

And may I add that the administration that continues to criticize Congress for its appropriations policies has created a new bloated bureaucracy of its own in the executive branch—spearheaded by the Office of Management and Budget.

Expenditures for the Executive Office have been increased from \$31 million in fiscal year 1969 to \$71 million in fiscal year 1973—the costs of the Executive Office have more than doubled since this administration took office.

Is this fiscal prudence?

Is this budgetary restraint?

Obviously not.

What we have is budgetary trickery and subterfuge.

Mr. Chairman, what we are really talking about here today is a matter of priorities—the right to set priorities.

The proposed ceiling is simply a means whereby the executive branch wants to take over the right of Congress to make these basic decisions and determine levels of funding.

While we are all concerned about expenditures, there are some who are also concerned, greatly concerned, about the erosion of powers of the Congress to the executive branch.

I say the time has come to resist any further encroachment by the executive branch.

Let us vote against this irregular procedure.

Let us vote "no" on the line item veto expenditure ceiling.

If any resolution on this subject is needed, in my judgment, the substitute resolution to be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is much preferable.

I urge defeat of the expenditure ceiling bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, what I am going to have to say in the next moment or two probably will not appeal to some of my colleagues. However, I do not think we are here in the business of appealing to one another. I am talking to my colleagues as one who might be described as a fiscal conservative in this Congress and in previous Congresses.

The easiest thing we in Congress do is vote "yes." It is very simple to vote "yes" for everything that comes along the line: more for welfare, more for education, more for hospitals, more for poverty, more for old folks. Why, we are even appropriating money for diseases that have not even been discovered yet because it is a popular thing to do, and then we can go home and say, "Look what I have done for you. I am humane. I am compassionate."

But we in Congress have abdicated our responsibility. Those of us who deplore the giving up of power to the executive branch, we had better take a look at our own house before we deplore what we give away. And I speak editorially when I say, "we" in the Congress, because all of us have not engaged in these excesses. But there are quite a number of us who have voted "yes" on everything, and then when we talk about increasing the national debt ceiling to pay for it, we say, "Oh, I would not do that. That is inflationary."

Actually it is the responsible thing to do, to vote for the national debt ceiling increase, especially those of us who have been responsible for the increases in spending.

I do not find myself in that category. I have been around here for about 14 years, and I think during that 14-year period we have had to face the fact of increasing the debt ceiling at least 20 times, and I have not voted for increasing the ceiling, because I have felt that in voting against the bill that money could be saved, and that maybe Congress in passing it would get the message and not continuously blow the budget all to the devil. But those who have voted for increasing the spending should vote for the debt ceiling to pay for their excesses.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself today in a different posture on it, because I believe those of us who have exercised restraint and have had to face our constituents and our opponents who say, "Oh, he is against teachers; he is against kids," when all we were doing is trying to operate within a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote to increase the debt ceiling today. I have not done it during the 14 years I have been here, but it is my belief that is the only way we can reach the spending ceiling recommended by the President of the United States. I was one of those who co-sponsored the bill to put a \$250 billion spending ceiling on, because we have shown that we are irresponsible here, and the only way to treat an irresponsible child is perhaps to discipline him, and so we are putting some discipline on the Congress by putting on a \$250 billion ceiling.

I recall an old farmer in my district who said, "The only way to wean a calf is to take away the cow."

Perhaps that is the only way we can do it and to have the Congress act responsibly, and that is by putting a ceiling on spending, which is what we should have been doing over the years.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. DEVINE. Yes, I will yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, my very dear friend, JOE EVINS, made some observations about the increase in expenditures in the White House as far as fiscal 1969 to fiscal 1972 is concerned, or fiscal 1973.

A quick look at the increase in the cost of running the Congress is somewhat interesting. In fiscal 1969 the cost was \$192 million to run the Congress; in fiscal 1973 it will cost \$332 million, which is about a 70-percent increase.

So our skirts are not so clean, either.

I would like to mention one other matter. FRANK Bow, the gentleman from Ohio, was a leader in instituting a spending limitation. FRANK has fought long, hard and now his efforts may bear fruit. If the Mahon amendment is defeated and the bill is passed as recommended by the committee, FRANK Bow deserves great credit and I take pleasure in giving him this long overdue accolade.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman.

I might in conclusion say this, without pointing the finger of responsibility, because my remarks here are primarily aimed in the direction of some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle who have voted with me and voted against increasing the debt ceiling from time to time: During the time I have been in the Congress the national debt has increased from someplace in the area of \$265 billion to the point where today, on October 10, 1972, it is in excess of \$435 billion, and we now may increase the ceiling to \$465 billion to pay for some of the obligations which the Congress has foisted upon the country.

Many of you may say, "Oh, this is a Nixon deficit."

A Nixon deficit it is not. Only the Congress can authorize; only the Congress can appropriate public funds.

Let us accept the responsibility. We are the ones who caused it.

I want to say in passing, Mr. Chairman—because a little politics has been injected into this—that the Congress has been controlled by Democrats 36 out of the last 40 years, and I guess the other party has had control pretty solidly for the last 20 years, and they led this Nation into these financial problems.

Let us face our responsibilities, accept the blame, take action to force some discipline on our big spenders and vote to put a \$250 billion spending ceiling on the statute books.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ARENDS. First I want to commend the gentleman for the position he has taken today. Your statement is a statesmanlike position and I want you to know I appreciate it.

Only the other day in regard to one of

the spending bills we passed, which was a very, very costly one, shortly thereafter we had an extension of the debt limit bill before us. I took the time to ferret out the votes and the names of the people who were for that spending bill, which many of us voted against. When the question of the debt ceiling came up just a matter of days later, there were between 75 and 100 Members of this House who had voted to spend money, but who would not vote to extend the debt ceiling. It just does not add up. You can not have it both ways.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the remarks of my fellow statesman, geographically that is, from Ohio, Mr. DEVINE, in saying that he had never voted for an increase in the debt ceiling but he was going to this time.

Well, I just want to tell him that I am exactly the reverse; I have never voted against one, but I am going to this time.

The facts of the matter are that the Congress has exceeded the President's budget by a total of about \$2.5 billion and \$5 billion of that is revenue sharing, which the President has been lobbying for for a long, long time.

Now, what do we share? We are sharing a national deficit of majestic proportions, but we are going to give them money. And what good is it going to do? Oh, the great bill that came out of the distinguished chairman's committee (Mr. MILLS) on revenue sharing. I thought he was not for it, and then he got to be a candidate for President, and he got for it in a hurry.

Well, what are they going to do with the money? Piddle and dribble it away and then there will be nothing in this country to show for it. The little town I live in is going to get \$4,700. What can you do with \$4,700? I will guarantee you they will spend it in one way or another. Some other city is going to get \$16,000. And when you add it all up it comes to \$5 billion. And 5 years from now there will not be anybody in the country, including my friend from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) who can point his finger at anything and say that this is what was done with revenue sharing. You had better build a \$5 billion monument to folly and find a place in town to put it on. At least 50 years from now you can say "There is Mr. Nixon's and Mr. MILL's monument—revenue sharing. That is what we have done with the money, and it will be here forever." Otherwise nobody will ever know what happened to it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues, particularly those on my right hand over here, to support the spending ceiling.

I want to apologize to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES), for what I am about to say, because what I am about to say is pretty political and he did not know I was going to say this when he gave me all this time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Can I still reserve it?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, sir; you can.

We have heard a lot of fine speeches here today, but we really have a political situation in front of us. You and I know about Mr. Nixon's economic policy which resulted in an increase in the national debt in 4 years, when he finishes his term of office, amounting to about \$100 billion. You and I know that has happened. And you and I know that the Congress cut the appropriations that he sent here by about \$14 billion, but the public does not know that. We are caught. We have helped to spin a lot of the web ourselves and the press helped to spin the web and the President really spun the web for us, and we are caught in it and the Congress is pictured as a great big spendthrift organization that is going to spend us all out of existence.

And you know—but I guess the public does not know—that the Congress does not spend any money, the Congress just gives the President a check and says to the President, "You can write your checks," and he writes the checks. And the President is the one who is spending the money, and he is the one who is now asking for a ceiling.

And as proof of that, if you look in the committee hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means there you will see that I asked the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Treasurer, why we needed this legislation, and both of them said that we did not need the legislation, but that it had a good psychological impact on this country.

What they really meant was it had a good political impact for the President. It just further reinforces the old argument that it is the Congress that spends the money and it is the President who wants to try to reduce spending, and we are caught. I think that the President has sprung a political trap. And then in February I have every reason to believe that he will come back in and say, "This is a little too tight, some emergency has come up that I could not foresee, and maybe we ought to relax the spending ceiling."

He is not going to cut spending one bit further than he already could have done, and for which he now has the powers to do, powers he already has. Right now he has the power to cut every single nickel he is going to cut. He knows that. And all he is doing this for is that if we vote down the debt ceiling then he can blame Congress for an increase in taxes, so we are just foolish if we sit here and let him get away with that sort of thing. That is why I am going to vote for the ceiling. The President can already do everything that he is asking us to do for him, and there is no other power we can give him that he does not already have. The President is just trying to make suckers out of all of us, and to make it appear as though we are the big spenders, and that he has made these cutbacks, and that he is not going to increase taxes, but it will be the Congress who is going to increase taxes. And if we do not pass this spending ceiling then it is all our fault that the taxes will have to go up.

Well, anybody who has examined the conditions of the Federal economic sit-

uation, the income and expenditures of this country, knows that we are going to have to do something; we are either going to have to quit borrowing so much money, or you will have to tax a little more. If we do not, we are going to keep on building the inflationary fires.

So we are going to have to face up to it. I think we ought to say, "Mr. President, here it is, but you have already got the power, but we will help give you additional backbone to help you use that power."

And by next February he will be back in here asking us to increase that ceiling.

I think that we are not giving up any power that the President does not already have; that we have already given up years ago for controlling spending.

The President has never in the history of this country been forced to spend a nickel that he did not want to spend. And I would ask any Member of this body who has any knowledge to the contrary of when the President spent a nickel that he did not want to spend that that Member would stand up and let me know now, because I do not want to misconstrue history.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do recall that there was testimony that there were lawsuits pending as to whether or not among other entities, school districts have some claim on money that we have appropriated under a formula.

It is my own feeling that that is precisely why we are going through this exercise.

I call the gentleman's attention to page 2, line 20 of the bill that we are now considering which says: "the amount available for obligation as determined by the President."

That is the operative portion of this bill.

This President does not want to spend money which has been appropriated for education and on which the school districts have a legal claim. It is the only part of the budget that he cannot freeze and it is the reason we are going through this exercise.

Mr. GIBBONS. I would say to the gentleman from California that I am familiar with that argument. It is set out in detail in the January 20, 1970, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was a Senate insertion. There is some feeling in the executive branch, although the present occupants of the executive branch deny that it is true—there is some feeling that perhaps the President cannot refuse to spend money that has been appropriated for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and that amount of money controlled by that formula is about \$1 billion. If he cut all of that out, he could not get the \$6 billion required to cut out of this spending ceiling.

As I say, I think he is going to spend that anyway. He has done it every time. There is some doubt as to whether he can refuse to spend that. But he has

never spent and no President has ever spent a nickel that he had not wanted to spend in the past and he always finds some way to get around it.

You all know that ever since the time of George Washington, this Congress has tried to make the President spend appropriations to buy such items as horses and bombers and things that the President thought we did not need. Even a Veterans' Administration Hospital—President Eisenhower and President Kennedy refused to build and the Congress passed language mandatorily requiring that it be built and be built at a specific spot.

I do not think that we are giving up any power that we ever had.

Therefore, in holding up an appropriation he has always got his inherent power to fall back on—that he cannot spend money that he does not have.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. I agree with my distinguished and respected colleague in the well when he said that the Congress has never been able to force the President to spend moneys that we authorize and appropriate. I think that is a correct statement. In a way I agree with the rightness of it.

I remember when Secretary McNamara refused to build an atomic or nuclear battleship for which the Congress several years going had authorized and appropriated funds. He felt it was not necessary and would be obsolete. So he refused to spend the money.

So the so-called liberals at that time supported the administration, and were outspoken in support of the President's right not to spend the money that Congress had authorized and appropriated.

You know that we cannot have it both ways. The refusal of an administration to spend money that we authorize and appropriate may in some informal way be a part of the pattern of checks and balances that underlie the formal Constitution relationships that make our tripartite system of Government work.

But I think you are going a great step further when you say that therefore we ought to abdicate our basic constitutional right and duty to appropriate and authorize, and set national priorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GIBBONS. We do not spend money here in the Congress. All we do is put money in the bank. The President spends and writes all the checks and he can refuse and has refused to write them. I think it is a political trap, and the best course of action is to give him what he is asking for and let him see if he can live with it. I do not think he can live with it and I do not think he will live with it.

I will say to my friends over on the right, if our candidate is elected President, he can come in here and rescind all this next year if he wants to. But we have that decision right now. I think we ought to make the best of it.

I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) that I apologize for making such a political speech on his time. I know that he did not know what I was going to say when I got up here to say it, but I do appreciate his generosity anyway.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida for the candor with which he has just spoken.

On March 12, 1969, I addressed myself to the debt ceiling increase then pending on the floor of this House of Representatives. At that time I served notice that I would not again vote for another increase in the national debt except in an emergency situation if steps were not taken to balance the budget. I pointed out at that time that fiscal responsibility had to begin in the White House; that it would be exceedingly difficult for the Congress to bring expenditures in line with revenues without leadership from the White House as Congress was inherently a spending body and not inclined to be fiscally conservative because of the pressure on each individual member to fund needed projects in his own district which are especially important to him. Following the remarks that I made in 1969 I have voted against all increases of the total debt limitation.

Today we find that the present administration has accumulated deficits for the last three fiscal years totaling 70 billion dollars. The deficit for fiscal year 1973 is estimated to be in excess of \$32 billion.

Thus the present administration will accumulate total deficits in excess of \$100 billion. In fact, this administration has accumulated larger deficits than the Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson administrations combined and this sorry and fiscally irresponsible situation is the fault of both the executive and legislative branches. Neither can escape responsibility.

I believe that there is a direct relationship between such deficit spending and the inflationary spiral we have experienced in recent years. There is also a direct causal relationship between such spending and the recent devaluation of the dollar and when we view the \$2 billion trade deficit for calendar year 1971 and the even larger prospective trade deficit for 1972, we face the grave danger of the collapse of our free world money system which is dependent upon the soundness of the American dollar.

In the face of the crisis we face today I have no other alternative except to vote for H.R. 16810 establishing an expenditure limitation of \$250 billion for fiscal year 1973. I do so, however, with great reservation because I deplore giving the executive in effect on item veto. It is my sincere hope that the joint committee to review operation of our budgetary system will bring about methods that will result in balancing the budget without the necessity of future reliance upon the drastic method provided in this bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mahon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong opposition to title II of H.R. 16810, which would give the President virtually unlimited power to reduce spending for Federal programs in order to limit total expenditures in fiscal year 1973 to \$250 billion.

I am strongly opposed to this provision for two reasons. First of all, in view of the present administration's misguided sense of priorities, I am greatly concerned that any provision which will give the President unrestricted authority to cut the appropriations of Congress will inevitably lead to a cutback of funds for programs in such vitally needed areas as education, manpower training, environmental protection and health.

And second, I strongly oppose this provision because I feel that it will result in a dangerous abdication by Congress of its constitutional role to determine national priorities and to appropriate funds.

I am sure that all Members of Congress share the President's concern over the escalation of the Federal budget. However, it is quite obvious that the administration's attempt to enforce a tight ceiling on expenditures for fiscal year 1973 is a political, election-year gimmick designed to point the blame for increasing Federal budget deficits at Congress and away from the White House.

The President has continually accused Congress of inflationary spending and he has used this assertion to justify his request for new powers to cut spending. However, the statistics do not bear out the President's charges. For fiscal year 1973, the House Appropriation Committee has actually cut \$1.6 billion from the President's budget requests. In addition to these cuts, the committee and Congress revised the administration's spending priorities to shift some of the President's proposed military spending to domestic programs. Although expenditures for fiscal year 1973 have increased by about \$6 billion over the \$250 billion figure, every program which accounted for this increase was approved by the President when he signed the bills into law.

If Congress were to limit spending to \$250 billion this year, it would have to cut from \$7 to \$10 billion from proposals which President Nixon put forth in January. And by the time that the ceiling would go into effect, 5 months of the fiscal year would already have elapsed, requiring cuts of from \$12 to \$15 billion at an annual rate.

My deep concern is where the administration will choose to make these cuts. It is quite obvious that the administration does not plan to cut the defense budget any further and, by law, it cannot cut funds for social security, veterans' benefits, public assistance, unemployment compensation, or revenue sharing. In view of the history of Nixon vetoes of key education and manpower training programs, it is apparent that the entire brunt of the budget cut would come from

the \$75 billion allotted to programs for education, health, environmental protection, manpower training, and other critically important programs.

Former Budget Director Charles Schultze estimated that these programs would have to be cut by approximately 20 percent in order to bring the budget within this \$250 billion ceiling. These cuts would have a serious, if not a totally destructive effect—on many of our urgently needed domestic programs.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I oppose section 201 of this bill because I believe that by voting to give the President unrestricted authority to cut Federal spending, Congress would be abdicating one of its most important constitutional responsibilities. The Constitution specifically granted Congress the right to raise and collect revenue with the power to determine how this money should be spent. In recent years, however, we have seen this power seriously eroded by the Nixon administration's practice of impounding funds which have been appropriated by Congress.

The President already has the power to make budget requests and to veto any authorization or appropriation bill that exceeds his budgetary requests. If the President is also given the power to determine how much money, if any, will be allocated for specific programs, we are actually granting him the power to legislate and to administer simultaneously.

Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this excessive and potentially dangerous grant of authority to the executive branch and to support the substitute which has been offered by the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have supported the 20 rises in the debt limit because I thought that was the responsible thing to do if I voted for the appropriations. I am willing today to support a rise in the debt limit, providing it does not carry with it a booby trap, and that is what this bill does on page 2. It carries the booby trap of abdication of congressional power. Let nobody make any mistakes about it.

We are in no trap, if the Mahon amendment is agreed to and we pass the bill. We are in no trap. If the chairman wants to bring the bill back without this item veto power given to the President, then we are not in a trap; and if he does, the bill will go through in an ordinary debt-rising way with the second section to set up the commission to study. It is only the material on page 2 that will be stricken and the insertion of the Mahon amendment that is involved here, and that means we either exercise our responsibility as Members of Congress or we abdicate.

We have had a lot of criticism in the press and from a lot of people about Congress having abdicated its power. Are we going to make that come true today? Are we going to give present proof to the statement that Congress is abdicating its power to the executive branch? I say that is exactly what the Members are

doing if they accept this bill without the Mahon amendment.

The Constitution of the United States says that we shall be coequal. It says that we shall do certain things and the executive branch shall do certain things. It is up to us to legislate the program and set the money, and if the President does not want to spend it, by the inherent constitutional powers, which have been claimed and never tested in court—he can stop the expenditure.

But what we are doing here is adding the statutory power to his claimed inherent power not to spend. We are giving him a mandate.

I voted against revenue sharing for the same reason. I will not tax my people with Federal taxes and let somebody else spend the tax moneys for things that they want to spend them for. When I levy taxes—and I voted for every tax bill—upon my people, I want to know what that money is going to be spent for.

Now we are in a box as a result of this \$30 billion revenue sharing bill which we passed under the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. How are we going to solve it? We are going to solve it by giving the President the right to selectively veto program after program. There is no mystery about this. We know that the President of the United States and his administration want to kill the great social programs of our time. They want to pick on education; they want to pick on medicare; they want to pick on the programs that the people of this Nation have and the people deserve. That is where they are going to item veto. They are going to pick the things they want, but they are going to use the item veto enough to make up for the revenue sharing money that they are going to give to people at the local level to spend for anything they want.

I had an article by my local people in the Los Angeles Times the other day, and I asked, "What are you going to spend the revenue sharing for?" "We are going to build an animal shelter."

So help me God, that is what they said. "We are going to build an animal shelter."

What is the business of the Congress of the United States? Giving money to the local people to spend for animal shelters and a lot of other silly things? That is not a national program. Our job is to authorize and fund programs which are national in scope and national in impact, not local programs. We do that in this Congress.

The signers of the Constitution wisely recognized that the Congress and the Chief Executive may not always agree, and as a result the Chief Executive can withhold; he can veto.

And it is provided that we override the veto by two-thirds, and we did that. This is a delicate and important balance of power upon which our Government is founded. We are tinkering with the very balance of power between the executive and the judicial and the legislative branches when we abdicate our power and say, "Papa, we cannot do the job. Please come in and help us do it. We are

not smart enough, we are not responsible enough, we cannot do the job."

We will be doing just what many of the critics are saying today about the Congress of the United States. We will be abdicating our power and not doing the job we should do when we turn everything over to the executive branch.

I say to the Members today I hope they will vote for the Mahon amendment when it is offered. If that is done I will vote for the debt limit bill, but if the Mahon amendment does not pass, then for the first time in 30 years I am going to have to vote against the debt limit but not because of my desire to put on a spending limit. We can put the \$250 billion spending limit on and we can do it ourselves and we do not have to leave it to papa to do it downtown if we are responsible Members of Congress. But if we are irresponsible and if we cannot stand up and face this so-called trap—and I do not concede that it is a trap. It is not a trap for me. I can jump over it or I can walk around it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we heard today about the dictatorial power but we also heard it is a temporary dictatorial power. That is like saying it is a 6 months pregnancy and not 9 months, only 6 months. Are we going to go ahead then and deliver the baby? Are we going to deliver it prematurely or not deliver it? Or are we going to abort it?

Why not stand up now and assume our responsibility and impose a spending limitation ourselves if the spending limitation is to be imposed and not get down on our knees, and give our responsibility away to the executive branch.

The Congress is receiving an increasing amount of criticism over the abdication of its powers to the executive branch. I believe that we have justly earned a great deal of this criticism.

In this session of Congress we have already abdicated control over the expenditure of \$30 billion in federally collected taxes. I voted against that so-called revenue sharing bill because it erodes the traditional and constitutional "power over the purse" which resides solely in Congress.

This politically expedient bill, which indiscriminately distributes \$30 billion—not on the basis of need—not on the basis of desirable and controlled programs—will require our action on a Federal tax increase on our constituents within the next year.

Like the bill before us now, the "revenue-sharing" scheme does violence to an historical and constitutional principle of accountability. This principle is that those who tax the people should directly account to those same people for expenditures; that legislative power carries with it a high degree of legislative responsibility.

In the same session of Congress, we are now asked to abdicate just a little more power, for just a little while. We are told that the Republic will fall to communism or to a "strong man on a white horse" unless we give the President the "power over the purse," which the Constitution trusts only to us. I cannot believe this, and I will not vote to destroy the checks and balances of our Government on the

basis of that remote possibility. We are also asked to believe that the 535 Members of Congress are collectively irresponsible, and that we must have a keeper in the form of the President who is somehow, more responsible. This is the bill of goods which is being sold, but I do not buy it.

I would like to help the President out of his great dilemma. I know that decreased Federal tax income, due to the recession and its high rate of unemployment, have resulted in huge Federal funds deficits. Billions in tax incentives administratively given to large industries have added to these deficits. High rates of inflation have also added to his problems.

I am willing to help the President and vote for a ceiling on outlays as he requests, even though these ceilings have never been successful in the past. But I will not vote for a bill giving one man the power which he requests.

I have seen 30 budgets come and go. I have now served with six Presidents. I have heard every excuse for deficits and every justification for tax increases. I have seen good programs gutted, and bad programs praised. But during that 30 years, I have never seen circumstances which I believe warranted a grant of congressional power to the executive to the degree which is now requested of this Congress. Such power is not warranted now.

I will vote for the Mahon amendment, and if it is rejected I will vote against the bill.

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

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. He is making a very fine statement on a very important issue of the abdication of the powers of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, one of the major arrogations of congressional prerogatives by the executive branch was demonstrated 2 years ago when the House approved President Nixon's proposal that the Bureau of the Budget be replaced by an Office of Management and Budget. We are close to a similar and equally dangerous usurpation of congressional authority by the proposal contained in H.R. 16810 that would provide the President unbridled power to overstep Congress constitutional authority over spending levels. The former proposal has resulted in the establishment of a powerful superagency invulnerable to the oversight of the Congress and an unprecedented fiscal club to be wielded by the President.

The claim that the Congress has failed in its responsibility toward fiscal prudence in the face of sound fiscal management by the President cannot stand close scrutiny. Will anyone deny that the present administration has increased the budget every year? Is there any question that the Congress has reduced this budget through appropriations during this same period and, for that matter, for the past 25 years? A basic common law maxim in courts of equity was that no relief should be given him who comes into court with "dirty hands." This "dirty

hands" theory was predicated in large part on the reluctance of the courts to provide relief when the claimant, himself, was responsible in part for his misery. How then can we voluntarily delegate the one remaining congressional stronghold in the separation of powers; the power of the purse. I am not prepared to concede that the Congress is impotent to conduct its own affairs and bring into control what has been irresponsible Federal spending. I am not prepared to delegate this constitutional authority in spite of the strawman threat of increased taxation.

Few of my colleagues could, in good conscience, ignore the need for a strong and reasonable spending ceiling. I have been calling for an end to irresponsible Federal spending from my first day in this body. But I cannot ignore the admonishment of Justice Jackson in his concurring opinion declaring President Truman's seizure of the steel mills an unconstitutional assumption of legislative authority:

But I have no illusion that any decision by this Court can keep power in the hands of Congress if it is not wise and timely in meeting its problems. A crisis that challenges the President equally, or perhaps primarily, challenges Congress. If not good law, there was wordly wisdom in the maxim attributed to Napoleon that "The tools belong to the man who can use them." We may say that power to legislate for emergencies belongs in the hands of Congress, but only Congress itself can prevent power from slipping through its fingers.

The smothering influence of inflation must be met. The President is confronted with this problem as surely as the Congress. But are we to throw up our hands and say that only the President and his sharp-pencil boys at the Office of Management and Budget can provide the answers? The President, in an October 7 radio broadcast, assumes that the Congress is unable to fulfill its constitutional role and its responsibilities to the people we have been elected to represent. If this is true, we are in more serious trouble than we know. The President said:

(T)he Congress is not meeting this responsibility (fighting higher taxes and higher prices) . . . The problem is the inherent weakness in the present structure of the Congress as a whole to deal with this danger.

The President has totally ignored the proposal made by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations which effectuates the proper need to control spending, but protects the supremely important constitutional issues involved; constitutional issues on which the President was conveniently silent in his October 7 message. Mr. Justice Brandeis raised the serious separation of powers question in his dissenting opinion in *Myers against United States*, when he said:

The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy.

The seriousness of the administration's proposal to give the President a spending ceiling without any guidance by the Congress as to where the necessary cuts will take place is to voluntarily delegate powers reserved to the Congress. Powers given to each of us as elected representatives of the people. I wish that the President would advise me how to tell my constituents that I have no voice whatever, and, consequently, that they have no voice in the decisionmaking process of where our tax dollars are to be spent. It is curious indeed how the President can on the one hand announce to the State and local governments that he is going to provide them billions of revenue-sharing dollars and then assume sole authority to take it away on the other. The power of the Congress to raise and collect revenue and to determine how those moneys are to be spent must not be abridged. I strongly object to the assertion that a vote against the spending ceiling is a vote in favor of higher taxes. We have been presented a viable alternative to this spurious choice and I earnestly encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the substitute proposed by my colleague from Texas.

The blatant usurpation of power as manifested in the administration proposal is consistent with the impoundment practices with which we are all familiar. The January 1972 issue of the Washington Monthly chronicles the investigation and findings of the junior Senator from Florida, LAWTON CHILES. The article shows how a number of Federal programs affecting rural citizens in the State of Florida were endangered by executive impoundment of appropriated funds. Research in nonchemical pest control, rural electrification, water and waste disposal grants, and \$75 million in direct operating loans from the Farmers Home Administration fell victim to having program funds withheld.

Can we deny that this practice of the President is different from the item veto power he is now seeking? The President has demonstrated what must be described as a reversal of priorities for the American people by vetoing again and again much-needed funds for education. The Congress, interestingly enough, has never overridden a veto on a spending bill. The President, then, has been able to defeat the intent of the Congress without worry of being overridden by a two-thirds majority by impounding important funds for domestic programs. Yet, when he does veto a bill he has been given the support of the Congress. The strawman threat of being labeled a big spender by opposing the proposal to give the President sole authority for the expenditure of Federal funds is specious indeed.

I concur wholeheartedly with the dissenting views drafted by Congressmen BURKE, FULTON, and CORMAN in saying that "if we want to have a \$250 billion ceiling this fiscal year, then it is up to us to make the cuts where they must be made, to tell our constituents what we have done and if it displeases them we will be the first to know." I do not oppose the spending ceiling. Conversely, I strongly support the implementation

of spending restraints. I cannot, however, in good conscience give the President a no-strings-attached authority to determine where appropriated funds are to be allocated. I reject this delegation of authority on sound constitutional grounds and because this is not what my constituents sent me here to do. I am privileged to serve a district of wonderful people—people who share my concern about irresponsible spending and the concomitant inflationary spiral which detracts from their lives. Therefore, I support strongly the spending ceiling with proper constitutional safeguards provided. The President has a sincere desire to bring Federal spending into line. I share his desire for this result. I do not, however, feel that I can sit back and watch this body delegate its constitutional prerogatives silently.

While the impoundment of funds causes me great concern and the then Assistant Attorney General William Rehnquist was reported to have written that "with respect to the suggestion that the President has a constitutional power to decline to spend appropriated funds, we must conclude that existence of such a broad power is supported by neither reason nor precedent. It may be argued that the spending of money is inherently an Executive function, and it seems an anomalous proposition that because the executive branch is bound to execute the laws, it is free to decline to execute them," the Congress can meet this challenge by withholding funds from programs given a high priority by the President. This is not true, however, in the present request by the President for this unprecedented authority. The Congress must maintain the power of the purse or it will be grossly derelict in its responsibilities to the American people.

It is apparent from the hearings on this measure that the primary area from which cut-backs will be made is in the area of education. The President has demonstrated an unfortunate reversal of priorities for the American people by consistently opposing educational measures. The education of our young is the greatest priority of this country and provides them an opportunity to improve their lives and enjoyment of life while contributing to the welfare of our country. If the President wants to cut education programs, let him tell the Congress and the American people that is what he is going to do. Then the Congress, fulfilling its proper role, can decide whether these programs are the proper ones to be diminished.

Suggestions have been made that the General Accounting Office be expanded to assist the Congress in locating and defining sound spending parameters. This would, of course, aid the Congress in obtaining a broader perspective of the total spending picture. The President has the responsibility of recommending and the Congress in enacting spending bills. There is a great need to assign proper priorities jointly drawn. The proposal as contained in the present bill is a dangerous delegation of congressional power and is masked in the gossamer cloak of preventing a tax increase during the next 4 years. Decrease Federal expendi-

tures through the vehicle of a \$250 billion spending ceiling; yes. Delegate important constitutional prerogatives of the Congress; never.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN).

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say much in 1 minute.

I do think if we went along with the bill as reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means we would be guilty of giving away the powers that people expect us to exercise.

I would call the attention of Members to one thing. The Mahon substitute says that we ask the President to report to us not later than January 2. If the Mahon substitute carries, I assume the President knows right this minute where he wants to spend that \$250 billion, and that is all I have been trying to find out since the President first asked for this unlimited power. I was shocked when we were asked to give him that expenditure ceiling, that total authority over every other law, and yet he would not give us any clue as to where the cuts were to be made. If the Mahon amendment carries and the President reports to us later tonight how he is going to spend the \$250 billion, we could act on the expenditure ceiling. We probably should have one. It would be unconscionable for us to repeal every spending decision we have made in the last 10 months.

It is clear to me that the one appropriation which the President cannot cut, but wants desperately to cut, is formula spending for health and education. Why, 4 weeks before a national election, does the President refuse to tell the Congress and the American people what he plans to do with the American people's money?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this spending limit is a gigantic hoax. It is a device to enable the President to blame the whole situation we have gotten into, partly it is true at our own fault, entirely on Congress. We who work here every day all know that a very large part of the overspending is the fault of the President of the United States. I voted against revenue sharing, the President's bill, a couple of weeks ago. I spent a whole afternoon trying to get foreign aid cut down by a billion dollars. This foreign aid bill, the President's foreign aid bill, is 2½ times as big as when President Nixon took over.

Another attempted handout was the so-called welfare reform. This was the President's bill. I voted against this guaranteed income and the Congress rescued the country from it. Now how has President Nixon gotten this spending legislation? Our trouble started when Nixon became the President, and the minority, which was supposed to have been a fiscally prudent minority, has been turned by the President into a bunch of spenders. That is when the problem started, when the Republican minority changed its spots.

What a marvelous arrangement President Nixon has with Congress. Our col-

umnists are claiming to be puzzled as to why President Nixon is not fighting hard to get a Republican Congress. Why should he? He gets what he wants from this one. We have a compliant Republican minority. We have an obliging chairman or two on the Democratic side. And the President has been able to outmaneuver us by arranging a token veto now and then of a popular program.

After shooting the works on handouts to corporations and corrupt foreign governments, he waits until we get a really good program such as railroad retirement or the education bill, and he vetoes that, knowing that if we are going to do a responsible job, we have to overturn it. Then, he can claim that Congress is overspending.

Why should President Nixon want a Republican Congress? He is getting what he wants with this one and he has the added advantage that he can blame it all on the Democrats.

The bitter irony of all this is that, while the power seems to go to the President, it is more power than he knows how to use, or possibly can use. Where will it really go?

The power will go to the bureaucracy; to the Budget Bureau and hundreds of other military and civilian bureaucracies. We will not know where or what we are fighting. Congress has its faults, heaven knows. But one thing about Congress: its faults are obvious to the whole world. We have the Press Gallery sitting up here looking at every wart on our faces. Every mistake of grammar, every blunder, is out in the open.

But, what goes on in the Budget Bureau? What goes on in the executive offices of the President? What goes on in a hundred bureaus is totally unknown. Let us vote to keep it out in the open.

For those who say that this is just temporary, let me remind you of the piece of legislation which paved the way for what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) just pointed out, the fact that we abdicated our control over spending a long time ago. When? We did it, if I am not mistaken, in 1905 when Congress passed a bill, a very innocent little bill which was designed to keep executive agencies from squandering a lot of money the last part of the fiscal year. We gave them the power to withhold the money. They stretched that power into the present situation where they can hold back \$12 billion worth of sewer and water funds and claim that it is the prerogative of the President.

I say to the Members, if you pass this piece of legislation, this, too, is going to be stretched the same way as that innocent, temporary act of 1905 was.

I oppose this bill. It is an unconscionable abdication of our power. It is another surrender; one more defeat in the long struggle of elected bodies against official tyranny.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I can easily vote for a debt limit, for a limitation of spending, but I just cannot vote for something which does not put some restraint upon the spender.

Very frankly, if we are being realistic and want to do what the President is telling the public we should be doing—I heard him say the other day that if the Congress adjourned without passing this legislation, he would call it back into session—that already is a dictatorship in any form whatsoever.

The gentleman from California put it very well when he said that there is no temporary dictatorship just as there is no temporary pregnancy. You can have an abortion, either natural or unnatural, but you can have one.

Let us not say we want to get rid of this so-called temporary dictator by having an abortion in this country. This has been happening in too many places. We can still hear the thump of the goose-steps all over Europe, their echo may well reach this side of the ocean.

I am a little tired of being called irresponsible. Let us see how irresponsible we have been. We have a debt today of \$450 billion. We are going to add, I understand, \$15 billion more. That entire debt is made up of interest paid on money borrowed by the Federal Government plus not even one-fourth of the money we have given away or spent outside the United States. The truth of the matter is that this Congress and every Congress preceding it has raised enough money in taxation to meet all the obligations of the spending of this Nation, even the foolish expenditures we have made, if we had not gotten ourselves into the trap of trying to be the world's big brother. Just recently I learned the amount of our balance-of-payments deficit for last year, 1971. This year's deficit may well reach \$400 million more. We have been spending more on foreign trade and aid far beyond our Treasury receipts.

This has been hidden from the people and yet the Congress has cut over \$14 billion from the President's budget request since he took office.

Even at this late date Congress has cut \$1,700,000,000 from the President's request.

It is not that a spending ceiling is bad, it is only bad when the Congress gives the President the power to cut any amount from any program and add the money to any other program at his own wish or whim.

The President has indicated by his vetoes this term where he intends to cut. He intends to cut the people's program and add to the so-called military spending.

Military spending takes 50 cents out of any dollar of taxes paid. No cuts are proposed by the President but his record shows that people's programs will be cut.

The way this bill was presented was to give the President the increased debt ceiling to \$465 billion by tricking the people into believing that the spending ceiling would save new taxes.

He failed to tell the people that the income is only \$225 billion, and our authorizations from Congress are less than \$250 billion.

If he wants to keep from a new debt why does he ask for more than the income, more than Congress authorizes.

The answer is simple, put another Nixon spiral—he will try to blame Congress for new taxes and yet he knows he will spend what he wants to spend and pay no attention to Congress.

Any further release of rights by Congress can only mean that the people will get less and less for their tax dollars.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I resent this bill, for two reasons.

One reason is it does not take into account in the national debt \$70 billion that has been paid. If we do not take that \$70 billion into account we will have to pay it again. We are paying \$4 billion on it right now for interest annually. It is just that simple. Our fiscal agent has taken our printed money and bought \$70 billion over a period of years with that money. Of course the money is outstanding, and if we do not cancel the bonds the bonds will remain outstanding, too. That is double inflation.

Another reason why I resent the bill is that it comes to the floor under a double gag rule. One gag rule is bad enough, but here in this rule no Member has permission to strike out the last word and speak for 5 minutes. There are only four amendments, and the rule provides 5 minutes to the side on each amendment. With these four amendments then the show is over and the gag rule prevails. I do not believe that is right. I think that is taking advantage of the Members.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I would oppose the bill even if it contained no more than another temporary increase in the ceiling on our national debt. As I said back in February, when we last considered such a measure,

I am not opposed to additional spending. I believe that we must be prepared to spend massive amounts for such programs as housing, child care, public service employment, mass transit, and pollution abatement. We have for too long neglected these vital domestic needs in favor of wasteful military adventures, and if money alone is the price we eventually pay for that neglect, we will be fortunate indeed.

The problem is that raising money by borrowing it merely adds an additional burden—that of the debt service—to the existing inequitable tax structure. This sort of device merely adds to the lion's share of the burden already borne by our low and middle income citizens, and we then add insult to injury by spending the money on weapons instead of houses, schools, and child care centers.

There are better ways to raise this money. Revisions in the capital gains tax ceiling, in the oil depletion allowance, in the interest-free income from municipal bonds are but a few of the alternative solutions. In addition, we must reduce our defense spending and apply that money to our domestic priorities.

In August 1971, at the time he instituted the wage-price freeze, President Nixon stated that he would submit a tax reform program to the second session of

the 92d Congress. In February of this year, at the time we last raised the debt ceiling, Chairman MILLS wrote to the President, reminding him of his promise and concluding by saying:

To me this matter is most important if there is to be a debt ceiling increase to accompany borrowings required under the 1973 Budget. I hope you will give it your immediate attention.

We are now in the fourth month of the 1973 fiscal year, and the second session of the 92d Congress is drawing to a close. We have yet to receive the President's tax reform program, and I suspect that we will never get it, so long as we continue to give him anything he asks. We would see a program very quickly if we refused to extend the temporary debt limit beyond the 31st of October, and I therefore think that we should vote down the bill.

THE SPENDING CEILING

The accession of the Ways and Means Committee to the President's failure to submit a tax reform program is bad enough, but the inclusion in the bill of title II, giving the President blanket authority to cut spending wherever he wishes in order to keep Federal expenditures for fiscal 1973 within \$250 billion, constitutes a tragic and perhaps fatal abdication of the constitutional powers of Congress.

It is expected that the total of the appropriations for the fiscal year contained in the individual appropriations measures passed by Congress and signed by the President will come to about \$256 billion. This means that under title II as reported, the President would have power to cut \$6 billion from whatever program or programs he chooses. Having seen Mr. Nixon in action for many years, I have no doubt as to what kind of programs he would reduce if afforded the opportunity, for this is the man who vetoes funds for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare while exhorting the Congress to spend more money for military purposes. My certainty as to where Mr. Nixon would cut is further solidified by the report that Treasury under Secretary Walker has said that Great Society social programs would be the first to get the ax; these are to include pollution, education, day care, and urban development programs, according to Walker.

We in Congress have failed our constituents and our country by refusing to exercise our constitutional responsibilities in the fields of foreign and military policy. While I disagree with many of the decisions we have made in this Congress with regard to appropriations, we have at least asserted our powers to make them and to decide where our money should be spent. But now, we are acting to surrender this power too.

The people of this country spend over a half a billion dollars annually on the operation of Congress. They get almost nothing for their money in terms of guidance in foreign and military policy, and now, they will get a like return in terms of guidance on appropriations. The chairman of the rules committee (Mr. COLMER) suggested during the debate on the rule for this bill that if we do not act

to give the President semidictatorial powers now, our monetary system may soon collapse and we will have to give him full dictatorial powers. That such a statement can be made in good faith by a senior Member of this House indicates how far down the sorry road we have come.

As I stated at the outset of my remarks, I do not think we should be cutting Federal spending, but merely altering where we get the money and where we spend it. But even if the Congress believes that we are overspending, it is our constitutional duty to decide where to cut, and we cannot and should not abdicate that duty to the President or the Office of Management and Budget. The Mahon amendment would require the President to recommend such reductions to the Congress, and we would then act on them in the exercise of our constitutional duties. I urge its adoption.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in our deliberations today on the proposed budget ceiling of \$250 billion, we are undertaking an effort with far-reaching consequences, and I hope that we shall approach this measure with foresight and caution.

The record of this administration in amassing staggering public debt year after year clearly indicates the need for prompt action. I have strongly supported efforts to reform the budgetary processes of the Federal Government, and last year I introduced a measure, House Congressional Resolution 493, to help bring Federal expenditures in line with anticipated revenues. For this reason, I strongly support the proposal today to place a limitation on Federal spending.

However, I have also been greatly concerned about the already inordinate power of the President and the Office of Management and Budget in the practice of "impounding" funds appropriated by Congress. We have seen the actions they have taken on vital domestic programs. I have strongly spoken out against that practice, and I introduced H.R. 12883, to require the President to notify Congress whenever funds are impounded and to create procedures by which Congress could approve or disapprove such actions.

This is why I object to the provision in today's bill which would, in effect, grant the President an "item veto" of vital legislation. This power is directly contrary to the Constitution. If this provision is retained, Congress will be giving absolute budget-cutting authority to the President. For the first time in history, the President would have an unprecedented blankcheck power to cut and revise Federal appropriations made by the Congress. There can be no denying that this would be an abdication by Congress of our constitutional power to review the budget, to alter priorities, and to appropriate funds.

This provision would mean the death of many vital domestic programs. The President's recent veto of the appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare is an example of the type of action to which this provision would lead. The administration would sacrifice money designed to

help people obtain good housing, adequate health care, good nutrition, and quality education.

This provision is also a shrewd political move by this administration, attempting to shift the blame for "overspending" on Congress. In fact, this administration is notorious for the inaccuracy of its budgetary planning and predictions. More than once we have seen the President come before Congress in January to announce that his new budget will be balanced or will have a surplus; a year later, the announcement comes that there will, instead, be a deficit of \$20, \$30, or \$40 billion. I do not feel that those are the hands into which we should entrust such enormous and dangerous powers.

Therefore, I hope that the House of Representatives will delete the provision granting an item veto to the President. The real solution to our budgetary dilemma consists in the submission of more realistic budgets by the President, and the approval by Congress of spending programs that accurately reflect the availability of funds.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I support this measure today to extend the debt limit and also to transfer power that belongs only to the Congress to the President of the United States. I feel it is a delegation of legislative power that should never happen. However, under the circumstances, since this Congress has refused to act prudently insofar as spending is concerned, I feel compelled to give that authority to the President during the ensuing 8 months with the fervent hope that he will do what the Congress has failed to do; namely cut the excessive spending and curtail the ever-increasing deficit which will, in turn, halt inflation.

I was tremendously impressed by the persuasive arguments offered on the floor of the House today by the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER, chairman of the Rules Committee. I feel his words were so well put that they should be engraved on the walls of this House so that this Congress and every Congress from now on will be reminded of the great crisis of 1972.

Those who have taken the floor to castigate the President of the United States, branding him as a big spender, should review their own voting records. Time after time, these very same people supported measures that added more than \$1 billion in excess of the budget. For example, how did they vote on the HEW appropriations bill which came to the House floor from conference \$1.8 billion over the budget—we know where they were. They voted for it for a political reason in an effort to force a Presidential veto so that they could claim that the President was antieducation.

During the 92d Congress, the big spenders have been the House and Senate and not the President. Presidential vetoes prove all of this.

To the everlasting credit of the gentleman from Mississippi, BILL COLMER, is his departure from the political moves made by the leaders of his party for the benefit of his country. He warned the big

spenders that the day of reckoning is here today, and if the attitudes of this Congress are repeated in the coming years, the outcome of the election on November 7, 1972, will make little difference.

Like the gentleman from Mississippi, I will vote in favor of the measure although I am opposed to the delegation of any authority from the legislative to the executive body.

I am delegating this authority to the President of the United States for the short period of 8 months with the hope and prayer that he will exercise better judgment than did the 92d Congress.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the American people want Congress to give to the President substantial control of the Nation's pursestrings. What is proposed here today would significantly limit the authority granted to Congress by the Constitution on appropriations. Particularly would this measure give the President the power of line item veto, something that Congress has jealously guarded against all through the years. We have been criticized in recent weeks for abdication of power to the Chief Executive. This would be an extreme case of abdication of congressional authority.

As a matter of fact, much of the budgeting power formerly reserved to Congress already has slipped from the grasp of the Nation's elected representatives and into the hands of those in the White House and in the Federal agencies. The Office of Management and Budget has preempted many of the responsibilities formerly reserved to Congress. In addition to this, billions upon billions of dollars in appropriated funds have been withheld from projects and programs which the Congress, by law, has said are to proceed. Instead of giving a new broad grant of authority to the President, I believe we should address ourselves to the problem of withheld funds as quickly as possible.

The matter now before us is of first importance. We are asked to surrender not only the power of the Congress to determine where and when tax moneys are to be spent, but we are asked to surrender one of the last vestiges of protection exercised by Congress over the tax dollar.

Were we to take this unprecedented step, I think it be possible—even probable—that the day would come when the President—any President—would simply ask the Congress to appropriate money in an amount equal to all projected revenues or in an amount exceeding revenues by some specified amount. The President, the Office of Management and Budget, and the various agencies would then divide up the money as they chose. Congress would have lost its voice in expenditures of government.

Clearly this is the wrong way to go about the budgeting process. Of course, there are shortcomings in the present system. We labor through months of work in review of the budget, and, to say the least, it sometimes becomes a messy procedure. Possibly a committee should be set up to look into the whole procedure of budgetary review. But to give

away at this time or at any time the congressional responsibility for allocating funds would be a disservice to the taxpayers and would further erode congressional authority.

Spending limits and guidelines are clearly within the purview of Congress. It is the responsibility of Congress to determine what programs shall be funded and where cuts in expenditures are justified. This is no way to change a system that has worked well and which insures the people, through their elected representatives, a voice in the way their tax dollars are spent.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, we are presented today with a proposed \$250 billion ceiling on Federal expenditures. We are asked to give to the President the power to slash funding for—or terminate—vital Federal programs approved by Congress, in order to bring Federal spending to this arbitrary level, regardless of the human consequences. By this seemingly simple act, according to administration spokesmen, all of our problems will be solved and the high inflation generated by the massive budget deficits of the Nixon administration will disappear.

If we give this unprecedented authority to the President, the country will suffer greatly for the foreseeable future.

Ours is supposed to be a government of laws, not men. The law in this case—the Constitution—is unequivocal: Congress alone is given the authority to raise and collect revenues and to decide how these funds are spent. The 535 elected Representatives of the people were granted this authority by the Founding Fathers—not a few appointed bureaucrats in the Executive Office Building. The measure before us today is a constitutional Pandora's box. We are asked today, ironically at this time of dangerously increased power—usurped power—on the part of the Executive, to give away that constitutional authority most basic to our function.

If Congress passes this measure, we will be limited to setting spending ceilings and making unenforceable recommendations on various programs—recommendations which, we may be sure, will be consistently ignored. We are asked to give to the Executive that which no other Congress has granted—the power of item veto. We are asked, in essence, to give ourselves a vote of no confidence. We are asked to admit under duress—the duress of the political season—first, that the 535 Representatives who sit in this and our companion body, who each year engage in continuous consideration of the Federal budget, cannot be trusted to assess responsibly the fiscal needs of this country, and, second, that one man must have the authority to evaluate our work and change our decisions in his unlimited, unreviewable discretion.

There is a great need for improved congressional scrutiny of the budget. I support the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget, and I agree that we need to adopt a more comprehensive and unified approach to the budget than presently exists. Also, I have often disagreed with some of our colleagues with respect to budget priorities. But none of this alters

the fact that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to make these decisions, and nowhere have I seen any evidence that would legitimize the wholesale giveaway of authority this measure presents.

Federal expenditures should and can be reduced. I have consistently voted to reduce Federal spending in nonessential areas. But such reductions should not come at the expense of proven, vitally-needed people-oriented programs—programs for education—three education bills have already been vetoed by President Nixon—for social security—20 percent increase opposed by President Nixon and signed by him with reluctance—for child-care funds—which President Nixon vetoed last year. Spending reductions should come in those areas of the budget which are wasteful. The waste in this administration's military budget, for example, is a national disgrace.

The House is today being made the victim of a cynical political ploy by the administration. Throughout September administration spokesmen repeatedly claimed that there would be no need for any tax increase, not just for the coming year, but for 4 years. Suddenly the tune has changed. Now Congress is told by the President, in a paid political broadcast last week, that unless it passes this ceiling it will be responsible for the now-anticipated tax increase.

This latest claim is simply false. If a tax increase is proposed it will have resulted from the pervasive failure of this administration's tax and economic policies—policies which have added some \$100 billion to the national debt in only 4 years, which have caused unemployment, inflation and recession.

This arbitrary \$250 billion ceiling would be a fiscal disaster. A study by the conservative American Enterprise Institute, based on legislation already passed, and signed into law by President Nixon, and legislation proposed by the Nixon administration, shows that fiscal year 1975 Federal expenditures will increase by more than \$50 billion above the proposed ceiling to a level of \$301 billion. Included in this \$51 billion increase are increases of at least \$10 billion for defense, \$19 billion for income security—including social security, medicaid, and medicare—\$6 billion for health, \$5 billion for expansion of existing education programs, and \$5.3 billion for revenue-sharing. The detailed American Enterprise Institute study shows that in order to meet the Nixon administration's "full employment balance," the administration will have to increase taxes \$21 billion for fiscal year 1975, \$13 billion for 1976, and \$6 billion for 1977.

This administration's fiscal record is one of reckless spending. In its 4 years of economic mismanagement this administration has accumulated a shocking \$87.2 billion budget deficit, exceeding by more than \$10 billion the combined deficits of the four previous administrations. Between 1970 and 1972 this administration overestimated revenues by \$27.3 billion and underestimated spending by \$17.1 billion. For fiscal years 1970 and 1971 this administration continuously predicted a total budget surplus of \$7.1 billion; the final figure for the 2

years was a budget deficit of \$25.8 billion. Did they learn from their mistakes? No: the deficit for fiscal year 1972 rose from their estimate of \$11.6 billion to a final deficit of \$23 billion. In all, the Federal debt sky-rocketed from \$356.9 billion at the end of the 1969 fiscal year to more than \$477 billion at the close of the current fiscal year. And, most amazingly, unemployment continues at an intolerable 5.5 percent level nationwide, notwithstanding the extravagant promises and policies of this administration.

The record shows that Congress is not responsible for these unprecedented revenue shortfalls. During the first 3 years of the Nixon administration Congress increased total Federal spending by \$3 billion—1 percent of the administration's total budget proposals. What Congress did was to alter the priorities of the budget, shifting our emphasis to urgent domestic programs without significant alteration in total expenditures.

In contrast to the \$3 billion congressional overspending figure, \$8 billion in Federal revenues was lost as a result of permanent tax breaks given to big businesses last year by the administration as part of its so-called new economic policy. This \$8 billion figure alone consumes the difference between estimated Federal spending this year and the proposed \$250 billion ceiling.

The Nixon trickle-down theory behind the business tax giveaways has been a failure. It was a misguided effort to increase corporate profits in the hope that jobs and stable prices would "trickle down" to workers and consumers. But this hasn't happened. Instead, prices have gone up, unemployment has not decreased, and, while wages are rigidly controlled, corporate profits are approaching all-time highs. Unemployment has jumped from 2.8 million in 1968 to 4.9 million as of August of this year, an increase of nearly 75 percent or an additional 2.1 million unemployed workers. The Consumer Price Index has jumped over 20 points from the 1968 average, with the result that goods and services which cost \$100 in 1968 now cost \$119.96. Food prices—particularly meat—have soared. The number of workers on unemployment compensation has nearly doubled—from 900,000 in December of 1968 to 1.7 million in mid-July 1972.

During the years President Nixon has been in office the war in Indochina has stolen \$65 billion from the American people. This year alone \$13 billion will be drawn from the Treasury for this catastrophic war.

The Defense budget has reached record levels in this administration, and is packed with wasteful and unnecessary projects. A General Accounting Office study, released in 1970, revealed a cost increase of \$33.4 billion over cost estimates for 61 military systems studied. This administration has committed itself to the purchase of costly and unnecessary weapons systems which will cost billions over the next few years. Moreover, from fiscal years 1969 to 1971 Defense Department outlays exceeded congressional defense appropriations by \$9.4 billion—an example of how the congressional appropriations authority is al-

ready being ignored by this administration.

Another source of increased Federal expenditures is the cost of paying the interest on the national debt. Interest-cost alone on the Nixon administration's national debt increases has risen by \$5.7 billion, from a 1969 figure of \$17.7 billion to \$23.4 billion.

President Nixon has also consistently refused to increase Federal revenues by supporting tax reform. The Joint Economic Committee Economic Report, released in March 1972, stated that by fiscal year 1974 "at least \$10 billion can and should be raised through tax reform." This \$10 billion by itself would be more than enough additional revenue to cover the estimated \$6 billion difference between the \$250 billion ceiling figure and the actual expenditures without the ceiling. A recent study undertaken for the Joint Economic Committee by Joseph A. Pechman and Benjamin Okner of the Brookings Institution revealed that elimination of loopholes and special advantages written into the current income tax scheme would result in an increase of about \$77.3 billion in Federal revenues—nearly enough to cover the total Nixon-accumulated debt. The study found that elimination of eight selected tax breaks for businesses and the wealthy would result in a total of \$18.6 billion in new Federal revenues annually, and that this figure would rise by \$3 billion to \$21.6 billion if the minimum tax provisions enacted in 1969 were tightened as they should be.

A recently released Harris poll demonstrates beyond question that the voters want tax reform. Sixty-seven percent of those polled believed that the tax laws are written for the rich and not for the average man, and by a margin of 88 to 6 percent support was expressed for closing tax loopholes for the wealthy. Sixty-eight percent agreed that "corporate profits ought to be taxed at a higher rate," compared with 16 percent who disagreed. Fifty-four percent approved of tightening the minimum tax provisions for those who earn over \$6,000.

How can President Nixon support his own programs without substantial tax reform? How can President Nixon make good his promise to reduce property taxes without substantial tax reform?

Former Budget Director Charles Schultze has noted that if a \$250 billion ceiling is imposed, cuts of between \$12 and \$15 billion will have to be made in the next fiscal year. A large part of the Federal budget is virtually "untouchable." These programs include Social Security trust funds—including old-age and survivors insurance, medicare, and disability benefits—Federal employees and railroad employees retirement trust funds, and essential veterans' programs. Also "untouchable" are expenditures to pay the interest on the national debt, and revenue sharing. In addition, given this administration's determination to increase defense spending, it is highly unlikely that the defense budget will be reduced by President Nixon should he be reelected.

When all of the "untouchable" programs are subtracted from the Federal

budget, about \$55 billion remains. Even much of this sum is "untouchable" as a practical matter—such as the FBI appropriation, highway construction funds and reclamation projects. According to one estimate, when all of these "untouchable" programs are subtracted, only \$25 billion remains within which annual cuts of at least \$12 billion must be made.

The remaining "touchable" programs would either be terminated or their budgets would be slashed. In any event, these programs which at best would be subject to across-the-board reductions of from one-third to one-half include most of the civilian social service programs that are vitally important to millions of Americans: grants-in-aid to education, manpower training, health, pollution control, urban mass transit, child care, housing and urban development, and environmental protection.

The drastic cuts required by this ceiling would virtually wipe out these crucial programs, and would have a grave effect on the Nation's economy. Hobart Rowen, the Washington Post's economics writer, has demonstrated that the result of a \$12 billion cut in these job-producing programs would be a net loss to the gross national product of between \$20 and \$25 billion—with a corresponding increase in joblessness, which, according to Mr. Rowen's estimate, would rise from the already intolerable level of 5.5 percent to a 6 percent.

One billion dollars in the defense budget on the average generates 35,000 civilian jobs. The same billion dollars, invested in teachers, means 100,000 jobs. This billion-dollar figure spent on domestic programs could also mean 76,000 public housing jobs, 76,000 construction jobs, 77,000 nursing jobs, 132,000 municipal service jobs, or 151,000 Job Corps jobs.

The proposal before us today, then, is another example of the Nixon administration's lack of concern for people and their problems. For the benefit of a \$6 billion saving, a reduction in this year's deficit from \$38.4 billion to \$32.4 billion, the Nixon administration would add hundreds of thousands of citizens to the welfare and unemployment rolls and terminate or cripple social service programs on which millions of Americans depend.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, if any branch of the Government is guilty of irresponsibility in its conduct of fiscal matters, it is the executive branch in this administration. We have already seen our authority eroded by the impoundment procedure carried out by the President's Office of Management and Budget. In fiscal year 1971 alone, OMB impounded nearly \$13 billion from high-priority domestic programs which Congress considered and approved. If we enact the \$250 billion ceiling that President Nixon wants we will have abdicated the most important legislative function granted Congress by the Constitution, and in the process effectively abolished some of the most urgently needed social-service programs. I urge my colleagues to stop the flow of power to the executive branch. I urge my colleagues not to be taken in by this fiscal shell game being played by the ad-

ministration. We must reject this measure.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against H.R. 16810, the public debt ceiling bill, because I resent the delaying tactics which this administration has consistently used to prevent real tax reform.

This is the third time this year that the Administration has sought to beguile Congress into extending or upping the debt ceiling while doing nothing to raise revenue through desperately needed tax reform.

In February 1972, when the first administration request for a higher debt ceiling was under consideration, a group of Democratic Congressmen proposed an amendment requiring the President to come up with a loophole-plugging program for tax reform by May 1. We were dissuaded from offering it by Chairman WILBUR MILLS' letter to Mr. Nixon setting the even stricter deadline of March 15.

The President simply disregarded the chairman's message.

Later, in March, the Democratic caucus warned that further debt ceiling legislation would be jeopardized if the President did not at least indicate which tax loopholes Congress might spend its time closing without fear of a Presidential veto. The Presidential response was more silence.

Then, in April, Mr. Nixon announced to a select audience of tax avoiders at Secretary Connally's ranch that his one objection to so-called loopholes, such as oil depletion and accelerated depreciation of real property, was that they were not large enough.

In June, when the administration came back to Congress with a second request for a debt ceiling raise, we tax reformers sought to vote down the previous question so as to make in order loophole-plugging amendments. We lost, but by relatively close vote of 205-181.

The debate surrounding today's request for a higher public debt ceiling has taken place amidst escalating budget deficit estimates and campaign promises. Rather than raise revenue by closing the loopholes which finance his contributors, Mr. Nixon has resorted to the old notion of a spending ceiling to solve his budgetary—and electoral—problems. This means that while millionaires pay pennies in taxes, Federal funds for senior citizens, for school lunches, for pollution control facilities, will be slashed.

This administration time after time has placed the interests of special privilege over the interests of the average American. Nor do I see much hope for the future. "No tax increase," Mr. Nixon has declared, with elaborate and contradictory qualifications. But this deliberately avoids the issue. The immediate issue is not the overall tax rate but the tax structure. The issue is reform to achieve a fair distribution of the tax burden; once this is obtained, raising or lowering the tax rates will only be a matter of careful technical adjustment.

The confused parliamentary situation created by the rule making in order both the bill and an improved substitute prevents me from offering my tax reform

amendment on the floor. I shall therefore vote against the debt ceiling bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the President's request, reflected in the Debt Ceiling bill currently before us, for authority to decree spending cuts in Federal programs to limit total Federal spending to \$250 billion is an affront to the Congress and to the American people.

One need only look at the President's vetoes—health care, education, emergency employment—to know what programs he would cut if given the go-ahead. That alone is reason enough to oppose this provision.

The more important one, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, is the effect such an unprecedented delegation of power to the President would have on the Congress and its role in our traditional Democratic governmental system. The "power of the purse" is surely the most effective tool Congress possesses for setting national policy. Admittedly, the Congress does not always use that power as vigorously as it might and perhaps should. It has failed, for example, to use the power of the purse to end the war in Vietnam, despite the persistent efforts of a great many of us in the House to gain majority support for such a move. Nevertheless, to turn over a major portion of this power to the President would, at best, seriously weaken the influence of Congress in the job of governing this Nation and, at worst, would set us on a course away from our system of checks and balances and toward government by a single, all-powerful executive. To give the President authority to alter expenditures approved and directed to be made by the Congress would make it unnecessary any longer for Congress to worry about how it allocates the Nation's resources and that, in turn, would go a long way toward making Congress itself unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the American people are ready to give up the direct voice they have in the affairs of this Nation through their elected representatives in Congress. I do not believe they want to move any more than we already have toward Presidential government. If anything, I believe the American public wants to see Congress exercise its powers more fully, recognizing that the Congress is the best reflection of the public will and an active Congress, which takes its responsibilities seriously and guards them jealously, is the best defense this Nation has against the dangers inherent in a government by Executive decree.

Mr. Chairman, the President charged in a radio address to the Nation on Saturday, October 7, that the Congress has failed to meet its responsibility to hold down Federal spending, and that to vote against the provision of this bill to give the President authority to reduce Federal spending to \$250 billion would be a vote for higher taxes. Both these charges are distortions of the facts, and identify this proposal for what it is—an election year maneuver.

The Congress has cut Presidential budget requests by \$16 billion since 1968—by \$4.4 billion this year alone. As

far as taxes are concerned, I agree with the view expressed editorially by the New York Times yesterday that:

The nation cannot keep inflation in check and meet its social needs without some combination of higher taxes and reduced military expenditures.

To imply otherwise, as the President has, is a cruel hoax upon the public. The fact is, as Senator McGOVERN has wisely pointed out, tax increases for super-rich corporations and individuals, combined with cuts in military fat, could be just the right approach to achieving a balanced Federal budget.

In short, a balanced budget has eluded the President not because of a big-spending Congress, but because he has squandered \$61.9 billion since he took office on the Vietnam war and has opted for tax cuts for his big-business cronies rather than tax reform that could increase revenues and provide equity for the workingman without putting further strain on middle- and low-income families.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that at the appropriate time, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. MAHON, intends to offer an amendment in the form of a substitute which would require the President to notify the Congress and enable the Congress to approve or disapprove any Presidentially proposed cuts in programs for which the Congress has made appropriations. While there are pitfalls to this approach, it is certainly an improvement over the bill as it is. To support the provision currently in the bill would indeed, as Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY pointed out in a recent Washington Post editorial, be endorsing a "domestic Tonkin Gulf resolution," and I intend to support the Mahon substitute.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, it may be that the importance of today's debate in connection with legislation to increase the ceiling on the national debt is being inflated beyond all proportion. The fact remains that Congress will increase the debt ceiling, because the Government must pay its bills, and whether we approve the spending ceiling mechanism contained in the Ways and Means Committee bill or the formula in the Mahon substitute national spending priorities will continue to be distorted and the administration will continue to prevent the will of Congress by impounding appropriated funds.

This being the political ceiling, Congress and the administration have been engaged in fierce and protracted debate over responsibility for spending increases and/or fiscal responsibility, responsibility for prospective tax increases, and so on. What has not been determined, in all the rhetorical flourishes is when and how we will end the war which continues to drain our national spirit and resources, when and how we will end the unemployment and inflation which have wrought such havoc among millions of American families, when and how we will face up to the challenge of the urban crisis instead of ducking behind such phony issues as busing.

The President, for his part, feels it is to his advantage to campaign against a Congress accused of profligate spending,

and demands a \$250 billion spending ceiling for fiscal 1973 with the implicit threat that any future tax increase will be solely the fault of Congress if such a ceiling is not imposed. He would like the American people to believe that he is the paragon of fiscal responsibility, while Congress stands guilty of reckless spending.

The fact is that congressional action on the administration's budget requests over the past 3 years have added only \$350 million. The anticipated \$6 billion increase in outlays for fiscal 1973 can be attributed to the black lung benefits program, the social security increase and revenue sharing retroactivity. It can also be attributed to a record defense budget at a time when the Vietnam war is supposedly ending.

The administration's fiscal priorities seem clear enough: continued blank-checks for the Pentagon and continued antipathy toward programs for health, education and nutrition. Impose a flat spending ceiling giving total discretion for spending cuts to the White House and we will see more millions in funds for housing and community development impounded. We will see priority given missiles over meals for the elderly. We will see schools and libraries suffer while the generals and the defense contractors run up multibillion bills for projects and programs that will never get off the drawing board.

My own feeling is that a \$250 billion spending ceiling is not unreasonable. There is no question that Federal spending has fed the fires of inflation. But to give the President unlimited authority to determine the level of spending for each and every authorized program would be to abandon any remaining congressional responsibility for setting the Nation's policies and priorities. It would be the domestic counterpart to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in which Congress abdicated so much of its responsibility in the field of foreign affairs to the President—and with such tragic results.

The unwarranted and unprecedented use of executive impoundment of congressionally appropriated funds under the Nixon administration has already created a constitutional crisis which has not been given nearly enough attention either by Congress or the American people. I am not sanguine that Congress will move aggressively enough to recapture its lost authority, but of this I am sure: if the spending ceiling-item veto formula in the committee bill is adopted, the future role of Congress in our federal system will not resemble anything close to a full partnership with the executive branch. The President will ride roughshod over authorizations and appropriations alike, and the country will be run essentially by the Office of Management and Budget.

With the hope that there remains enough vision and initiative in the Congress to tackle the real problems facing our society, I urge adoption of the Mahon substitute requiring congressional approval of spending cuts proposed by the President.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, after all the rhetoric and rationaliza-

tion is done, the question remains whether the Members of this Congress are going to discharge their constitutional responsibilities or once again make a huge grant of legislative authority to the executive branch.

Members will recall that Winston Churchill, when he was Prime Minister, remarked:

I have not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of his empire.

I say to each Member here, "you and I were not elected by the people of our districts to liquidate the Constitutional powers of the Congress."

I am shocked by some of the arguments advanced in favor of the bill before us and against the Mahon substitute. It has been argued that we have already allowed the executive to assume many of the powers of Congress, so we might as well make it official. It has been argued that the Congress has failed to create internal machinery to control spending, so let us give our legislative powers to the President.

I strongly believe that the Congress should reform its internal procedures so that it can become a more effective body, especially in developing a coherent national fiscal policy. Its failure to do so inevitably results in an erosion of its powers. President Nixon's request for this legislation is surely the handwriting on the wall. But surely it should spur us to take corrective action in our own house instead of giving another blank check to the President.

Congress unwittingly gave away its authority to declare war in 1964 when it passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. Eight years, 55,000 dead, and a \$100 billion later, Congress is still trying to get its war powers back.

The Vietnam war should have taught us by now that one of the greatest dangers confronting our system of government today is the tremendous expansion of presidential power. Congress' authority over the Federal budget is really the only check it has on the executive. It is the only way Congress can have some influence and control over our national priorities. Give that up, and we might as well repeal the Constitution and establish a presidential dictatorship.

The President already has enough power to control Government spending. He submits the budget to Congress in the first place. If he does not like the way Congress handles it, he can veto the appropriations—as President Nixon has done on several occasions. It takes a two-thirds vote in Congress to override a presidential veto, and that has only happened once in the 92d Congress. It has happened only two other times since 1969.

Under the Constitution the President has leverage to hold down spending on programs he does not like, but he has to do it in full view of the public, through the use of the veto. There is always a certain amount of political risk in that. What President Nixon is asking for, in this new proposal, is the right to cut programs he opposes in the back rooms of the budget office. That kind of rule by executive decree would be a far cry from

the open, representative government our Founding Fathers gave us.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us is really quite simple. If we enact H.R. 16810, we will have taken another important forward step along the course of economic expansion without ruinous inflation. If we reject this bill, we will have turned toward the same kind of inflationary spiral that dealt us such a damaging blow in the mid-to-late 1960's.

H.R. 16810 provides for a tight debt limitation of \$465 billion through the remainder of this fiscal year. The limitation, however, is predicated upon our adherence to an equally tight spending ceiling of \$250 billion for the fiscal year. If we fail to provide the limitation on expenditures, the statutory debt limitation might well prove to be inadequate before the end of the fiscal year.

Against this background, we have a clear-cut responsibility to act affirmatively on both ceilings. To do otherwise would be foolish.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not intend to go further into details of H.R. 16810 with respect to either ceiling. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and others among my colleagues on that committee have thoroughly explained these provisions.

I would, however, like to comment additionally and briefly on the third major element of this legislation—the provision for a joint committee on budgetary control.

Whereas the expenditure ceiling would provide us with a temporary, short-range answer to our immediate fiscal crisis, the provision for a joint committee on budgetary control would offer the opportunity for a longer range, more lasting solution.

It would establish the basic machinery for congressional review of both spending and taxing—machinery which is sorely needed. If we are ever going to get a handle on both income and outgo simultaneously in the Congress, we will have to move in the direction indicated by this third element of H.R. 16810.

For a long time now, members of the Ways and Means Committee have been concerned about our inability to attain and maintain a good income-outgo overview. We look at the administration's budget from time to time, in connection with proposals to increase the statutory debt ceiling, and at those times we can and do compare and contrast revenues and expenditures. But these occasional confrontations with the budgetary facts of life have proved to be poor substitutes for acting on budget totals at the start of the appropriations process.

Similarly, the Appropriations Committee and the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Federal Expenditures have attempted to inform the House of the effect which appropriations bills might have on Federal expenditures. But these efforts, too, have been inadequate in directing enough attention to expenditure totals in dealing with the problem of program priorities.

Therefore, it would appear imperative that we create a new procedure to fill the

vacuum which our organizational structure has permitted to develop.

Title III of H.R. 16810 provides for such a procedure. It may not include the last word on adequate budgetary control by the Congress, but it does set up a satisfactory framework for real progress toward getting a legislative grip on expenditures and revenues in this fiscal year and laying the groundwork for developing a permanent budgetary control mechanism for the years ahead.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, titles I and II of H.R. 16810 are essential to our continued economic well-being and title III is critical with respect to our hopes for budgetary stability in the future.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering H.R. 16810, the debt ceiling bill which includes a \$250 billion spending limitation.

This bill has been attacked as a scandalous giveaway of legislative authority to the President. Indeed it is, but it is a legislative authority that Congress has never had the will to use for itself.

Certainly Congress should not give away its prerogatives. The Executive, especially in the last 40 years, has already established definite superiority over the Congress in their supposedly equal roles in the operation of government. Only in time of crisis, and then only on a temporary basis, should Congress consider delegating its spending authority. This is a time of crisis. We have put a couple of \$25 billion deficits back to back. There is no end in sight to future deficit spending. Our national deficit stands at over \$400 billion. Our annual interest obligations exceed \$23 billion. The crisis is not at some obscure future date—it is now.

The bill before us, I suppose, is bad policy; but it is necessary medicine. One can even hope that it might force the Congress itself to make the hard decisions to that the President will not be given authority to make his own decisions on how to cut spending. As I see it, that is one of the great advantages of this bill. It might force us, the Congress, to make the hard decisions we should have been making all along.

I certainly would not vote for this bill if it extended the delegation of powers beyond the end of the next fiscal year. This bill has only 8 months of duration and does expire next June.

The bill has also been attacked by those who fear that the President will cut the programs in which they are especially interested. We do not know now what he will cut, but we have an excellent way to prevent him from cutting anything. That means is simply to appropriate no more than \$250 billion.

I do not know whether \$250 billion is the right number or whether it should be more or less. In this bill I do not have the opportunity to change the figure anyway. I do know, however, that this is the first bill through which Congress has attempted to establish some "fiscal law and order" even though through it we are asking the President to establish that discipline for us.

Perhaps the best part of this bill is title III which calls for a committee including members of the Appropriations

and Ways and Means Committees of our House to investigate and report back to the Congress—prior to the expiration of this bill—on methods by which the Congress can control its own spending processes, or match its appetites to its resources. If the bill accomplishes nothing more than forcing us to look at our own processes of coordination, it must be considered a valuable piece of legislative reform. Obviously we cannot have one committee spending more than another committee is raising. Yet, that is what has happened for all these many years.

Many years ago, but during most of our lifetime, the Congress discovered that it could appropriate to its heart content without paying the piper. Therefore, Congresses have been happy to appropriate more money than our taxes collected, and yet have never been willing to collect the taxes to finance our spending schemes. Instead of paying the bill in taxes, we consumers and citizens have paid the bills in terms of inflation, or we have had inflated bills deferred by control systems laid over our economy.

We have a number of choices in the Congress. We can raise taxes to satisfy our spending appetites. We can lower the spending appetites. We can continue to spend without taxing and have inflation. We can continue to spend without taxing and maintain very strict controls over our economy; but these controls are repugnant to most in this Congress and cannot be imposed on a permanent or extended basis.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this bill as the only alternative that has been presented in the 92d Congress that will lead the Congress or the country either to setting of priorities or to matching our income to our expenses. I know that it is not a good policy, except on a temporary basis; but I do not know of any other way to establish discipline in this Congress.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, Article I of the United States Constitution vests in Congress, and Congress alone, the total residuum of all legislative powers. The mere ability to pronounce law, however, is of no consequence unless coupled by those appropriations needed to effect their provisions. This dual role of Congress must be executed solely by that body—to delegate one or the other to the President is no less than total abdication of the entire legislative process.

The constitutional position of the President is one who executes not institutes dispositive law. While he may be considered a vital catalyst in propounding various legislative programs, the Constitution does not vest his position with the power to inaugurate law. This is the function of Congress—a function now sought to be rendered purely nugatory by the Nixon-Mills bill.

Congress, as the duly elected legislative body of the country, is charged with the responsibility of arranging social priorities through a scheme of ordered laws. Throughout this session Congress has been in diligent pursuit of this duty. Now it is suggested that one man—the President—be vested with total discretion in rearranging Congress' determination of our social priorities. To remove such

power from Congress is to remove from our constituency the ability to fix responsibility for budgetary variations on particular Members of Congress. Instead they must be referred to the Office of the Budget—a bureaucracy with no identity controlled by those civil servants not dependent on the ballot box for their terms of employment.

There is no doubt the President must be armed with adequate tools to stem the tide of rising inflation in this country. The abdication of congressional law-making power is not, however, the answer, but an expedient measure unsanctioned by constitutional authority. Congress has already vested the Executive with one of the most pervasive and flexible pieces of legislation in recent times to combat inflation. The Economic Stabilization Act bespeaks of wide latitude in this area and yet the President, in his discretion, cannot, as of this time, find the means for its effective utilization. The power is now present; the President must decide how best to use it. Additional grants of power, unbridled by effective direction, can only lead to uncertainty at best and economic chaos at worst.

The administration has, thus far, proposed increased national appropriations unprecedented in the history of this Nation. Now, the Executive seeks the flexibility of definite legislative powers in order to cut spending and curtail inflationary trends. This inconsistency not only bespeaks of paradoxical reasoning but also of a political system totally uncontemplated by our Constitution.

It is for these reasons that I strongly support the proposed Mahon amendment—Congress must legislate, decide social priorities and have a voice in those appropriations needed to effectuate such priorities. The Constitution demands no less and the Executive can expect no more.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, as a fiscal conservative and one who has consistently opposed the excessive spending engaged in by this Congress, but as one who simultaneously views with abhorrence the continuing erosion of the prerogatives of this body as a coequal branch of Government, I am caught on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, there is a crisis aspect to the anticipated deficit for fiscal year 1973. On the other hand, there were more prudent ways to seek to avoid this crisis than to resort to an unprecedented new power delegated to the executive branch by a Congress that has difficulty imposing the necessary discipline upon itself.

I resent, as a Member of the legislative branch, being put into the category of an irresponsible child who must be disciplined by his father.

I simultaneously deplore the disposition to proceed in this body with a champagne appetite while the overburdened taxpayer has a beer pocketbook.

Ralph Nader has referred to the Congress in his latest book as the broken branch. While I disagree with some of the conclusions drawn from his analysis of a Congress disposed to abdicate its responsibilities, I nevertheless feel there is much warranted criticism in his analysis of the

increasingly subservient role played by the Congress.

If this trend is not reversed and soon, I am convinced that our republican form of government with its checks and balances will be totally destroyed. If it is, we shall become an impotent rubberstamp not just of the Chief Executive but of impersonal and unaccountable members of the administrative bureaucracy. There are ample historic precedents for such governments but tragically they have all led down the garden path to abuse and the loss of personal liberty.

Societies that seek to be irresponsible and free, seek something that never was and never will be. By the same token, legislative bodies that abdicate responsibilities repudiate their reason for existence.

I cannot, in good conscience, repudiate my reason for existence as a legislator or as a freedom-loving American.

Woodrow Wilson, who was an astute student of history, once observed:

The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the powers of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

It is my prayerful hope that my colleagues in this body will on the one hand refuse to relinquish any more of their prerogatives than they already have while on the other hand assume the responsibility of exercising restraint in expenditures necessary to avoid continuing deficits which eat into the pocketbooks of everyone—but most severely those who can least afford it—and can ultimately cause national bankruptcy.

Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to vote against this bill.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this body are probably aware of my efforts to focus attention on the decline of congressional authority over appropriations. This decline is due to the increasing impoundment of moneys by the Office of Management and Budget.

On July 26 of this year, I initiated a special order on this problem. Many members participated.

The consensus seemed to be that nearly every Member of this body has, at one time or another, had their district affected by OMB's impoundment of funds appropriated by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this may be elementary, but I, and my staff, have searched the Constitution in vain for language implying that the Congress can only recommend appropriations. I know of no colonial-era OMB in our Founding Fathers' thoughts.

And today, this Congress is asked to give the executive branch even more power—power that the Congress should exercise. H.R. 16810 represents a very disturbing precedent, Mr. Chairman.

This precedent, if allowed to be set, means that anytime our economy is out of balance, the Congress is to step aside. The emergency may be 6 months or a year this time. Next time it may be 2 or 3 years. Then we may begin to regard Congress as an advisory body only. Elected advisors do not make for democ-

racy; elected decisionmakers do. Let us be a Congress of decisionmakers, not advisors.

During the past few months, Members have been interviewed and reviewed by a project called the "Congress Project." Now the conclusions of this project are being made public. Many Members complain, with reason in many cases, as to the several conclusions of the "Congress Project." But this "Congress Project" has one conclusion, however, that is disturbing. This conclusion is that Congress is the weakest branch of the U.S. Government.

Members of Congress, can we complain about this conclusion if we continue to give up our powers over the budget? I say no, and I think that the citizens of America would say "No."

I urge the adoption of the Mahon substitute. We face a financial crisis. I think that my colleague from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has offered a substitute that meets this spending crisis with the executive and congressional branches as equals in the decision-making process.

This approach, the Mahon substitute for title II of H.R. 16810, is a sound one, and more in line with the concepts of equal power among the three branches of government than is title II of the committee bill.

I salute the Appropriations Committee for their work in the 92d Congress. They have trimmed to the bone many budget requests. Sometimes I have disagreed with the Appropriations Committee on specific programs. Overall, however, I have only admired their cost-cutting work this session.

Mr. Chairman, I support controlling inflationary spending. Because the Mahon substitute does this without abdicating congressional authority, I will vote for this approach to controlling our spending.

The fact is, however, that our deficit keeps growing year after year, our debt ceiling is raised year after year. In almost every year, we exceed our budget, and the unseen money of obligated funds keep flowing through the pipeline in larger and larger amounts.

Thus, in spite of what the Congress appropriates, or fails to appropriate and in spite of what new programs the President recommends or cuts, the deficit grows and grows. We must do something different than what we have done in the past.

I think the primary responsibility lies with the Congress. In the final analysis, the Congress represents the people. The Congress must have the final word in the appropriation of funds. To be responsible, it seems that Congress must control the expenditure of funds.

For years we have ducked that responsibility. We, the Congress, must become hardnosed. I would think the place to begin is to strengthen the staff of the Appropriations Committee, and for the Appropriations Committee to be a budget officer, along with OMB and to set tough limits of expenditures and make the Congress live up to these limits.

Our hope lies in the Appropriation Committee. A strong willed, tough committee. Else, we should not cry out against the President or the OMB when funds are cut.

The Ways and Means Committee can help also, that committee passes the tax relief to spur up the economy at the possible risk of not bringing in enough tax money to run the Government. That committee also passes social security raises without providing adequate taxes. And that committee literally passes legislation such as revenue sharing, thus bypassing the appropriation process.

If the Appropriation Committee and Ways and Means Committee worked closely together, with firm resolve, I think the Congress can control spending.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the bill and against the Mahon amendment. Neither vote is an easy one to cast, but I believe that the circumstances confronting us in the closing days of this session leave us with no responsible alternative.

The \$250 billion ceiling presents the House admittedly with a real dilemma. In approving it we do give the President temporary authority to supersede the action of the Congress in the matter of appropriations. Certainly under normal circumstances, we should not yield this authority. But this bill also authorizes a further sizeable increase in the national debt. And we in the House bear a share of the responsibility for this increase. If we do not like these continuing deficits then we must somehow find some way to put some top limit on our spending and hold down this deficit.

This we have not so far done. And with only a few days left in the session it is unrealistic to think that we can do it in the next few days through the normal legislative processes.

The Mahon amendment is no real alternative to the committee bill, because it provides no real spending cut, and very little prospect of any real cuts in the future.

I wish some other alternative had been offered that would have made cuts yet at the same time retained control in our hands, such as an overall percentage reduction, for example. But no such proposal has been offered to us.

The adoption of this ceiling will not be painless, of course. The people do want Federal spending; they want substantial Federal help, no less so in New York State than elsewhere. But the people also do not want more taxes, and that is even more true of New Yorkers than of citizens in other States. And if we insist on going into debt, without making any effort at all to hold the line on spending, then further taxes can be the only ultimate result. And so in the interests of fiscal stability and support the committee bill and the President's proposed ceiling.

But I do hope we will move quickly to prevent this same situation from confronting us again next year. The 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act directed Congress to institute its own legislative budget controls. But Congress has never carried out that mandate. It is time we did so now; and I hope the new study committee which this legislation creates

will have such proposals for us to vote on early next year—if we are lucky to be back. In that way Congress can then recover our proper powers over the purse next year and prevent any recurrence of the present painful dilemma.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 16810 and the proposed Mahon amendment to it. At the outset I want to make it clear that I share the concern of my colleagues and of the President about the need for a \$250 billion ceiling on spending. However, in granting extraordinary powers to the President for a 6-month period, this bill removes Congress from the budgetary process. And the Mahon amendment which attempts to curb the effects of this bill by keeping congressional control over budgets has a glaring defect. It refuses to accept congressional responsibility for setting a ceiling under which we can all live.

I firmly believe that Congress can and must be held accountable for an annual self-imposed spending limit. In this same context it is clear that any attempt to curtail congressional involvement in the budget process results in a serious abdication of the power delegated to the Congress by the Constitution. No Congress should give any President the statutory line item veto power incorporated in this bill.

This bill authorizes not only an unsound principle but a dangerous precedent by sanctioning for the first time the impounding by the President of funds duly authorized and appropriated by the Congress. This in itself is an unwarranted grant of power to the executive branch. However, H.R. 16810 goes far beyond even this by giving to the executive branch the clear authority to reduce or eliminate appropriations for congressionally mandated and guaranteed programs such as Veterans Benefits and even the social security program itself.

In voting against this measure I would like to propose the following course of action for Congress:

That we pass a spending ceiling for the next fiscal year by June 30 each year; that we require passage of all appropriations before the first dollar can be spent for any budgetary line item; and that we apply a pro-rata reduction to all appropriations when the total budget exceeds the limit established by Congress. I believe such an approach, rather than what is proposed in H.R. 16810, will effectively make us in the Congress live up to our constitutional responsibilities and avoid further buck-passing to the executive branch.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Chairman, the manner in which Congress appropriates and budgets funds is one of the most fundamental problems confronting our Government today. The American people are rightfully concerned about this issue and I am certain that we are all anxious to see reforms in this area. At this point, I feel there is a distinct danger that the real issues surrounding the proposals which Congress is considering today will get lost in the flurry of activity which marks the last hours of this session. There is so little time to discuss the complexities and conse-

quences of the proposals before the Congress and their political implications.

The salient principle brought out in today's debate has been the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to manage our Nation's budget. When there is time and opportunity, Congress must come to grips with this problem.

Earlier this session I introduced a bill I believe is a reasonable and workable alternative to our present fiscal chaos. It is the result of a careful examination of the alternatives which I believe are available to Congress.

The bill which I introduced, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972, contains four sections:

The first would make the fiscal year coincide with the calendar year. Such a change would help enable members of Congress to plan budgets more effectively on the long-range comprehensive basis.

The second establishes an annual spending ceiling which could not be exceeded unless some provision is made to raise the additional revenue. The only exceptions would be in cases of national emergency or natural disaster.

The third establishes a Federal impoundment procedure which will regulate and limit the manner in which a President may withhold appropriated funds.

The fourth, and I believe one of the most important sections of my bill, would authorize Congress to undertake a study of alternative budgetary and fiscal procedures. This study would be a comprehensive look at all the paths available to the Congress to achieve a rational and effective fiscal procedure.

I believe my bill represents the most reasonable approach to our fiscal problems. It takes immediate steps toward achieving the goal of giving Congress greater control over spending, economic planning, and bureaucratic growth.

But, it also provides for further study into the matter to determine which additional steps should be taken, if any. I sincerely believe that my bill represents the most responsible answer to the vital question of fiscal reform.

However, the problem presented to us, well articulated and argued by Chairman MILLS supporting his bill and Chairman MAHON supporting his substitute, is one that must be answered by a vote today. Spending must be controlled, and the President has asked for the help of the Congress. I will vote with Chairman MILLS today in hopes of helping the President to control spending and inflation. In the next Congress I will exert my influence to reach the objective which Chairman MILLS and Chairman MAHON obviously agree on—that is, we must enact final legislation such as I earlier introduced which helps the Congress to recapture their responsibility through internal structural reform.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 16810 which provides for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, but also more importantly places a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

Those of us who have been here in the Congress any length of time have trav-

eled down the road of debt increases many times before. We have had the opportunity to be responsible in the sense that we have to recognize that when the money has been spent and the bills come due they must be paid. Those with a long history of voting against an increase in the debt ceiling believe they are consistent. Yet it would be interesting to find out how many of those who have constantly voted against the increase in the debt ceiling have also voted against total appropriations in an amount equal to the increase needed, and also whether or not over the years they have been as constant or consistent in voting against all non-essential expenditures as they have been in voting against raising the ceiling.

During the debate we have heard the expression used several times that we are at a crisis in this country. This is true. In only 5 of the past 20 years has the Federal Government shown a budget surplus. The only really substantial surplus was the \$4 billion one in 1956 following the very small \$50 million surplus in 1952. Over all the other years the deficits have ranged from \$1 billion in 1954 to \$25 billion in 1968, and now the accumulated deficits from 1969 to 1973 during the Nixon administration total \$75.8 billion, including the estimated \$27 billion deficit for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, it is not pleasant to have to vote for an increase in the debt limit. In the past I have seriously considered voting against such lifting of the ceiling. But what may be pleasant or even popular is not the point at issue today. Without such an increase in the debt limit all the items drawn against the Treasury are faced with the threat that the limit of our national credit will not permit their payment. Think of it. Social security beneficiaries, members of our Armed Forces, recipients of veterans benefits, Government workers, suppliers of goods and services would not be paid if the debt limit is not increased. Put very simply, when bills come due and the debt limitation is so low it does not permit their payment, all operations of our Government come to a screeching halt. I am sure no Member wants to assume even a small part of the responsibility for such a happening.

During general debate on this bill, we heard such comments as "the danger flag is up," and also such comments as "if the credit of our country is gone, we will be destroying our country from within." It was argued that we should have been able to see the crisis was coming for years. But now it is here. Something must be done. The distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, presented some figures that are impossible to refute. The interest on the national debt now runs \$2,637,000 an hour, \$44,000 a minute, and \$735 every second. I am not certain of the factual basis for the assertion, but in a discussion of how long it would take to pay off the debt based on the record of repayment since the close of World War II, it was stated that it would take about 900 years. If that is true, then it is certain we are not putting a burden on our grandchildren, but on our great, great grandchildren,

and even this kind of thinking is based on the assumption that if we do not do something very soon about the national debt, our beloved Republic may not last long enough to see the debt retired.

As we approach the vote on this measure in the heat of this election year, some may wish to consider what is the politic thing to do or the impolitic thing not to do. We all concede that to give this power to the President under title II to limit expenditures and net lending for fiscal 1973 to \$250 billion, is a rather unusual grant of power. Why is this necessary? Simply because Congress has demonstrated again and again that it cannot or will not limit expenditures. Organized pressures for spending by special interests seem to be so great that Congress always yields.

As much as any other Member, I hate to think of abdicating any of our powers in the Congress. But we may be at a point right now where there is no other alternative. The time has come to call a spade a spade. As I understand the temper of my district, two of the biggest issues, are the concern over a possible tax increase next year and the twin concern over continued inflation. Now I have never been one of those that believes each and everything the President tells us. Back on October 7 he indicated that in his judgment a vote against the spending ceiling of \$250 billion for this current fiscal year could very well be a vote for higher taxes in 1973, and went on to indicate that if H.R. 16810 is passed and the title II limitations are imposed, there would be no tax raise in 1973 and perhaps not in 1974.

If I had any inclination to oppose a proposal to fix some kind of firm limitation on expenditures I would be going against a commitment which I made throughout my congressional district last spring, and particularly at several large gatherings during the month of May. At that time I said something had to give, something had to be done, or else when the time came that the people of this country and throughout the world realized that our debt was \$500 billion, a new word would creep into our vocabulary. The people would soon realize that this \$500 billion was really one-half trillion, and as the meaning of the overpowering magnitude of a trillion dollars soaked into the understanding of our people and also the rest of the people in the world, there would be a kind of earthquake in our own stock market and all the international money markets. The dollar would be in more trouble than it had never seen before. I cannot and will not talk out of one side of my mouth in my district and talk out of the other side of my mouth on the floor of this House. I will never indulge in this kind of double talk or conduct myself in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, another reason that I support H.R. 16810, is because its title III sets up a joint committee to review the operation of the budget ceiling and to recommend procedures for improving congressional control of budgetary outlays and receipt totals. Those who suggest we have one appropriations committee are incorrect and inaccurate. As a

matter of fact we have over a dozen committees on appropriations, and this leads to a fragmented review of the total budget. The only budget we have today is the budget of the executive branch.

Many years ago under that beloved Missourian, Clarence Cannon, for 1 year there was a consideration of all appropriations bills in one measure at one time. It was an ordeal, but the record shows there was a substantial surplus that year. Title III of this bill may not be perfect, but it is the start of an approach to what in my judgment should have been the law long ago, and that is that no appropriations bill can be considered until the Congress—repeat, the Congress—adopts a comprehensive budget for the fiscal year on its own, not some budget prepared by the executive branch. Any housewife knows that there is no way for her to work under a household budget unless she sets a ceiling for all the family expenditures that she must control. We in Congress have failed to follow such a sensible pattern. Therefore, I suggest that we are all ultimately responsible for where we are today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that we are abdicating our responsibility and turning everything over to the President. That is not true. Rather, we abdicated our responsibility long before this bill ever came along. Why is this so? Because we never saw fit or took the time to propose or work out a congressional budget. All we do is go through the motions of adding or subtracting a few items from the budget of the executive branch. We have never devised a vehicle for adequate congressional control over our Federal outlays.

Moreover, we must devise some kind of mechanism which will consider all nonappropriated funds in one bucket or one basket along with all the appropriated funds rather than just adding or taking away a little bit here and there from the items of the executive budget turned over to us, at the beginning of each calendar year.

To complicate matters, we have backdoor spending. There is far too much of this automatic spending. Perhaps that is the chief reason for the great inflationary impact that we are experiencing today. The only alternative that I see at this time is to try to work out some kind of control over total spending by adopting our own congressional budget. Another one of our faults is that all we do is consider obligatory authority. We never carefully consider expenditure control. In other words, we never consider what will be spent in any given year but only extend obligatory authorities over a year or years in the future.

In my view there is nothing wrong or evil about title III. It simply creates a joint committee of 30 members from the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and on the other side from their Finance Committee and their Appropriations Committee. Years ago all revenue and appropriations was considered by one committee. Perhaps this historic situation is a kind of precedent for title III of this bill.

As we come to a vote on this bill it

should be remembered that at the present time the Executive already has the power to withhold expenditures except in a few prohibited areas. Actually this bill does little more than the President can already do without this bill. It has been argued that Congress is today the weakest part of the tripod of our Government, and that this kind of a thing will make it even weaker. It is suggested that this grant of authority gives the President power no previous Congress has ever granted him. Well, those arguments may be partially true, but if I read the temper of my constituents correctly, they are not interested in some close case of constitutional interpretation. They are not interested in any jurisdictional matter, or even any point of parliamentary procedure. What they want and will demand is an expenditure control to avoid an increase in taxes. They want this now, and they want to be sure that unrestrained expenditures will not add more fuel to the fires of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I would have preferred that there be a clause in this bill that the President can not cut any program more than 5 or 10 percent. If the rule under which this bill came to the floor would have permitted it, I would have offered such an amendment. I opposed the so-called Mahon substitute. There was nothing wrong with it, except that it just did not do anything or accomplish much of anything. It was meaningless.

I support this temporary increase and I also support title II with the \$250 billion limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal 1973. It must be emphasized that this is a temporary limitation. I agree it would be a bad thing to do this permanently. It would be unwise if we made this a habit and did this year after year. But such is not the case. Just as the debt ceiling increase is temporary, so is title II temporary. It is so temporary that it only applies until June 30, 1973, just about 8 months away. But we are in a crisis. We are in trouble. We are afflicted with the great disease of spending more and more each year than we take in, in revenue. A dread disease calls for some bitter medicine, and that is why I support title II with a strict limitation for the next 8 months and also title III, in the hopes that a new review operation of a budget by the Congress rather than a budget by the executive branch may bring expenditures under control once again, then and only then Congress can truly assert its authority over the purse strings, as was contemplated in the Constitution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there was a President who used to say, "Let us reason together." Let me borrow his phrase, and ask that we reason together, about the very seri-

ous fiscal problems everyone in this debate admits that we as a nation face.

The fiscal problem is made very apparent by the increase in the debt limit provided by title I of this bill that is absolutely essential if we are to continue the operations of the Government after October 31 on a responsible basis. This increase in the present overall limit of \$450 billion through October 31 to \$465 billion through June 30 of next year is essential.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that this is the third time this year that we have had to act to increase the capacity of the Government to borrow in order to pay the bills that were already incurred and are coming due.

There has been little discussion about the increase in borrowing authority today, and I think probably that is a good thing, because it is not a controversial matter. At other times, we have had controversy over the amount of a proposed increase in the debt ceiling because some of us felt the executive branch was asking for more borrowing authority than it needed. Sometimes we were successful in getting some reductions in excessive borrowing authority, but an adequate ceiling was always established and with my support.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out: Unless spending is limited to \$250 billion, as is proposed by the ceiling in this bill, the \$465 billion in borrowing authority provided will not get us through this fiscal year. If expenditures are allowed to exceed this ceiling, we will have further requests for borrowing authority, more interest payment, and more inflation.

The debate today has correctly focused on the question of Congress doing two things: first, directing that expenditures in this fiscal year not exceed \$250 billion, and second, giving the President the authority to carry out that mandate. The real question we have to ask ourselves as we approach these issues is: Do we feel that we are spending too much?

We seem to generally agree that we are, and unless we do something about it, we are going to have to pay some very heavy penalties. We are going to have to pay the penalty of inflation; we are going to have to pay the penalty of a deterioration of the dollar at home and abroad; and we are going to have to pay the penalty of large tax increases.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard no one come into the well of the House and advocate that we are not spending enough, and I do not expect to hear it from anybody. No one has said that we do not have enough inflation, and that we ought to feed the fires more. I have not heard anybody come into the well of the House and say we should have a large tax increase.

There are some of us—and I am one of them—who have differed with some of the things that have been said downtown. I think our fiscal situation is such that I do not know how we can get by without some kind of a tax increase in the next year or so. As one looks down the road and sees the commitments that have been made—by the executive branch and by the Congress of the United

States—for the expenditure of money beyond the receipts under present law, a tax increase may well be required.

Our people have to be advised that they cannot constantly ask for more and more services, all of which cost money, and escape the responsibility of having to pay for those services in the form of taxes.

That is what the issue of an expenditure ceiling is all about. Our willingness to face up to the responsibility of funding the services we demand, has created a fiscal crisis, threatening renewed inflation unless we tighten our belts.

If you refuse to do something about current spending and the current deficit, then you are in effect openly advocating increased inflation and substantial increases in the people's taxes. There is just no other way to get around it.

Much has been said today—and I suppose this is to be expected at this season of an odd-numbered year—as to who is responsible for this fiscal crisis, and who should take the blame for spending being out of hand. Frankly, there is enough blame to go around and touch every base. I am not going to excuse the President, since he has advocated spending programs that I have not supported.

I say to my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, with whom I sympathize, that he and I voted together in opposing a number of these proposals. Revenue sharing is one. Members of the House will recall what I hoped and thought was a vigorous but reasoned plea to turn down the bill. Frankly, I will make a similar plea on Thursday when the conference report comes up, because I do not think it is any better now than when it passed the House. It costs more money than it did when it left the House, and I am still against it. However, that still does not relieve me of the responsibility as a Member of Congress of facing up to the large deficit we face—not just because of programs I voted for, but because of the action of the Government of the United States—the President and the Congress acting together.

That is the responsibility we have to face up to. It does not do any good to try to hide behind the excuse; that some of the programs were passed without my support.

I heard the gentleman from Ohio and others talking about revenue sharing. I was not for it, either. I think I opposed it as consistently and vigorously as any Member of this House. But if it is on the books, it is part of our spending. Most of the money in revenue sharing was in the budget recommended by the President. That is not a budget-busting item if the budget the President asked for in January and his supplemental requests are the baseline criteria. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, called the 20-percent social security increase an expenditure and talked about its effect on the budget. You will recall that this increase was added in the Senate to the last debt ceiling bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

No committee has even considered the 20-percent increase in benefits or the method of financing associated with that proposal. It was added on the floor of the Senate and it went to a conference committee. We had some differences, as to whether the conference committee even reached agreement. We took votes in the conference and came to an agreement, and then pretended no agreement was reached in order to bypass some of the House rules on conference agreement. This dubious procedure aside, the substantive decision to provide a 20-percent increase was a mistake. It should have been 10 percent. If it had been 10, then we would have some leeway to take needed action now as we go into a conference on other social security amendments, many of them needed to create equities in the social security system. Now we cannot put any of these needed amendments on the books without increasing social security taxes beginning next year. We completely preempted any of the periodic financial latitude occurring in the system from time to time due to increased earnings levels for the 20-percent rise.

But it does not do me any good to say that I was not for it and, therefore, as far as I am concerned we do not have a fiscal problem. We have a fiscal problem whether we like it or not; whether we as individuals had anything to do with it or not.

And I suggest we have the responsibility of doing something about it. I think the executive branch, both past and present, share the blame because the spending initiatives often originated in the executive branch. Any objective economist will tell you that the inflation of the last few years was the spending that we originated in the "guns and butter" philosophy of 1966, 1967, and 1968, when we began living way beyond our means as a nation.

But even that argument is not sufficient to let us hide behind the skirts of somebody else. It will not obviate the fiscal crisis that we face nor obliterate the clear path of fiscal responsibility we must now take.

If we spend \$250 billion, we will still have a \$4.5 billion deficit on a full employment budget basis.

I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), about some of the problems associated with the full employment budget concept. It covers up what the true deficit picture is. On a unified budget basis, there will be a \$25 billion deficit, and on a Federal funds basis a \$32.4 billion deficit. But it is generally agreed that a full employment budget of any magnitude is stimulative; and even with a \$250 billion ceiling we will have a \$4.5 billion deficit in fiscal year 1973 on this basis.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. MAHON) who is also the chairman of the Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures has reported that congressional action through September 30 has increased outlays above the Presidents budget of \$250 billion by \$7 billion. This is the latest report of that committee. This would mean outlays of \$258 billion instead of

\$250 billion, unless we have an effective spending ceiling. This also increases the deficit on a full employment, unified and Federal funds basis and would require a further increase in the debt ceiling.

We have to admit that there is sufficient blame for all to share, and Congress has a big responsibility.

I am amused in reading the substitute resolution to be offered the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He recites the deficits in the last 3 years totaling \$70 billion and another deficit coming up this year. The implication is that it is the President of the United States who is responsible and we should not have these deficits. Where do you suppose the President got that money? Everyone here admits that there is not a penny—not 1 red cent that the President can spend unless he first gets it from the Congress.

The President does not find some money someplace. We have authorized it. We have appropriated it and in some cases we have directed that he spend it. We cannot avoid sharing the responsibility for those large deficits.

I am not going to blame the Committee on Appropriations for all these problems. I sympathize with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I would like to win you over to my side of the argument and recognize that we do have to take responsible action. I sympathize with you because much of the increased spending that is taking place is because of the Committee on Appropriations is being bypassed. We bypassed it in the revenue sharing, and the gentleman knows I approved that procedure.

The Water Pollution Control Act Amendments considered the other day included large amounts of contract authority that also bypasses the Appropriations Committee.

We have to do something. We just cannot let events simply take their course. My problem with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is that he admits and agrees in nearly every speech that I have heard him make in this session that spending is out of hand and that we have to get it under control.

But now what does he suggest? I agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) that Congress has the authority to do the reducing itself. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) who says that Congress can impose its own priorities to reduce spending to \$250 billion. But I do not see any indication that having failed to take that action until the twilight hours of this Congress, that we will act now. We are getting ready to adjourn and we certainly cannot do anything while we are in adjournment.

Then, when you come back here, as the minority leader pointed out, it will be February before Congress begins operating, and the year will be nearly over before action can be taken. You cannot put a spending ceiling for \$250 million for the fiscal year 1973 on in April or May of that fiscal year when the year is nearly over. You have to act now.

But who is going to act? I have not heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations suggest that he was getting his committee together and they were going to stay in session and go through all of the actions of Congress to find out where they could cut to get it down to \$250 billion or some other reasonable ceiling, and then bring in a bill for rescission. No, we are not going to do anything, as the Mahon substitute confirms.

The Speaker suggested this ceiling and emphasis on restraint is something now that the President is proposing. I can understand that the Speaker is busy and it may not have come to his attention, but this was recommended by the administration early this year. It was forcefully brought to the attention of the Congress in connection with the debt ceiling increase that they asked for in June. It was emphasized again in September. The administration has consistently pointed out that spending was getting out of control and have suggested a ceiling.

Some time ago, the chairman and I talked to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and expressed the hope that that committee would take this matter under its jurisdiction. But we are within 4 or 5 days of adjournment and no action has been taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, something can be done and it would be fairly simple to have a debt ceiling limitation placed in the bill, a spending limit which would direct the President to cut percentage-wise the different programs that the Congress passes to the point where it would meet that ceiling. That could be done.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Sure, you could do that, but I do not think the gentleman would recommend a meat ax approach of that kind, cutting without any regard to the relative need and merit of the programs involved.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say that the meat-ax approach is where we give the President the right to bludgeon to death specific programs he does not like which the Congress has passed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me address myself to that point. I am glad the gentleman focused my attention on this issue at this time.

Congress is not going to act. Congress has the authority. We could rescind spending bills if we had the will to do it, but the will is not there. Let us admit it. We are now trying to find some excuses to avoid imposing a ceiling. But the one thing we know we can do, because it has been done before, is to establish a ceiling. Before we were asked to impose a

ceiling for it by the Executive, but we insisted that the Executive take that responsibility. We said, you cannot spend any more than this given amount, and we will give you the authority to cut back to the amount specified, in this case \$250 billion. There is the one hope that we have, the one mechanism we have, for bringing expenditures down to a responsible level. Let us use it.

There are those who have come up with this argument about abdication of power. As the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) pointed out, we abdicated that a long time ago. We never exercised control over expenditures in any given year. We have always said that was an executive prerogative. There are those who argue—the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER)—that constitutionally, the President must spend every penny we give him. Then on the other side, it has been argued just a moment ago that the President does not have to spend anything. I think our problem in part is that we just do not know the degree to which either one of these positions is right.

I think there is a degree of truth in each of them. There are some things the President cannot do unless we give him authority in this bill. There are others we know he can do, and there are others in the gray areas. The only way we can resolve that is by giving him the authority.

The gentleman talked about abdication of power. We have abdicated before. We abdicated in 1967-68 when we had an emergency. If there is an abdication this time, what are we abdicating for? Eight months. And to what intent? Out of a potential expenditure of between \$250 and \$260 billion we are asking the President to exercise this cut \$6 to \$10 billion. On the other \$250 billion—a quarter of a trillion dollars—and the overwhelming proportion of the total, the gentleman's argument is completely inapplicable. When one talks about abdicating power to the executive branch, compared to what we have done in the past, this is peanuts—and is essential. We have abdicated power in the past without getting anywhere near the kind of results or solving problems as serious as those confronting us today.

Let me point this out: Passing the ceiling today is going to help us beyond fiscal 1973. It is going to be of some help in fiscal 1974 and fiscal 1975, because it is the basis upon which those fiscal years prescind from. And hopefully by then Congress itself will have faced up to the responsibility of providing spending authority within responsible overall limits.

We must take advantage of the part of the bill that sets up the committee to take a look at how Congress handles money matters to see if we cannot develop a system that will work and help us face the problems that will confront us beyond fiscal 1973.

Let me just conclude by saying this, Mr. Chairman: What does the Mahon amendment do? I am just as surprised as I can be at my friend on the Appropriations Committee. He says we have got to do something to get expenditures under control. Then what does he advocate?

He says "Mr. President, on January 2 you tell us what you would like to have done by way of cutbacks and we will take a look at it and see what we want to do."

Why do we abdicate to him even by saying we are going to wait for his list? If Congress can do it and we have got the willingness to do it, Mr. Chairman, we should be working on it right now and not passing the buck and saying maybe we will do something in January. That is all the Mahon amendment does.

Let me point out that in January the President has to submit a budget for the fiscal year 1974, but as part of that budget he also has to submit an updated fiscal year 1973 budget, and in there of course he can detail the areas of reductions he feels he has the authority to make and that should be made to restore fiscal responsibility to the budget.

But all that is recommended by the Mahon amendment is that we duck the issue. We duck the issue as to whether we want more inflation. We duck the issue as to whether we are going to have to impose much higher taxes. And we duck the issue as to whether we want to face up at all to the problem of excessive spending.

If we vote for the Mahon amendment we are saying we do not care what happens to the dollar, and we do not care what happens to inflation. Having failed to be fiscally responsible, we will be denying the Executive the power to be fiscally responsible.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield our remaining 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, we have been listening attentively all afternoon and we have heard over and over again much the same arguments. I want to try for a few moments to summarize and close the debate on this subject. We have heard some say today that they are going to oppose this bill because they do not want to give up congressional prerogatives to the executive branch, and there is some merit to that argument, but where were those same people, I would ask on this occasion, when just before the July recess we voted to grant, that is; this Congress did, a 20-percent social security increase, at which time as a part of that proposal we gave to the executive branch the authority in the future to grant cost-of-living increases to social security beneficiaries without any consideration of the Congress? But the Congress is going to have to provide the taxes to finance those now-given-away prerogatives when the cost-of-living increases are granted.

Then I hear some say that they are afraid this constitutes a line item veto authority for the President, and I suppose that if he chooses to use it in this way it could do exactly that. But if I can be brutally frank and political, if that is the fear of Members, common sense tells me that there is more to lose by not going along with the President if that is true than there is by going along with him, because then he might look with a little bit more favor if we support him—but I am not advancing the

idea that we support this proposal for that reason.

There have been some who have said we have a booby trap in this bill on page 2. They say this gives to the President the authority under a formula to cut wherever he wants whenever he wants.

It does give him some authority. It really does not give him any authority he does not already have, but I would point out that we have done it before. I hold here in my hand the joint resolution which passed the 90th Congress, House Joint Resolution 888. It calls for making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for further purposes. Section 204 of that bill, which I have here in my hand, did exactly the same thing in almost exactly the same language, so there is not anything new about that.

But, we have heard all these reasons. Let us get down to the meat of the cocoanut; get down to the facts. There are really only three points to consider as we give consideration to whether or not we are going to write into law a spending limitation. These three points covered in this proposal have to do, first, with the debt ceiling increase. Who here would deny the need today for a debt ceiling increase prior to June 30, calendar year, 1973? That is where this debt ceiling increase is intended to carry us through; June 30 of next year.

We may not like to vote for debt ceiling increases but everybody wants the U.S. Government to pay its debts. You and I, the Congress made those debts. We are going to have to have a debt ceiling increase of at least \$15 billion if we write this expenditure ceiling into law, but if we do not write this \$250 billion limitation into law, we are going to have to have a debt ceiling increase far in excess of the proposed \$465 billion; \$65 billion of which is considered temporary in nature, but you and I know that it is not temporary for the foreseeable future, because the Mahon proposal does not, as has already been said here today, provide for a spending limitation.

It simply asks, as others have said, for the President to tell us by January 2 of next year what cuts he thinks should be made if we are going to limit the ceiling to \$250 billion. Then Congress must act but it will be too late to be effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If we are going to limit it to \$250 billion, then and only then will we give consideration to what the Congress ought to do. That is the first point.

The second thing has to do with the fiscal situation or point of view. Who here today would say that we do not have runaway inflation in this country? Who here today would deny that the deficits which we have incurred in this Government over recent years is anything else but the doing of this Congress? I submit to the Members that the Congress neither has the desire nor the will in an off-election year, to say nothing of an election year such as this, to limit spending, to control spending as it should be

done. We do not have the guts. We can not resist the pressure.

I am going to read for a moment in trying to show what the financial plight of this Government is, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 24473.

We were considering then the water pollution control amendments of 1972. The distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, my friend from Texas (Mr. MAHON) was speaking. These are his words:

I have a document here, a scorekeeping report on the expenditure effects of all congressional actions and inactions, which is provided at the taxpayers' expense by one of the congressional joint committees. In checking these figures I find the following. Including the \$5 billion in the pending bill, the appropriation bills and nonappropriation bills out of the legislative committees, such as this one, the House has thus far—and most of our bills have not been finalized—the House has busted the President's budget request for new spending authority in fiscal year 1973 that began only three weeks ago by the astronomical sum of \$20,770,436,000.

To be perfectly clear I should add that that figure includes \$6 billion advance contract authority for fiscal 1974 in the \$18 billion, 3-year package for waste treatment construction grants voted by the House some weeks ago. Does that bring a chill or tear?

Mr. MAHON asked. He answered the question for himself: "Apparently not."

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I would hope the gentleman might be yielded a little additional time, if necessary.

In that debate we were debating the Patman bill for an additional \$5 billion of public works. I fought it strenuously. As the gentleman will remember, we defeated it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. So we defeated that bill. That brought the \$20 billion over the budget down by \$5 billion, to about \$15 billion.

Where was the other money? There was another \$2.8 billion in general revenue sharing over the budget. Another was the Water Pollution Act, of \$11 billion in new contractual authority over the budget. I was speaking of those measures, and some others.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I realize quite well what the gentleman was speaking about. The point is that the gentleman pointed out for the Congress and the RECORD attests to that fact, that we were \$20 billion over the budget. That is the reason why we feel we have to do something about it. No matter where it was, if it is over it is over. It still creates the same fiscal crisis.

Mr. MAHON. I said that if we passed that \$5 billion of the Patman bill we would be over in the sum of \$20 billion.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Let me read the statement back to the gentleman again.

I find the following. Including the \$5 billion in the pending bill—

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Reading further:

The appropriation bills and nonappropriation bills out of the legislative committees, such as this one, the House has thus far—and most of our bills have not been finalized—the House has busted the President's budget request for new spending authority in fiscal year 1973 that began only three weeks ago by the astronomical sum of \$20,770,436,000.

Mr. MAHON. But the \$5 billion, which is the beginning part of the sentence, was not approved by the Congress. We defeated that. That brings it down to the Clean Water bill, general revenue sharing, and some other smaller items.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I do not believe the chairman would feel that \$15 billion was small. It seems large to me.

Mr. MAHON. No. It was not small and I strongly opposed the clean water bill and the revenue sharing bill.

Mr. WAGGONNER. At least we are in agreement that the fiscal condition of this country is in bad, bad shape, and requires some corrective action by the Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me point out that the statement of the gentleman was made some months ago. Since then some other things have taken place which have moved us on up. I might point out the fact that we have a \$18 billion social security bill in conference right now.

Mr. MAHON. I certainly hope that a better job on that will be done than was done on revenue sharing and some of the other measures.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, I said that there were three basic features of this bill to which we have to give consideration. I talked about the portion of the bill having to do with the debt ceiling. I talked about it from the fiscal standpoint.

Now let me talk to the Members, and especially to my Democratic friends, about the political aspects of this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. So far as I am concerned, this may be the real thing we had better base our decision on.

Consider the political aspects of this proposal. Who among the Members, individually, or among the Democrats collectively, can afford, from this moment on, once this vote is taken, to have his constituents say to him and to have the President of the United States say to the country that the Democrats do not want to do anything about controlling spending in this country?

If Members want—and I do not—a Republican House of Representatives, they are going to take a step, a big step and perhaps a fatal step, in that direction if they ignore the political aspects of this proposal.

It is not political folly. Dick Nixon is the smartest Republican who ever occupied the White House in our lifetimes. Mind you, he has got you over a barrel. He has got me over a barrel, and that is true whether you like it or whether I like it or not.

I think it is fatal for a Democrat to oppose this ceiling. I am going to tell you why. He is going to be off the hook as far as his promise for no increase in taxes for the next 4 years if we do not do something about and enact this expenditure ceiling. He will not have an obligation; he has told the country about this. He will not need a tax increase he says if the Congress is willing to enact this spending ceiling. In my personal opinion, we ought to make every effort to prevent a tax increase. We have demonstrated no desire to control spending thus far.

But there is something else you have to have, and this is title III, we call it the Ullman amendment. We have got to have the mechanism to give control of this budget and these appropriations back to the U.S. Congress, and I believe this will be a good step in the right direction toward that goal.

Are the Members aware that every living Secretary of Treasury who has served under every President wants this expenditure ceiling? They think it is necessary and that includes some people who served as Democratic Secretaries of the Treasury as well.

But let us not worry just about the President of the United States; let us not worry just about these Secretaries of the Treasury who used at least to be Secretaries of the Treasury. The people of the United States want something done about the financial plight of this country. They want an expenditure ceiling, and they know this Congress can do something about it if it wants to. Are you going to ignore them? You cannot and get by with it.

Well, the Members may say they are not giving or they do not want to give the President any additional power. Let me tell you this: He can, truthfully, impound funds until hell freezes over, and he can accomplish the goals, I readily admit, whether we do it or not.

I am saying to the Members that it would be political suicide individually and collectively for us as Democrats not to try to be fiscally responsible. We cannot afford to say to this Nation as Democrats: "That is your problem, Mr. President."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state the parliamentary situation.

Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

The bill is as follows:

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

TITLE I—TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

SEC. 101. During the period beginning on November 1, 1972, and ending on June 30, 1973, the public debt limit set forth in the

first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757b) shall be temporarily increased by \$65,000,000,000.

TITLE II—LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES AND NET LENDING FOR FISCAL 1973

SEC. 201. (a) Expenditures and net lending during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, under the budget of the United States Government shall not exceed \$250,000,000,000.

(b) The President shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligatory authority hereinafter made available, such amounts as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).

(c) In the administration of any program as to which—

(1) the amount of expenditures is limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution,

the amount available for obligation (as determined by the President) shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula.

TITLE III—JOINT COMMITTEE TO REVIEW OPERATION OF BUDGET CEILING AND TO RECOMMEND PROCEDURES FOR IMPROVING CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER BUDGETARY OUTLAY AND RECEIPT TOTALS

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby established a joint committee composed of thirty members appointed as follows:

(1) seven members from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(2) seven members from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(3) one additional Member of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(4) seven members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate;

(5) seven members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

(6) one additional Member of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

(b) The joint committee created by subsection (a) shall make a full study and review of—

(1) the procedures which should be adopted by the Congress for the purpose of improving congressional control of budgetary outlays and receipt totals, including procedures for establishing and maintaining an overall view of each year's budgetary outlays which is fully coordinated with an overall view of the anticipated revenues for that year, and

(2) the operation of the limitation on expenditures and net lending imposed by section 201 of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The joint committee shall report the results of such study and review to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate, not later than February 15, 1973.

(c) (1) The chairman of the joint committee shall be selected by the members of the joint committee.

(2) The joint committee is authorized to appoint such staff, and to request such assistance from the existing staffs of the Congress, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(d) The joint committee shall cease to exist at the close of the first session of the Ninety-third Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment shall be in order except: First, amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means to title I of the bill; second, an amendment containing the text or a portion of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 713, if offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to title II of the bill; and, third, an amendment proposing to strike out title III of the bill.

Are there any amendments to title I of the bill by the committee?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There are no committee amendments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to title II of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON. Page 2, line 3, after section 201, strike out the remainder of lines 3 through line 23, inclusive, and insert the following: "The President is hereby respectfully requested to advise the Congress not later than January 2, 1973, of the specific reductions in budget authority and budget outlays (by appropriation or fund), and changes in existing law affecting same, that in his judgment may best be made in order to limit budget outlays for the fiscal year 1973 to not more than \$250,000,000. It is the sense of the Congress that, upon receipt of the list of such specific reductions and modifications, the Congress shall consider legislation dealing with the President's recommendations."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we are rapidly approaching the moment of decision. We have had a very lively and informative debate. We have had presented to us one of the most unique pieces of legislation that has ever been presented during my service here.

It has been said by some that we have authorized the executive to amend the law in previous actions. I shall place in the Record at a later point documentation showing that this statement is somewhat inaccurate.

How am I going to vote? Well, I am going to vote for the much-lambasted Mahon amendment, because I believe in economy and economy means saving the value and the integrity and the power of the Congress. I do not want to give it away. I am too frugal to do that.

Now, what is my vote going to achieve? My vote is going to achieve some very important economies not necessarily because of title II but because of title I. I think the long-range benefits of my amendment to title II will be good. The President could promptly send us at any time between now and January his list, which is no doubt now substantially completed and in the hands of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

How am I going to vote? I am going to vote for title I because of the \$465 billion debt ceiling in title I. What does that mean? That means whenever this becomes law the President has to tailor spending in keeping within the debt ceiling. That is what he will have to do and what he proposes to do.

By voting for title I and voting for my amendment to title II you achieve our goal. We protect the integrity of the Congress and the President retains the right to make reductions within the law. We do not give him the right to in effect enact additional law himself and to change congressional enactments.

We had Mr. Weinberger, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, before the Committee on Appropriations to talk about the overall budget. We said, "Why are you withholding funds which Congress has appropriated? You are impounding funds." He said, in effect, there is a debt ceiling and that he was trying to establish reserves so that the debt ceiling would not be exceeded. That is a reason why funds are being withheld.

On page 166 of the hearing on January 27 he simply says, "I am holding these funds back." He is doing that now. He has actually already started and as he will continue to do so after this legislation is passed. He said he was holding these funds back "to help meet a statutory limitation on the outstanding public debt."

So if you want an economy vote, then vote for title I and then vote for my amendment to title II to try to get a long-range more effective handle on the problem of Government spending.

The President has the authority under title I of this legislation to tailor spending to fit the debt ceiling. And if the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress will sit tight on this \$465 billion ceiling, then he can enforce the savings which he proposes to enforce rather than spend 2 percent more than he otherwise would do.

I feel that the Committee on Ways and Means has never been willing to use this tool as effectively as it should be used, but Mr. Weinberger knows about it, and he is reserving those funds against the expenditure ceiling.

Can it be said that if my amendment is adopted we have done nothing? Certainly not, we are taking important and meaningful steps toward restraint in spending.

I make no apology for the amendment which preserves the power of the Congress over legislation and at the same time gives the President the authority under title I to make reductions in keeping with the debt ceiling. Why should we not preserve our constitutional power and at the same time let the President use the power that has been used since Thomas Jefferson to reserve funds—not change the law—if it is necessary to do so under emergency situations? And it will be necessary in this case under the expenditure limitation.

Now, if the President wants to come back in January or shortly and say, "Yes, I can do that, but I would like for you to change the law to some extent on a few matters that I think are important," then we would certainly act on that. We are on a sound basis, and I hope you will vote for the Mahon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make reference to a colloquy earlier in the debate with the gentleman

from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) in regard to a statement I made in the House on July 19, 1972.

I now quote pertinent parts of the RECORD of July 19 when I was speaking in opposition to a \$5 billion public works spending bill sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House:

INCREASES OVER THE BUDGET

I have a document here, a scorekeeping report on the expenditure effects of all congressional actions and inactions, which is provided at the taxpayers' expense by one of the congressional joint committees. In checking these figures I find the following. Including the \$5 billion in the pending bill, the appropriation bills and nonappropriation bills out of the legislative committee, such as this one, the House has thus far—and most of our bills have not been finalized—the House has busted the President's budget request for new spending authority in fiscal year 1973 that began only three weeks ago by the astronomical sum of \$20,770,436,000. To be perfectly clear I should add that that figure includes \$6 billion advance contract authority for fiscal 1974 in the \$18 billion, 3-year package for waste treatment construction grants voted by the House some weeks ago. Does that bring a chill or tear? Apparently not.

Have we been dulled and made insensitive by some virus that is infesting the country?

We must provide more revenue, or we must somehow try to do a little less by way of escalating spending. Do I want to go home—do you want to go home—and tell your constituents that you have supported thus far this session \$20 billion in spending authority over the President's budget?

Do the Democrats want to do that?

Do the Republicans want to do that?

Should the people of this country be expected to endure this sort of treatment at the hands of their elected officials? I am just wondering—and so are quite a few more.

Let me now make reference to the basic information supporting my statement at that time with respect to the \$20 billion figure. On page 5 of the June 30, 1972, scorekeeping report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, there appears the figure \$20,770,436,000. This figure represents new obligatory authority enacted by the House as of June 30. This figure included amounts in appropriation bills and new obligatory authority provided otherwise. Significantly, only \$479 million of that amount resulted from action on appropriation bills. The remaining portions grew out of actions authorizing spending in nonappropriation bills.

The foregoing quote from the RECORD and the figures I have given relate to the June 30 date and only to actions by the House. The figures have sharply changed since June 30.

At that time I was speaking of new obligatory authority, not spending. Today's debate involves spending figures only but I want to again put the situation in perspective.

The facts are, and I am speaking only of spending and not of appropriations or new obligatory authority, that Congress will have, when it concludes this session, increased spending probably by about \$6 billion over the President's budget. This is accounted for in nonappropriation bills. Indeed, in appropriation bills han-

dled by the Congress, it is estimated that at the end of this session we will have reduced spending by about \$1.5 billion.

DELEGATION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO THE EXECUTIVE

Under further leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to address, for a moment, the statement made in this debate that Congress has in previous action delegated to the Executive the same broad legislative powers now proposed under title II of the committee bill. This statement specifically is based on the fact that section 201(c) of the committee bill is similar to section 204 of Public Law 90-218, which was a continuing resolution for fiscal year 1968. I include at this point the language of the present committee bill.

(c) In the administration of any program as to which—

(1) the amount of expenditures is limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution.

the amount available for obligation (as determined by the President) shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula.

And now I include for the RECORD the language of Public Law 90-218:

SEC. 204. In the administration of any program as to which (1) the amount of obligations is limited by section 202(a)(2) of this title, and (2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount available for obligation as limited by that section or as determined by the head of the agency concerned pursuant to that section shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula.

The point I wish to make is that the similarities between these sections do not touch upon the argument that the proposed committee bill would delegate unprecedented legislative authority to the Executive.

Public Law 90-218 directed the President to make reductions in budget authority and in outlays. But it did not authorize him to reduce spending mandated under previously enacted legislation, which the present proposal specifically does.

Section 203 of Public Law 90-218 exempts from reduction the permanent appropriations such as interest on the debt, trust funds, all the designated "relatively uncontrollable" programs, and—and here I quote "and other items required by law in the fiscal year 1968." The complete language of section 203 of Public Law 90-218 follows:

SEC. 203. (a) This title shall not apply to obligations for (1) permanent appropriations, (2) trust funds, (3) items included under the heading "relatively uncontrollable" in the table appearing on page 14 of the Budget for the fiscal year 1968 (House Document No. 15, Part 1, 90th Congress, 1st Session), and other items required by law in the fiscal year 1968, or (4) programs, projects, or purposes, not exceeding \$300,000,000 in the

aggregate, determined by the President to be vital to the national interest or security, except that no program, project, or purpose shall be funded in excess of amounts approved therefor by Congress.

The proposed ceiling under the present committee bill is completely comprehensive, excepting no program, whereas Public Law 90-218 exempted from reduction perhaps half of total Federal expenditures.

As I have indicated, the language of Public Law 90-218 specifically exempts outlays mandated by law. Section 201(a) of the proposed committee bill directs the President to hold Government outlays to \$250 billion, and section 201(b) directs him to carry this out "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law."

I include all of the language of section 201(b) at this point:

(b) The President shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligatory authority heretofore or hereafter made available, such amounts as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).

My position is that this language does constitute an unprecedented delegation of legislative authority to the Executive.

The proposed spending ceiling in title II of this bill is different in concept and design from any spending ceiling heretofore enacted by the Congress.

Under further leave to revise and extend my remarks I include in the RECORD at this point the text of House Concurrent Resolution 713 from which my amendment is taken:

Whereas the President has requested authority to impose a limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year 1973 in the amount of \$250,000,000,000, including authority to change existing laws and make unspecified reductions in existing mandatory spending programs such as social security, impacted area school aid, veterans' benefits, education and health programs, and other programs on which Congress has acted to date; and

Whereas consistent with the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to make appropriations for support of the Government, it is the practice for Congress to make specific appropriations for the various activities of the Government; and

Whereas the Congress is concerned about the fiscal plight of the country, especially in view of continued and mounting budget deficits and inflationary pressures; and

Whereas the total deficits in Federal funds for the last three fiscal years have exceeded \$70,000,000,000; and

Whereas the most recent estimate of the executive branch of the Federal funds deficit for fiscal year 1973 is \$32,400,000,000; and

Whereas approximately one-fourth of the Federal debt will have accumulated in just these last four years; and

Whereas in the annual appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1973, the Congress is in the process of reducing spending in excess of \$1,000,000,000; and

Whereas in other bills, including bills raising social security benefits, "black lung" benefits, and veterans benefits, the Congress, with the concurrence of the President, has exceeded the related budget estimates; and

Whereas in certain other bills, including general revenue sharing and water pollution control, the Congress is in the process of enacting spending authority for fiscal year 1973 in excess of the related budget estimates for 1973; and

Whereas the President has not advised Congress of the specific reductions in budget authority and budget outlays which he would make to limit outlays to not more than \$250,000,000,000; and

Whereas to grant the authority to impose such a limitation on expenditures, including authority to amend basic legislation governing mandatory programs, would in effect transfer legislative authority to the executive branch; and

Whereas the Congress cannot responsibly act on the proposed limitation of \$250,000,000 on expenditures and net lending without an advance opportunity to assess the impact of the consequent reductions (which, it now appears, would approximate \$6,000,000,000) on specific programs and activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is hereby respectfully requested to advise the Congress not later than January 2, 1973, of the specific reductions in the budget authority and budget outlays (by appropriation or fund), and changes in existing law affecting same, that in his judgment may best be made in order to limit budget outlays for the fiscal year 1973 to not more than \$250,000,000,000; and that it is the sense of the Congress that, upon receipt of the list of such specific reductions and modifications, the Congress shall consider legislation dealing with the President's recommendations.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. Chairman, let us look first to see what is in the bill itself. The bill provides in title II a directive to the President to reserve such funds as are necessary that have heretofore been appropriated and authorized by the Congress, to stay within the spending limitation of \$250 billion—a right that every President, according to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, from Thomas Jefferson on down, has exercised, the right to reserve moneys and not spend them in the fiscal year that is in existence. That has been done. There is nothing here, absolutely nothing except with respect to moneys put out under formulas that the President clearly does not have the authority already to do—and some of his lawyers think he has the authority even with respect to what is made available to units of Government under different formulas. So do not think you are giving him anything he does not already have. He has that authority.

What does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) propose to do through his amendment? Go right back to that same process of doing nothing we have not done up to date; namely, take the control of the rate of spending ourselves. We could do it, yes, but let us look at his proposition. The President is very cordially invited, under the language of it, to submit to the Congress certain areas where he would like for us to rescind, apparently, appropriations that have already been made. That must be done by January 2.

Congress meets on January 3. It has to go through the process of organization. How long do you think the Congress would take, if it had the willingness to operate under the Mahon amendment, to begin to work? Certainly no sooner than March, and more likely in April.

How much reduction could you make in the last 3 months of a fiscal year?

Mr. Chairman, this is bad medicine. But the situation that we face in this country, if only I could get my colleagues to recognize it, is so clear every place you look. Do not pay any attention to the statements that emanate from those of us who are running for political office, take everything we have said with a grain of salt if we are in charge, it is not as bad as someone thinks it is if we are outside and running, and some of them think it is a lot worse than we would inside. So let us take the statements with a grain of salt.

We have a crisis, and we have had it for years. The gentleman from Texas says, yes, we have had it.

Now is the time for us to face up to the fact that if we do not get the country off the track we are proceeding down today we are going to go into fiscal bankruptcy, and the kind that nobody in this country wants to happen to the dollars that we work for in this country, and the dollars which we attempt to accumulate a few for the time when we retire, so that we can take care of ourselves, but at the pace we are going there is not going to be much of value left to those dollars.

Let me tell you what you will do if you vote for the Mahon proposal, the proposal of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas. You will vote to completely disregard the immediate inflationary processes that are around here, and rising again, because you are going to put them off by not trying to do anything about it until March next year when it will be too late.

You will be disregarding the growing crisis of the dollar abroad and you are going to put it off until March when it will be too late to do anything about it. You are sending out to the world a message that the Congress has turned down a Presidential request to join the President in getting control of spending.

I am not exaggerating the situation, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to be brutally frank with my colleagues. I just say, as others have said, the political part of this worries me greatly. I have been fighting to do everything I can to keep CARL ALBERT, the Speaker of the House, in that chair where you sit in the next Congress.

If we abdicate here any willingness to join in controlling spending and thereby reducing the inflationary pressures, all in the world that the President has to do is to go before the American people on television and ask for a Congress as a result of the vote on November 7, a Congress that will cooperate with him in getting control of spending and in doing something about inflation.

I tell you—you are playing with your own political lives and destinies when you vote for the Mahon amendment. I hope it will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, all time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. MAHON, BETTS, BURKE of Massachusetts, and ULLMAN.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 167, noes 216, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—167

Abzug	Fulton	O'Konski
Adams	Fuqua	O'Neill
Addabbo	Garmatz	Passman
Albert	Giaimo	Patman
Anderson, Calif.	Gonzalez	Patten
Annunzio	Grasso	Pepper
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Aspin	Gude	Pickle
Aspinall	Hanna	Pike
Badillo	Harvey	Poage
Barrett	Hawkins	Podell
Begich	Hays	Price, Ill.
Blatnik	Hechler, W. Va.	Rangel
Boggs	Heckler, Mass.	Rees
Boland	Heilstok	Reid
Bolling	Henderson	Reuss
Brademas	Hicks, Mass.	Riegle
Brinkley	Hicks, Wash.	Roberts
Brooks	Holfeld	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Howard	Roe
Burlison, Mo.	Jacobs	Rooney, Pa.
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Rosenthal
Carney	Jones, Ala.	Roush
Casey, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Roy
Celler	Karth	Royal
Chisholm	Kastenmeler	Rummels
Clark	Kazan	St Germain
Conyers	Kluczynski	Sarbanes
Corman	Koch	Scheuer
Culver	Kyros	Seiberling
Curlin	Leggett	Shipley
Daniels, N.J.	Lennon	Sikes
Danielson	Long, Md.	Sisk
Delaney	McCormack	Slack
Dellenback	McFall	Smith, Iowa
Dellums	McKay	Steed
Dent	Macdonald	Stokes
Diggs	Mass.	Stubblefield
Dingell	Madden	Symington
Donohue	Mahon	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Mazzoli	Thompson, N.J.
Drinan	Meeds	Tierman
Dulski	Melcher	Udall
Eckhardt	Minish	Van Deerlin
Edmondson	Mink	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell	Walde
Ellberg	Mollohan	White
Esch	Monagan	Whitten
Evins, Tenn.	Moorhead	Wilson, Charles H.
Fascell	Morgan	Wolf
Flood	Moss	Wright
Flynt	Murphy, Ill.	Natcher
Foley	Natcher	Yates
Ford,	Nedzi	Yatron
William D.	Nix	Young, Tex.
Fraser	Obey	Zablocki

NOES—216

Abbitt	Brotzman	Collins, Tex.
Abernethy	Brown, Mich.	Colmer
Alexander	Brown, Ohio	Conable
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, N.C.	Conover
Anderson, Tenn.	Broyhill, Va.	Conte
Andrews, Ala.	Buchanan	Coughlin
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burke, Fla.	Crane
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Va.
Archer	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Byron	Davis, Wis.
Ashbrook	Cabell	de la Garza
Baring	Camp	Dennis
Belcher	Carey, N.Y.	Derwinski
Bennett	Carlson	Devine
Bergland	Cederberg	Dickinson
Betts	Chamberlain	Downing
Bevill	Chappell	Duncan
Biaggi	Clancy	du Pont
Biester	Clausen, Don H.	Edwards, Ala.
Blackburn	Clawson, Del.	Erlenborn
Bow	Cleveland	Eshleman
Bray	Collier	Findley
Broomfield		Fish

Flowers	Lent	Schneebeli
Ford, Gerald R.	Long, La.	Schwengel
Forsythe	Lujan	Scott
Fountain	McClory	Sebellus
Frelinghuysen	McCloskey	Shoup
Frenzel	McCollister	Shriver
Frey	McCulloch	Skubitz
Galifianakis	McDade	Smith, Calif.
Gaydos	McEwen	Smith, N.Y.
Gettys	McKevitt	Snyder
Gibbons	McKinney	Spence
Goldwater	McMillan	Springer
Goodling	Mailliard	Staggers
Griffin	Mallary	Stanton, J. William
Griffiths	Mann	Steiger, Ariz.
Grover	Mathias, Calif.	Steele
Gubser	Mathis, Ga.	Steiger, Wis.
Hagan	Mayne	Steiger, W.
Hall	Michel	Stephens
Hamilton	Miller, Ohio	Stratton
Hammer-schmidt	Mills, Ark.	Stuckey
Hansen, Idaho	Minshall	Talcott
Harrington	Mizell	Taylor
Harsha	Montgomery	Teague, Calif.
Hastings	Mosher	Terry
Hebert	Myers	Thomson, Wis.
Heinz	Nelsen	Ullman
Hillis	Nichols	Vander Jagt
Hogan	Pettis	Veysey
Horton	Powell	Vigorito
Hosmer	Preyer, N.C.	Waggonner
Hull	Price, Tex.	Wampler
Hunt	Pryor, Ark.	Ware
Hutchinson	Quile	Whalen
Ichord	Quillen	Whalley
Jarman	Railsback	Whitehurst
Johnson, Pa.	Randall	Widnall
Jonas	Rarick	Wiggins
Keating	Rhodes	Williams
Kee	Robinson, Va.	Wilson, Bob
Keith	Rogers	Wynn
Kemp	Rousselot	Wyatt
King	Ruppe	Wylie
Kuykendall	Ruth	Wymann
Kyl	Sandman	Young, Fla.
Landgrebe	Satterfield	Zion
Landrum	Saylor	Zwach
Latta	Scherle	

NOT VOTING—48

Abourezk	Gallagher	Mikva
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Bell	Gross	Mills, Md.
Bingham	Haley	Murphy, N.Y.
Blanton	Halpern	O'Hara
Brasco	Hanley	Pelly
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Wash.	Pucinski
Caffery	Hathaway	Purcell
Clay	Hungate	Roncalio
Collins, Ill.	Link	Rooney, N.Y.
Cotter	Lloyd	Rostenkowski
Davis, S.C.	McClure	Schmitz
Denholm	McDonald	Stanton
Dow	Mich.	James V.
Dowdy	Martin	Sullivan
Dwyer	Matsunaga	Thompson, Ga.
Evans, Colo.	Metcalfe	

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to be proposed which are germane under the rule? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16810) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, pursuant to House Resolution 1149, he reported the bill back to the House.

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.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 163, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

YEAS—221

Abbitt	Galifianakis	Patten
Anderson, Ill.	Gaydos	Pepper
Anderson,	Gettys	Pettis
Tenn.	Tenn.	Peyser
Andrews, Ala.	Andrews, Ala.	Pickle
N. Dak.	N. Dak.	Plke
Archer	Grasso	Pirnie
Arends	Gray	Powell
Belcher	Griffin	Preyer, N.C.
Bennett	Harold	Quile
Bergland	Hamilton	Railsback
Bettis	Hammer-	Randall
Boland	schmidt	Rhodes
Bow	Hanley	Robinson, Va.
Bray	Hansen, Idaho	Robinson, N.Y.
Broomfield	Harvey	Rogers
Brotzman	Hastings	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Hebert	Rousselot
Brown, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	Roy
Broyhill, N.C.	Hicks, Mass.	Runnels
Broyhill, Va.	Hillis	Ruppe
Buchanan	Hogan	Ruth
Byrne, Pa.	Horton	Sandman
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Iowa
Colmer	Jonas	Smith, N.Y.
Conable	Jones, N.C.	Snyder
Conover	Jones, Tenn.	Spence
Coughlin	Clancy	Springer
Curlin	Kee	Staggers
Daniel, Va.	Keith	Stanton,
Davis, Ga.	King	J. William
Davis, Wis.	King	Steele
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Dow	Kyl	Steiger, Wis.
Dowling	Latta	Stephens
Duncan	Lent	Stratton
du Pont	Lujan	Stubblefield
Edwards, Ala.	McClory	Talcott
Edwards, Ala.	McCloskey	Taylor
Edwards, Ala.	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
Edwards, Ala.	McCulloch	Terry
Edwards, Ala.	McEwen	Thomson, Wis.
Devine	McKay	Thone
Dickinson	McKevitt	Ullman
Dorn	McMillan	Veysey
Dowling	Mahon	Vigorito
Dowling	Mailliard	Waggonner
Dowling	Mallary	Wampler
Dowling	Maryne	Ware
Dowling	Mathias, Calif.	Whalley
Dowling	Mayne	Whitehurst
Dowling	Mazzoli	Widnall
Dowling	Melcher	Wiggins
Dowling	Findley	Williams
Dowling	Fish	Wilson, Bob
Dowling	Fisher	Winn
Dowling	Flood	Wyatt
Dowling	Flowers	Wydler
Dowling	Ford, Gerald R.	Wyman
Dowling	Forsythe	Young, Fla.
Dowling	Fountain	Zablocki
Dowling	Frelinghuysen	Zion
Dowling	Frenzel	Zwach

NAYS—163

Abernethy	Biaggi	Chappell
Abbuz	Bingham	Chisholm
Adams	Blackburn	Clark
Addabbo	Claiborne	Clawson, Del.
Alexander	Boggs	Conyers
Anderson, Calif.	Boiling	Conte
Anderson, Tenn.	Brademas	Corman
Andrews, Ala.	Brake	Crane
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brinkley	Culver
Archer	Brooks	Coleman, N.J.
Arends	Burke, Mass.	Daniels
Ashbrook	Burke, Mass.	Danielson
Baring	Burton	Delaney
Belcher	Carney	Dellenback
Bennett	Barrett	Dellums
Bergland	Casey, Tex.	Dent
Betts	Celler	
Bevill		
Biaggi		
Biester		
Blackburn		
Bow		
Bray		
Broomfield		

Derwinski	Cluczynski	Roberts
Diggs	Koch	Rodino
Dingell	Kyros	Rosenthal
Donohue	Landgrebe	Roush
Drinan	Leggett	Royal
Dulski	Lennon	St Germain
Eckhardt	Long, La.	Sarbanes
Edmondson	Long, Md.	Saylor
Edwards, Calif.	McCormack	Scherle
Ellberg	McDade	Scheuer
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Schwendel
Foley	Macdonald,	Seiberling
Ford,	Mass.	Sikes
William D.	Madden	Sisk
Fraser	Mathis, Ga.	Skubitz
Fulton	Meeds	Slack
Garmatz	Minish	Smith, Calif.
Gibbons	Mink	Stanton
Gonzalez	Mitchell	James V.
Green, Pa.	Moorhead	Steed
Gude	Morgan	Stokes
Hagan	Mosher	Stuckey
Hall	Moss	Symington
Hanna	Murphy, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Harrington	Nedzi	Thompson, N.J.
Hawkins	Nix	Tierman
Hays	Obey	Udall
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Konski	Van Deerlin
Heinz	O'Neill	Vanik
Heistostski	Patman	Waldie
Henderson	Perkins	Whalen
Hicks, Wash.	Poage	White
Holifield	Podell	Whitten
Hull	Price, Ill.	Wilson
Jacobs	Pryor, Ark.	Charles H.
Johnson, Calif.	Rangel	Wolf
Jones, Ala.	Rarick	Wright
Karth	Rees	Yates
Kastenmeier	Reuss	Yatron
Kazen	Riegle	Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—46

Abourezk	Gross	Miller, Calif.
Baker	Haley	Mills, Md.
Bell	Halpern	Murphy, N.Y.
Blanton	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara
Byrne, Pa.	Hathaway	Pelly
Caffery	Hungate	Pucinski
Clay	Link	Purcell
Cotter	Lloyd	Roe
Davis, S.C.	McClure	Roncalio
Denholm	McDonald,	Rooney, N.Y.
Dow	Mich.	Rostenkowski
Dowdy	McKinney	Satterfield
Dwyer	Martin	Schmitz
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Sullivan
Gallagher	Metcalfe	Thompson, Ga.
Green, Oreg.	Mikva	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Davis of South Carolina for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, Mr. Mikva against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, Mr. Dow against.

Mr. Satterfield for, Mr. Caffery against.

Mr. Roe for, Mr. Matsunaga against.

Mr. Baker for, Mr. Cotter against.

Mr. Halpern for, Mr. Roncalio against.

Mr. Martin for, Mr. Denholm against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, Mr. Blanton against.

Mr. McKinney for, Mr. Metcalfe against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gross.

Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Hathaway with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Mills of Maryland.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Schmitz.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Link with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Haley.

Messrs. CHAPPEL and HAGAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOLDWATER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members participating in debate on the bill just passed be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks; and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14989, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 14989) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10420, MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10420) to protect marine mammals, to establish a Marine Mammal Commission; 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 bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 2, 1972.)

Mr. DINGELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the marine mammal bill which we are considering here is very similar to the bill which this body passed last March by an overwhelming vote. Essentially, it sets up a system regulating the taking of all marine mammals by U.S. citizens or in U.S. waters and allows responsible par-

ticipation by the public in the regulatory process. Further, it establishes an independent commission to review activities in this area and to make appropriate recommendations to the Government and to the Congress.

In some respects, the bill reported by the conference does differ from that which we considered earlier this year, and I would like to take just a few moments to outline those differences.

Principal among these is the establishment of a permanent moratorium on the taking of marine mammals, where the House bill contained a 5-year moratorium period in the conference bill has a number of specific exemptions, however, which we believe will make the program workable. During the moratorium period, the Secretary is authorized to issue scientific or display permits to allow the taking of marine mammals. Both permits will require review by the Marine Mammal Commission and its Committee of Scientific Advisors before issuance and public hearings. I think that the conferees were quite clear in their feelings that, at least with regard to the scientific permits, the hearing and review process might be accelerated in proper cases to allow the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior to act with expedition where such action might be necessary in order to obtain the basic data and knowledge required to carry out the program.

Regular permits may not be issued without a great deal of preliminary information, and the issuance of proper scientific permits will allow that information to be obtained.

Another exemption from the moratorium will apply in the case of commercial fishermen who take marine mammals as an incident to their fishing operations. Here the moratorium will not apply until 2 years from the date of enactment, although the Secretary is authorized and directed immediately to establish regulations to see that these activities present a minimum hazard to marine mammals.

The Secretaries are further authorized to waive the moratorium in appropriate cases, subject, however, to the basic constraint elsewhere in the act: that any taking must be demonstrated to be not to the disadvantage of the species or stocks of the animals involved. I might note in this regard a fundamental concept of the bill, stated as a declaration of policy in section 2: that the primary objective of the management of marine mammals is to maintain the health and stability of the marine ecosystem upon which they, and ultimately we, depend. I will say that I cannot imagine a case in which the objectives of ecosystem stability and non-disadvantageous taking might conflict; but if they should, it is ecosystem protection which must prevail.

The act contains an exemption to allow Indians, Aleuts and Eskimos to take marine mammal for subsistence purposes, as did our bill. It expands this exemption, however, to allow taking for the purposes of creating articles of native handicrafts and clothing. I have been asked if this would permit natives to take polar bears and to sell the skins

of these bears to nonnatives for trophies. It is clear that this taking would be prohibited without a permit, issued to the ultimate recipient of the skin.

Another exemption to the moratorium will allow the Secretary to exempt from the operation of the act for up to 1 year from the date of enactment, persons who might otherwise suffer undue economic hardship. Similar language is found in the Endangered Species Act, and can be justified as a means of protecting persons such as importers who have made financial commitments before this time, and who, without this authority, might be seriously and adversely affected. We expect and I think I can assure my colleagues that these exemptions will not be lightly considered or given.

There was some discussion last March of the inequities of allowing a vessel or other conveyance to be subject to forfeiture, and in the light of this discussion, the House conferees felt it desirable to agree to the Senate proposal, which allowed forfeiture of the cargo of the vessel and assessment of a monetary penalty against the vessel or conveyance of not to exceed \$25,000. We retained a reward provision permitting payment to those furnishing information leading to a conviction for violation of the act.

The bill that passed the House covered fur seals as well as other marine mammals; the Senate bill did not. We accepted the Senate exemption, but instructed the Secretary to carry out a full study of the animal populations and of the relationship of this legislation to the existing international treaty. The results of this study are to be reported back to us within a year. At that point we will be in a better position to handle the question of how best to regulate the taking of fur seals in the Pribilof Islands.

Another major change in the bill related to the troublesome area of Federal-State relationships. The House bill preempted regulation of all marine mammals, but allowed the development of cooperative Federal and State programs. The compromise reached in conference was to continue the Federal pre-emption, but to allow the States to take over marine mammal programs, under Federal review, as and when the States elect to do so by adopting appropriate laws and regulations. We are not, I can assure my colleagues, anxious to foreclose State activities in this area. What we did attempt to do was to insure that State and Federal programs are consistent with one another, and with a rational scheme for protecting marine ecosystems and the animals within those ecosystems. If the Federal and State Governments will work together toward this objective, which would appear to be common to both, then this legislation will have done what we all hope for it.

Rather than go into more detail, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill as reported out of the conference, prepared by staff and giving more detail on the bill so reported:

	COST OF H.R. 10420				
	[In thousands of dollars]				
	Fiscal year—				
	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Sec. 110—Research on marine mammals.....	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
Sec. 111—Research on Commercial Fisheries Gear.....	1,000	1,000			
Sec. 114—Administration of the Legislation:					
Commerce.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Interior.....	700	525	525	525	525
Title II—Commission and Advisory Committee.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total.....	7,200	7,025	6,025	6,025	6,025

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. The Act may be cited as the "Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (1) This subsection makes the point that certain species and stocks of marine mammals may be threatened with depletion or extinction by man's uncontrolled activities.

(2) This subsection stresses the value and importance of marine mammals to the stability of the ecosystem of which they are a part and provides that they should not be permitted to diminish below their optimum sustainable population. Emphasis is placed on the need to protect those geographic areas of significance for each species of marine mammals from adverse activities.

(3) This subsection states that not enough is known of the ecology and population dynamics of all marine mammals.

(4) This subsection finds that immediate negotiations should be undertaken to encourage the development of international arrangements for research on and conservation of all marine mammals.

(5) This subsection indicates that marine mammals and their products either move in interstate commerce or affect the ecosystems of which they are a part in such a way as to affect other animals and products, and the protection and conservation of marine mammals is necessary to insure the continuing availability of such products which move in interstate commerce.

(6) This subsection states that marine mammals are resources of great significance and that it is congressional policy that they should be protected and encouraged to develop consistent with sound policies of resource management. The primary objective of this management must be to maintain the health and stability of the marine ecosystem; this in turn indicates that the animals must be managed for their benefit and not for the benefit of commercial exploitation.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. This section defines the various terms used in the bill.

(1) "Depletion" or "depleted" refers to the situation in which species or stocks of animals have declined significantly or have reached a point at which their future may be in jeopardy. The concept is broader than that of "endangered species" within the meaning of the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969. It provides the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce with authority to step in to protect animals from species and stocks which have declined significantly before they have become formally endangered or actually extinct.

The Act requires consultation with the Marine Mammal Commission and the Committee on Scientific Advisors on Marine

Mammals before a designation of a "depleted" species or stock is made. The Act will allow species or stocks to be protected before they have reached endangered status.

The designation of a species or stock as depleted under the Act, however, will not automatically qualify an animal for protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1969 and will not expand that Act, as it is presently written, to cover endangered stocks within otherwise abundant species. On the other hand, species now or later on the endangered list will fall within the definition of depleted within this Act.

(2) "Management" and "conservation" refer to the collection and application of biological information necessary to keep animals within a given species or population at the optimum carrying capacity of their habitat. The scope of this definition includes all those activities which are part of a modern scientific resource program. This term further includes, as appropriate, the periodic or total protection as well as regulated taking of any species or population.

(3) "District Court of the United States" means the various U.S. District Courts.

(4) "Humane" in the context of taking marine mammals means the method of taking which involves the least possible amount of pain and suffering which can be inflicted upon the animals involved. It is not a simple concept and involves factors such as minimizing trauma to groups of highly intelligent, social animals such as whales and porpoises where the taking of any member may be distressing to the group. In many cases, where an animal may not be taken humanely the bill will prevent that animal from being taken at all.

(5) "Marine mammals" means mammals which are physiologically adapted to the oceans, such as sirenians (manatees and sea cows), cetaceans (whales, porpoises, and air breathing dolphins) and pinnipeds (seals, sea lions, walruses and others). The term also includes animals such as polar bears which are adapted to an intermittent land-sea environment. For the purpose of the Act, the term includes parts of marine mammals, including but not limited to their fur and skins.

(6) "Marine mammal product" means processed or unprocessed merchandise made in whole or in part from marine mammals.

(7) "Moratorium" is defined as the cessation of the taking of marine mammals and a ban on the importation of marine mammals and their products.

(8) "Optimum carrying capacity" refers to the ability of a given habitat to support the optimum sustainable population of a species or stock without adversely affecting the ability of that habitat to continue that function.

(9) "Optimum sustainable population" is defined as the number of animals which will result in the maximum productivity of the population or species when considered in the context of the health of the ecosystem of which the particular species or stock is a part, as well as the carrying capacity of the habitat.

(10) "Person" means individuals, corporate entities, or employees of any government.

(11) "Population stock" involves a new concept, permitting and requiring the Secretaries to discriminate between different groups of animals distinguishable from other populations of the same species. The Alaskan polar bear, for example, is clearly a population stock within the general worldwide species classification for polar bears.

(12) "Secretary" within the context of this Act refers to the Secretaries of Interior or of the Department within which NOAA is presently operating (presently the Department of Commerce), depending on the animals for

which they are given responsibility. The Secretary of Commerce is thus given responsibility for all cetaceans and all pinnipeds, other than walruses; the Secretary of Interior is given responsibility for all other marine mammals.

(13) "Take" is defined broadly by the Act, as including harassing, hunting, capturing, or killing any marine mammal or attempting to do so. The act of taking need not be intentional: the operation of motor boats in waters in which these animals are found can clearly constitute harassment.

(14) "United States" includes all lands over which the United States government has jurisdiction.

(15) "Waters under the jurisdiction of the United States" means waters out to the twelve mile limit.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 4. For most purposes, the effective date of the Act is sixty days after the date of enactment.

TITLE I—CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION OF MARINE ANIMALS

Moratorium and exceptions

SEC. 101(a) This subsection prescribes a permanent moratorium, beginning on the effective date of the Act (sixty days after the date of enactment), on the taking and importation of all marine mammals and marine mammal products. There are, however, certain stated exceptions to this moratorium:

Subparagraph (1) authorizes the Secretary to issue permits for scientific research or for public display, following review of the permit application by the Marine Mammal Commission and its Committee of Scientific Advisors, established under Title II of the Act. Those bodies are instructed to review the application in the light of the expressed purposes and policies of the Act, and to approve them if they are found to be consistent. If the permit application is for importation and is approved by the Secretary, the applicant is then entitled to receive a certificate to that effect for presentation to customs representatives to allow passage of the animal or goods.

Subparagraph (2) authorizes an exception to allow the taking of marine mammals as an incident to commercial fishing operations. During the two year period immediately following the enactment of the Act, no formal permit is required, although commercial fishermen would be subject to broad regulatory powers of the Secretary, designed to insure that the smallest hazard is presented to animals which may be involved. Following the two-year period, incidental catches will be subject to normal permit procedures. The zero mortality and injury goal is applicable immediately and continues into the period beyond two years from the date of enactment. The Secretary is also instructed to request assistance from the Committee of Scientific Advisors on the numbers of marine mammals killed under existing and future fishing techniques.

This subparagraph also directs the Secretary of the Treasury to monitor foreign fishing techniques and to prohibit the importation of fish or fish products caught through the use of techniques which are forbidden to U.S. fishermen. To this end, the Secretary is directed to communicate with the governments of the nations involved as to their current fishing practices.

(a) (3) (A) grants additional authority to the Secretary, during the moratorium, to make decisions affecting marine mammals. It provides that the Secretary may permit exceptions to the moratorium when such exceptions would be in accordance with the policy of the Act to preserve and conserve the animals involved. The Secretary's authority would include the power to determine that a State's laws on marine mammals apply in lieu

of the Act. The criterion which must be met in any decision to waive the moratorium or defer to State law is that the principles of resources protection and conservation embodied in the Act must be maintained. Should a decision to make an exception to allow taking or importation pursuant to the Federal Act be made, then the sections of the Act on prohibitions, regulations and permits will apply. (In the case of importation, and additional requirement must be met; namely, that the program for taking marine mammals in the country of origin must be consistent with the prohibitions and policies of the Act. If it is found not to be consistent, then the importation cannot be allowed for any purpose.) If a decision is made to defer to State law, then the provisions of that law will apply; provided, of course, that the State law has been found to comply with the Act and continues to do so.

The Secretary's decision to waive the moratorium would not be a final action, from which appeal might be taken; recourse to the courts must await action under Section 103 of the Act. The Act requires that the hearings to be held by the Secretary on the regulations which he proposes to adopt would also encompass his decision to waive the moratorium.

(a) (3) (B) provides that during the moratorium, except for research purposes indicated in subparagraph 101(a)(1), no permit may be issued for the taking of any marine mammal classified as an endangered species or as depleted, and additionally no importation may be made of any such marine mammal.

(b) This subsection excepts from the moratorium and other provisions of this Act the taking of marine mammals by native Alaskan Eskimos, Indians or Aleuts who live on the coast of the North Pacific or the Arctic Ocean, but only if the taking (1) is for subsistence purposes by natives living in Alaska or (2) is done for purposes of creating and selling authentic native articles of handicrafts and clothing, and (3) in either case is not done in a wasteful manner. Such subsistence purposes include taking for food, clothing, heating, and other necessities of life. The subsection specifically defines the term "authentic native articles of handicrafts and clothing" to permit sales in interstate and foreign commerce.

As defined, "authentic native articles of handicrafts and clothing" must be manufactured without the use of mass copying devices in the exercise of traditional native handicrafts, including improved methods of production utilizing modern implements, such as sewing machines, so long as no large scale mass production industry results. The information of traditional native groups, such as cooperatives is permitted under the Act. The subsection also permits the sale of edible portions of marine mammals, such as meat, skin, and seal oil in Alaska native villages and towns or for consumption by Alaskan natives presently residing outside the state. It is intended that federal and state authorities both will work with the natives to insure that the taking of any species of marine mammal is accomplished without undue loss of such mammals. Examples of some areas in which such governmental cooperation may be undertaken are the taking of bowhead whales, some of which are lost beneath the ice, and alleged infrequent incidents of indiscriminating firing into walrus heads by native hunters.

This subsection also allows the Secretary (or the State of Alaska if such authority is delegated) to place limitations upon the taking of any marine mammal by Alaskan Eskimos, Indians or Aleuts if the Secretary determines any depleted species or stock of marine mammal to be threatened by native

activities. It is intended that the Secretary, in establishing such limitations, shall designate the species or the stock of the species in question, as well as a description of the geographical area involved, the season for taking, or any other factors contributing to such limitations. The limitations shall be lifted as soon as the need for imposing them has disappeared.

The Secretary is given the authority to curtail or to terminate the native taking whenever he concludes that such taking is endangering, depleting or inhibiting the restoration of endangered or depleted stocks. The actions of the Secretary in administering the provisions relating to taking by natives will be subject to review by the public and by the Congress, in order to see that his responsibilities have adequately been met.

(c) This subsection qualifies the moratorium section further by permitting the Secretary to allow persons up to one year as a grace period during which they need not comply with provisions of the Act, as the Secretary determines. It does not apply, however, to persons covered by section 101(a)(2). This exception to the Act only operates at the discretion of the Secretary, and is designed to minimize undue economic hardship. The concept is taken directly from section 3(b) (16 U.S.C. 668cc-3(b)) of the present Endangered Species Act. The Endangered Species Act authorizes the Secretary of Interior, in order to minimize undue economic hardship to a person importing a species of fish or wildlife that is placed upon the endangered species list, to continue such importation in such quantities and for such periods not to exceed one year as the Secretary deems appropriate. The situation which will arise upon enactment of the Marine Mammal Protection Act is analogous to the situation which occurs under the Endangered Species Act when a new animal is placed on the Endangered Species List. Substantial adjustments will be required to take account of the new law just as an importer of an endangered animal which suddenly is placed on the list will need to make adjustments in his contracts, etc. The situation is directly analogous in the case of tunafish processors since, without the special exception, it could happen that a processor would be forbidden by Section 102(c) to import tunafish for which he may have contracted earlier.

Prohibitions

Sec. 102. (a) This section states that it is unlawful, except as provided in sections 101 (moratorium), 103 (regulations), 104 (permits), 111 (gear development research) and 113 (treaties) for any person or vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to take any marine mammals on the high seas. It also prohibits any person or vessel or conveyance from taking any marine mammal on waters or lands under the jurisdiction of the United States unless expressly provided for by an existing international treaty, convention, or agreement to which the United States is a party.

In addition, it is unlawful for any person to use any port, harbor, or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States in connection with a prohibited taking or to use such port for unlawful importation of marine mammals or marine mammal products. The subsection further prohibits any person subject to United States jurisdiction from possessing, transporting, selling or offering for sale any marine mammal taken unlawfully. It also makes it unlawful for any person to use, in a commercial fishery, any fishing techniques that are in violation of any regulations issued by the Secretary for the purposes of carrying out this Act.

(b) This subsection makes it illegal to import any marine mammal within certain

specified categories unless that mammal is imported pursuant to permit issued for legitimate scientific research. The categories of animals are those: (1) pregnant when taken, (2) nursing (either parent or young) or less than eight months old, whichever occurs later, (3) taken from a species or stock which has been designated by the Secretary as depleted or from a species which is listed as endangered or (4) taken inhumanely. This subsection will bar the import of marine mammals or products taken from the baby Canadian harp seal.

(c) This subsection imposes an absolute and permanent ban on the importation of animals taken in violation of this title or taken in a foreign country in violation of the laws of that country. Importation of marine mammal products is banned in cases where importation of the mammal would be banned and in cases where the sale of the product is prohibited by the country or origin. Once the Secretary has taken steps to control the types of gear that can be used in commercial fishing, this section would also ban importation of fish caught by methods proscribed for fishermen subject to U.S. jurisdiction. This subsection will close the United States market to the tuna fish caught in this fashion.

(d) This subsection makes the subsections banning importations prospective only. It will serve to protect those with inventories of products at the time these actions become unlawful.

(e) The subsection states that provisions of the Act will not affect any marine mammal or marine mammal product which was taken before the date that the Act goes into effect.

Regulations on taking of marine mammals

Sec. 103. (a) This section establishes the basic theme of this Act. It states that the Secretary, on the basis of the best available scientific evidence and after consultation with the Marine Mammal Commission, shall issue regulations on the taking or importing of marine mammals to insure that such taking or importing does not occur to the disadvantage of the species or stocks from which the animals are taken and that such taking would be consistent with the policies of the Act. It requires, in effect, that limitations be established which will be designed to act for the benefit of the animals in question. While clearly it is not to the benefit of an individual animal to be taken, the Committee was persuaded by overwhelming scientific evidence that there are, in fact, cases in which animal species or stocks may be benefited by removing excess members. In these cases, the Secretary will establish appropriate limitations which will permit the taking of these animals.

(b) This subsection lists the general criteria which may be considered by the Secretary in the process of prescribing limitations under the Act. These include a wide range of factors such as the effect of limitations on present and future animal populations, U.S. treaty requirements, ecological and environmental considerations, the conservation and development of fishery resources and economic and technological feasibility.

The Secretary, for example, in regulating the operations of the tuna industry with respect to the incidental catching of porpoises must consider the technical capability of these fishermen to avoid injury to porpoises. It is not the intention of the Congress to shut down or significantly to curtail the activities of the tuna fleet so long as the Secretary is satisfied that the tuna fishermen are using economically and technologically practicable measures to assure minimal hazards to marine mammal populations.

(c) The regulations prescribed by the Secretary may include a number of factors; the number of animals to be taken or imported, what animals may be taken or imported,

when and from where this taking or importing may take place and restrictions on certain fishing techniques which he has found to cause undue fatalities to marine mammals in the particular fishery involved.

(d) This subsection requires the establishment of limitations to take place after full agency review open to public comment and hearing pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act. Before or at the time of announcing proposed regulations, the Secretary is required to make available to the public a number of documents: (1) a statement of the size of the populations affected, (2) a statement on the impact of his proposed regulations on the optimum sustainable population of the species or stock involved, (3) the scientific evidence upon which he proposes to base his regulations, and (4) any studies or recommendations relating to these regulations. At this point in the development of the rulemaking procedure the public is given the right, and the necessary information, to participate, and if it considers such action appropriate, to protest against the establishment of these regulations.

(e) This subsection requires the Secretary to report on the status of marine mammals to the public and the Congress within six months of the effective date of the Act and once a year thereafter, and in his report the Secretary shall outline the actions he has taken, and those measures believed necessary to assure the well being of such marine mammals. This will not require the Secretary to restudy each species and stock annually, but will require him to update, where appropriate, what had been done since the last report was filed.

Permits

Sec. 104. (a) This subsection allows the Secretary to issue permits authorizing the taking or importation of any marine mammal.

(b) This subsection requires permits issued under the authority of the Act to be consistent with the regulations prescribed in Sec. 103 and states that such permits specify terms and conditions under which the animals may be taken or imported. Whenever the reason for such taking is overpopulation, before issuing any permit to take a mammal the Secretary must first consider the possibility of transporting excess members of this population to other areas which were formerly the habitat of such animals.

(c) Scientific research permits or permits for the display of marine mammals by profit and non-profit institutions must be issued by the Secretary subject to his requirements as to the manner in which those animals may be captured, transported and cared for. These permittees must also report to the Secretary on the ways in which these requirements have been carried out. If the Secretary is not satisfied with these activities or these reports, he may take appropriate action, which includes the revocation of permits and assessment of penalties.

(d) This subsection authorizes the Secretary to prescribe procedures to carry out his permit authority. It requires him to make public notice of permit applications received and to invite comments from interested members of the public. Permit applicants must show that the taking or importation of marine mammals will be consistent with the purposes of this Act as indicated above and with regulations established under Sec. 103. The subsection authorizes the Secretary to grant public hearings upon request of any interested party, if the request is made on a timely basis. The Secretary is instructed to act in an expeditious fashion and to make full public disclosure of his action in issuing or denying a permit requested. The subsection also authorizes permit applicants or opposing parties to obtain judicial review of the issuance or refusal to issue a permit under this section.

(e) This subsection authorizes the Secretary to modify, suspend or revoke permits to make them consistent with revised regulations under Sec. 103, or where the permit has been violated. Such actions by the Secretary can only take effect after the permittee has had an opportunity for a hearing. Notice of such modification, suspension or revocation must be published in the *Federal Register*.

(f) This subsection requires permits issued by the Secretary to be in the possession of the authorized person during the process of the authorized taking or importation or at any other time incidental to that taking or importation. The copy of the permit must be physically attached to any container in which the marine mammal is placed or be aboard the vessel involved.

(g) This subsection requires the Secretary to charge a reasonable fee for permits issued, to be done through an informal rulemaking procedure allowing interested parties to comment.

(h) This subsection authorizes the Secretary to issue general permits under appropriate regulations covering the use of such permits. Fishermen, Eskimos, and others who may have a continuing problem may thus obtain general permits from the Secretary covering situations in which it is anticipated that permission is required, subject to those regulations which the Secretary considers consistent with the purposes and policies of the Act.

Penalties

Sec. 105. (a) This subsection authorizes the assessment of civil penalties by the Secretary for violation of the Act or permits or regulations issued under the Act, in the amount of not more than \$10,000 for each violation. If the penalty is not paid, the Secretary is authorized to refer the matter to the Department of Justice for action.

(b) This subsection authorizes criminal action and fines up to \$20,000 for each violation or up to one year imprisonment, or both, for any person who knowingly violates the Act or permits or regulations issued thereunder.

Vessel fine, cargo forfeiture, and rewards

Sec. 106. (a) This subsection makes the cargo or the cash value of the cargo of any vessel or other conveyance (such as an airplane or snowmobile) affected by the Act subject to forfeiture. The forfeiture may be imposed if the vessel is employed in the unlawful taking of any marine mammal. Negligent operation of power-driven vessels may constitute prohibited activity, if it takes place in waters where marine mammals are known to exist.

Subsection (b) renders such vessels (and, by implication, other conveyances) themselves liable for civil penalties. These may be assessed as maritime liens, but the penalty for each offense may not exceed \$25,000. Any such penalties shall be assessed by the U.S. district court having jurisdiction over the vessel.

Subsection (c) authorizes rewards, to be paid out of the General Treasury, to be paid to persons providing information leading to the conviction of any person for violation of this Act. Payments may not be made under the authority of this section, however, to Federal, state or local enforcement officers acting in performance of their duties.

Enforcement

Sec. 107. (a) The Secretary is charged with basic responsibilities for enforcement of Title I, except as otherwise provided. He is expected, however, to utilize other Federal agencies, such as the Coast Guard, for purposes of enforcement.

(b) The Secretary may also designate State officers and employees as enforcement agents, although they are not considered as U.S. employees for purposes of laws administered by the Civil Service Commission.

(c) This subsection authorizes U.S. judges

and magistrates to issue warrants or other process required for enforcement of this Act.

(d) The subsection authorizes appropriate officials to execute warrants or processes. It further authorizes those officials to arrest persons violating the law in their presence or view, with or without a warrant, and permits searches of vessels or conveyances either with a warrant or other process, or if the officials has reasonable cause to believe a violation has occurred or is occurring. Such officials may also seize the cargo of any vessel where such vessel has been used in violation of the Act or reasonably appears to have been so used. Marine mammals or marine mammal products taken in violation of the Act may also be seized and disposed of in accordance with appropriate regulations.

(e) This subsection requires the Secretary to expedite proceedings when a seizure has taken place. He is required to notify the owner or consignee of the seizure of these goods as soon as possible. When appropriate, the Secretary may either hold marine mammals or products, or other cargo, or permit the person concerned to retain them after posting bond. After assessment of civil penalties, the subsection permits the Secretary to proceed against the marine mammals and products or other cargo concerned, and forfeited, for appropriate disposition. The subsection requires marine mammals and products, and other cargo, seized in connection with a criminal violation to be forfeited to the Secretary. It allows the forfeiture of property or other items taken in conjunction with the violation. Marine mammal products, or other cargo, which have been seized must be returned to the owner or consignee, if (a) a civil penalty is assessed, but no action is taken to recover that penalty, or (b) if criminal action is unsuccessful and the Secretary has not thereafter commenced proceedings for the imposition of civil penalties.

International program

Sec. 108. This section requires the Secretary, acting through the Secretary of State, to: (1) initiate negotiations for bilateral or multilateral agreements for the protection and conservation of the marine mammals covered by this Act, (2) initiate negotiations with foreign governments that either through their own involvement, or that of their citizens or companies, are engaged in commercial fishing operations which the Secretary has found to be unduly harmful to any species of marine mammals, in order to develop bilateral or multilateral treaties for the purposes of protecting such marine mammals, (3) encourage the development of other international agreements for the protection of specific ocean and land regions which are of special significance to marine mammals, (4) initiate the amendment of any existing international treaties for the protection and conservation of marine mammals in order to make such treaties consistent with this Act, (5) seek the convening of an international meeting on marine mammals before July 1, 1973, for among other things, the signing of a binding international convention for the protection and conservation of all marine mammals and further, for the implementation of paragraph 3 of this section, and (6) report to Congress within one year of the enactment of this Act on the results of the activities called for under section 108.

In addition, subsection (b) requires study of the taking of North Pacific fur seals. Within one year of the date of enactment of the Act, the Secretary is required to report back to the Congress on the results of (A) a joint study with the Marine Mammal Commission on the present status of these fur seals, and (B) a joint study with the Secretary of State on necessary or desirable modifications of the existing international treaty and/or this Act. If either study indicates that problems exist, the Secretary is

further instructed to take the steps necessary to resolve these problems.

Federal cooperation with States

Sec. 109. (a) This subsection preempts State laws regarding marine mammals, but allows the Secretary to approve and accept State programs, which after review, are found to be consistent with the Act. This would allow the State to engage in a permit program, under Federal review, or a cooperative or exclusive enforcement program. The subsection clarifies the circumstances under which State marine mammal programs are continually reviewed. It also specifically authorizes State officials to take marine mammals in a humane manner if done for the welfare of the public or the animal, and if such taking is intended to return the animal to a wild condition and in an unharmed state. This would cover state agents returning beached pilot whales to the sea.

(b) This subsection authorizes the Secretary to make grants to the states to develop and implement laws and programs for the conservation of marine mammals consistent with the purposes and policies of the Act.

(c) Provides that the Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with state officials to delegate administration of the Act to the States.

Marine Mammal Research Grants

Sec. 110. (a) This subsection authorizes the Secretary to make grants or to provide other appropriate financial assistance to state and other agencies, public or private institutions, or other persons in order to assist them in carrying out research on subjects relevant to the protection and conservation of marine mammals.

(b) This subsection authorizes the Secretary to establish reasonable terms and conditions upon grants provided under the section 110 as appropriate to protect the interests of the United States. Any grant shall be reviewed by the Marine Mammal Commission prior to being given out.

(c) This subsection authorizes annually, for the fiscal year in which the section takes effect and for each of the next four fiscal years \$833,333 to the Secretary of the Interior and \$1,666,666 to the Secretary of the Department within which NOAA is operating.

Commercial fisheries gear development and financial assistance

Sec. 111. (a) The Secretary of the Department within which NOAA is operating is authorized to carry out a research and development program in order to devise better fishing methods and gear with the objective of reducing to maximum extent practicable the incidental taking of marine mammals during commercial fishing operations. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out this objective of reducing the level of incidental taking of marine mammals. At the end of two full years the Secretary shall report to Congress the results of his research and development activities. If new fishing methods or gear are developed, which are capable of feasible application, the Secretary shall by regulations require the same to be adopted by persons engaged in commercial fishing operations. Persons following the regulations established by the Secretary under this section need not obtain permits for incidental taking of marine mammals during the first two years of the moratorium. The Secretary is authorized \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, to carry out this subsection, and a like amount for the next following fiscal year.

The Secretary and the Secretary of State are further directed to commence negotiations within the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission in order to obtain essential compliance with the Act. The Secretary and Secretary of State are also authorized and directed to request the Director of In-

vestigations of this Commission to make recommendations to the member nations of the Commission to utilize any new commercial fishing method and gear. Additionally, authorized agents of the Secretary are empowered to accompany U.S. commercial fishing vessels, if space is available, on fishing trips for purposes of research and observation.

Regulations; administration

Sec. 112. (a) This subsection authorizes the Secretary in consultation with other appropriate federal agencies, if any, to adopt regulations to carry out the purpose of the Title.

(b) All federal agencies are authorized to cooperate on mutually agreeable terms with the Secretary in carrying out the purposes of the Title.

(c) This subsection authorizes the Secretary to enter into agreements, as necessary, with any person or agency of government in order to carry out the purposes of Title I of the Act.

(d) This subsection requires the Secretary to review annually all programs in which the United States participates, involving the taking of marine mammals on land. If the U.S. activities cannot be administered on lands owned by the United States in a manner consistent with the Act, the Secretary must thereupon suspend the program and notify the Congress, recommending legislation to resolve the problem.

Application to other treaties and conventions; repeal

Sec. 113. This section makes it clear that the Act is to be applied as supplemental to and not in violation of existing international treaties, conventions or agreements, or any statutes which implement the same, which otherwise apply to marine mammals such as those applying to whaling and fur seals. Thus the Act does not apply to the North Pacific fur seal because this mammal is covered by the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention. It also repeals the proviso in the Act (16 U.S.C. 659) regarding the protection of sea lions in Alaskan waters.

This section also grants authority to the Secretary to issue a finding as to whether this Act shall apply to a violator or whether the penalties under any international treaty, convention or agreement with respect to the protection of marine mammals from takings incidental to commercial fishing operations shall apply. An example might be that the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission may adopt regulations effecting essential compliance with this Act. In such a case the Secretary may declare that section 105 of this Act does not apply and that penalties provided in the international agreement, treaty or convention do apply.

Authorizations

Sec. 114. (a) This subsection authorizes \$2,000,000 to be appropriated annually for each of the next four following fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and for the next four following fiscal years, to enable the Department of Commerce to carry out its responsibilities under Title I.

(b) This subsection authorizes the sum of \$700,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$525,000 for each of the next four years to be appropriated, to enable the Department of the Interior to carry out its responsibilities under Title I.

TITLE II—MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

Establishment of Commission

Sec. 201. (a) Establishes the Marine Mammal Commission.

(b) The commission is composed of three members serving three year staggered terms, appointed by the President from a list submitted by the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the heads of the National Science Foundation and the

National Academy of Sciences of individuals who are knowledgeable in the fields of marine ecology and research management and who are not then or will be thereafter in a position to benefit from the taking of marine mammals. The section bars existing government employees from service as a member of the Commission. Members of the Commission may not be reappointed unless serving as a replacement to fill a vacancy.

(c) The President shall designate the Chairman of the Commission from among the members.

(d) Members of the Commission shall be compensated on a daily rate equivalent of a GS-18 (\$138.48 at this time) for each day the members are engaged in the actual performance of their duties. They are also entitled to reimbursement for travel expenses.

(e) The Title requires the appointment of Executive Director who will be a full time employee of the Commission, paid at a rate not in excess of that established for a GS-18.

Duties of Commission

Sec. 202. (a) The Commission is required to do the following:

(1) Review existing federal laws and international treaties relating to marine mammals, including those dealing with whales and fur seals.

(2) Review existing information on the stocks of marine mammals and ways in which they may be managed consistent with the purposes of the Act and of the most humane possible ways of taking marine mammals; it shall also review the research programs carried out under the Act and all applications for research permits, authorized under Sec. 103.

(3) Carry out necessary studies in connection with the protection and management of marine mammals.

(4) Recommend to the appropriate Secretary, and to other officials, such additional steps as it considers desirable in the interest of marine mammals.

(5) Recommend appropriate policies to the Secretary of State for strengthening existing international treaties and recommend additional measures for protection of marine mammals.

(6) Recommend to the Secretary of the Interior revisions to the Endangered Species List as they may affect marine mammals, and

(7) Recommend to the Secretary, other officials, and the Congress, measures deemed necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, including those which it deems appropriate to protect Alaskan natives who may be adversely affected by the Act.

(b) The Commission is required to consult with the Secretaries at their request, and shall furnish its reports and recommendations before publication to them for comment.

(c) The Commission's reports and recommendations are specifically designated as public records, to be available to the public on reasonable terms and conditions. Other activities of the Commission are also matters of public record, subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act.

(d) Where the Commission has made recommendations to federal officials, those officials must respond to those recommendations on a substantive basis within 120 days. Where those recommendations have not been followed or adopted, the appropriate official is required to return them to the Commission together with a detailed explanation of his reasons for his failure to follow these recommendations.

Committee of Scientific Advisors on Marine Mammals

Sec. 203. (a) This section authorizes and directs the establishment of a Scientific Committee of nine independent scientists knowledgeable in marine ecology and marine mammals affairs. The members of this Committee are to be appointed by the Chairman

of the Commission, with the advice of the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Chairman of the National Academy of Sciences, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

(b) The members of the Scientific Committee are to be compensated in like manner as the members of the Marine Mammal Commission.

(c) The Commission is required to consult with the Scientific Committee on studies and recommendations on research programs conducted under the authority of the Act and all applications for scientific research permits. Recommendations made by the Committee, or members of the Committee, to the Commission which are adopted by the Commission must be transmitted to the appropriate federal agency and the Congress with an explanation of the Commission's reasons for not accepting such recommendations.

Commission Reports

Sec. 204. This section requires the Commission to transmit to the Congress an annual report describing its activities, including findings and recommendations by and to the Commission, together with the responses to those recommendations.

Coordination with other Federal Agencies

Sec. 205. This section authorizes the Commission to have access to all federal studies and data relating to marine mammals. It authorizes the Commission to utilize the facilities of federal agencies, under cooperative arrangements, and directs the Commission to take every feasible step to avoid duplication of research and to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Administration of Commission

Sec. 206. This section authorizes the Commission to do the necessary things in order to carry out its administrative responsibilities under the Act. Its financial and administrative services are to be provided by the General Services Administration and appropriate reimbursement made therefor.

Authorizations

Sec. 207. This section authorizes the sum of not to exceed \$1 million for the fiscal year in which Title II is enacted, and for the next four fiscal years thereafter. Not more than one-third of the total amount of any sums appropriated to the Marine Mammal Commission pursuant to this Title shall be expended on activities other than research and studies conducted under the authority of 202(a)(2) and 3. This limitation was added to minimize the temptation on the part of the Commission to develop another paper-shuffling bureaucracy. It is the express intent of the Committee that the administrative activities of the Committee be held to an irreducible minimum; the Commission is expected to make every effort to see that its program is carried out accordingly.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman advise the House before we take action on the conference report as to whether all Senate added-on legislation was germane to the House-passed bill and whether or not there was an increase in cost over that authorized by the House?

Mr. DINGELL. I would advise my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that my view and in the view of the staff of the committee all of the Senate language was germane to the House-passed bill, and to the best of my knowledge there were no nongermane additions by the Senate to the bill before us.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman advise me as to the cost added on by the other body?

Mr. DINGELL. The cost estimates I have and I can give the gentleman: For fiscal years 1973, \$7.2 million; for fiscal year 1974, \$7.025 million; for fiscal year 1975, \$6.025 million; and for fiscal years 1976 and 1977, \$6.025 million.

Mr. HALL. The question is, Mr. Speaker, is that an increase on the part of the other body over the House-passed legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. I will say to the gentleman that the Senate had a larger figure in the bill which they passed than did the House. The compromise represents a slightly higher figure than the House figure, but a lower figure than the Senate figure.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee (Mr. DINGELL) in urging passage of the conference report on H.R. 10420, marine mammal legislation.

I sincerely feel that this legislation represents the most carefully drafted, structured, and intricate bill which I have had the pleasure of serving as a conferee on during this session of Congress. The overall policy issue of marine mammal protection is an important one which has been charged with a great deal of emotion and concern from small schoolchildren, environment organizations, scientists, fishery organizations, Members of Congress, and Federal, State, and local officials responsible for wildlife and marine resource management. The final product represents many long hours of devotion to the legislation on the part of all our conferees but, in particular, a great deal of the credit for producing a strong, viable end product which should meet with the approval of all concerned goes to our very able subcommittee chairman (Mr. DINGELL).

In its final version, the bill provides for an indefinite moratorium on the taking of any marine mammal with authority vested in the Secretary of Interior or Commerce, depending on the species involved, to waive the moratorium after public hearings and within certain specified regulations as to the extent of the waiver.

The measure also permits the taking of marine mammals by Alaskan Natives for subsistence purposes and preserves the cottage industry of such Natives subject to control by the Secretary.

In regard to those marine mammals taken accidentally or incidentally to commercial fishing operations, the conferees adopted a general goal that such damage should be "reduced to insignificant levels approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate". I wish to make it crystal clear that this language in no way will or should result in the closure or drastic curtailment of the Nation's commercial fishing industry simply because the biological fact exists that some

species of fish and marine mammals cannot be separated from a commonly shared food source in order to permit commercial fishing operations without the taking of a single marine mammal.

The statement of the conferees in this regard is an expression of desire that appropriate efforts be taken, under the commercial fishing gear development section and other applicable laws, to develop more advanced gear and fishing method technology to assist in the further reduction of the level of accidental taking.

The phrase "zero mortality and serious injury rate" has no other legislative fiat, directive, impact, or binding obligation on the part of the Secretary to reach for, strive for, and/or obtain a zero mortality goal by the potential or actual elimination of this Nation's commercial fishing industry or by the elimination of certain fishing techniques, such as the purse-seine method, simply to satisfy an expression of a general policy objective. We all desire that marine mammal mortalities be reduced significantly—and as fast as possible—but there must be an appropriate balancing of equities between the two extremes of a zero mortality rate and elimination of a commercial fishing industry.

The final version preserves the intricate and complex administrative and procedural aspects which appeared in both versions of the bill. In addition, the Marine Mammal Commission is preserved with appropriate research authority and duties in regard to assisting the Secretaries in the promulgation of regulations and permits. I am sure it is the desire of the conferees in both Houses that the provisions of this legislation be implemented within a short period of time, and that the Marine Mammal Commission, Committee of Scientific Advisors, and the Secretaries work in close harmony and purpose with each other in accomplishing the objectives of the act. Should the procedures built into the measure become cumbersome, duplicative, and result in difficulties of administration and implementation, I am sure that the appropriate committees in both bodies will take appropriate action to remedy the problem by vigorous oversight and subsequent legislation amending the act.

Mr. Speaker, for perhaps the first time, this country and Congress has recognized the need to enact legislation which would provide for conservation and protection of marine mammals prior to the time that many if not all such species become extinct or decline beyond the point of no return. Yet this legislation, standing by itself, cannot begin to provide the mechanisms of control and protection necessary to insure worldwide conservation and assistance to these important species. It is absolutely imperative that other nations develop appropriate domestic legislation, enter into bilateral and multilateral agreements, and take other appropriate action to insure the continued growth, survival and viability of these marine mammals.

The wholesale harvesting of marine mammals such as whales, porpoises, and others for commercial and food purposes

must be internationally prohibited or regulated, controlled, and enforced in order to prevent ultimate elimination of marine mammal species as a result of unsound, illogical, and unacceptable harvesting practices of other nations. To this end, our domestic legislation should serve as a model for other nations and the international community. The bill places a very strong, pointed, and direct mandate on the part of the Secretary of State to take those actions designed to expand the principles of the measure to the high seas and to other countries. Without a strong initiative on the part of this Government, acting through the Department of State, the objectives of this legislation will be defeated, for U.S. involvement in the taking of marine mammals is relatively minute in comparison with other countries.

The role the States do and should play under this legislation is an important one. The final version recognizes the traditional involvement of States in species management and conservation by providing that, once the State laws and program are reviewed and accepted by the Secretary, the States would then be delegated a great deal of authority and responsibility in regard to issuance of permits, enforcement, scientific research, and assistance in implementation of the act's provisions. Indeed, without the strong support and participation of the States in furthering the legislation's objectives, these legislative goals might not be reached.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the detailed, long and involved hearings on this legislation, it was repeatedly brought to your committee's attention that this country lacked scientific, technical, and practical knowledge on marine mammals and their aquatic environment, and thus was handicapped in providing data as to mortality rates, causes of mortality, and proven or recommended methods to further conserve, protect, and enhance marine mammal populations. It is the strong desire and intention of your conferees and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that adequate and appropriate funding of the measure be accomplished in order to insure that the conservation and management of these marine mammals may be accomplished on the basis of scientific fact and knowledge rather than from individual or group emotionalism and personal preference for one species management approach as opposed to others.

The agreements reached in conference are good ones, and I urge final passage and speedy enactment of the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 10420, PROTECTION OF MARINE MAMMALS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 717) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 717

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 10420) to protect marine mammals; to establish a Marine Mammal Commission; and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

One page 11 of the conference report, on line 1, insert the word "of" after the word "conditions".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 984, INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY PROTECTION

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 984) to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 4, 1972.)

Mr. FRASER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 984 was passed by the House on March 20, 1972, and by the Senate on September 14, 1972, after it was amended in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The House version provided for an open-ended authorization for "such sums as may be necessary" subject to congressional review in annual appropriation requests from the executive branch. I introduced the original bill at the request of the administration to delete the previous ceiling of \$15,000 a year and to change the name of the organizations from "International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property" to that of "International Bureau of Intellectual Property."

In amending House Joint Resolution 984, the Senate imposed a ceiling of 4 percent to the annual U.S. contribution, noting that in previous years the United States as a class I member of the organization had never been assessed more than 3.89 percent of the total budget of the organization. Subsequent to the Senate action, I was informed by the Department of State that due to the lowering of the assessment for a number of African states, the United States, along with other major industrialized countries who are class I members, would

be assessed about 4.1 percent of the budget of the organization beginning next year. In a House-Senate Conference on House Joint Resolution 984, it was agreed that the ceiling should be raised from 4 percent to 4.5 percent in order to accommodate the increase in the U.S. assessment.

I understand that the executive branch agrees to this change in the ceiling. By approving the conference report figure of 4.5 percent, the House will be allowing the United States to pay its assessed contribution to this organization for the foreseeable future. Each year, of course, the exact amount requested by the administration will be subject to congressional approval in the annual appropriation process.

The International Bureau of Intellectual Property performs the following administrative functions: First, provides the Secretariat for the Paris Convention, particularly as regards the assembly and executive committee of that convention; second, handles the preparatory and administrative work of the conferences of revision; third, conducts studies and provides services to member states to facilitate the protection of industrial property; fourth, serves as a clearing-house for information on and interpretation of patent and trademark laws; fifth, serves as a medium to promote ratification by states of the revisions of the Paris Convention and the adherence of new members; and sixth, publishes a monthly periodical and other publications designed to further industrial property protection. Because U.S. nationals have more industrial property—that is, patents and trademarks—to be protected abroad than any nation in the world, the effective administration of the Paris Convention by the International Bureau is extremely important to the United States.

I urge that the House accept the report of the conference committee.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask what the House-passed figure was that the other body changed into a percent?

Mr. FRASER. When the House passed the resolution it was open ended. The House resolution provided for such sums as may be necessary. The Senate put a 4-percent ceiling on that, which proved to be too low. It is now 4½ percent.

Mr. HALL. We are again in the unusual and embarrassing position of the other body being more frugal than we are.

May I ask the gentleman a question similar to one I asked the other day? Who determines what amount the 4 percent is of?

Mr. FRASER. This is done through agreement by the Committee of Nations. We are obtaining the same rate as the Soviet Union and a number of the other larger countries, but the dollar figure itself is subject to the appropriation process and our share of the amount may not exceed 4½ percent without coming back to Congress.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman does assure the body that even within the 4 percent

or 4½ percent—I see it is 4½ percent—it is subject to the appropriation process?

Mr. FRASER. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the conference report on House Joint Resolution 984, which amends the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The subcommittee chairman, Mr. FRASER, has already explained the purpose of the legislation, so I will not discuss it in detail. However, I do want to point out that this legislation was requested by the administration and that the executive branch is satisfied with the conference agreement.

This little known organization—the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property—performs a vital role for the United States because U.S. nationals have more industrial property—patents and trademarks—to be protected than any other nation in the world.

The responsibilities of the International Bureau include serving as a clearing-house for information on and interpretation of patent and trademark laws. It also provides the Secretariat for the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which is the principal multilateral agreement in the industrial property field, with 78 member states.

I urge approval of this conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 635, MINING AND MINERALS POLICY ACT OF 1970

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 635) to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 3, 1972.)

Mr. ASPINALL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on S. 635, a bill to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, have met and have resolved the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

I should like to point out that the ob-

jectives and purposes of both versions of the legislation are almost identical. Only the method of implementation differs. Both would provide for a more adequate national program of mining and minerals research through the establishment of research centers throughout the United States. Both would promote the training of mining and minerals engineers, scientists, and technicians by providing matching grants and other financial assistance.

The language agreed upon by the Conference Committee is substantially the House language. The differences and the recommendations of the conferees are as follows:

First. The Senate-passed bill established the research and training program by amending the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970. The House amendment established the program by a separate statutory enactment which merely supplements the 1970 act. The conferees adopted the Senate approach.

Second. The second difference involved the designation of eligible colleges or universities for participation in the program. This difference was resolved by adopting the House language with a clarifying amendment that provided a priority for State tax-supported schools of mines and for tax-supported colleges or universities which have or hereafter establish a unit for education and research in the minerals engineering fields.

Third. The third major difference involved the level of appropriations. This issue was resolved by reducing the appropriation authority contained in the House version for annual sustaining grants from \$500,000 annually to \$200,000 in the first year, \$300,000 in the second year and \$400,000 in the third and subsequent years. The effect of this amendment was to reduce the Federal expenditures by \$30.6 million in the first 3 years and by \$5.1 million annually thereafter.

Fourth. Two other minor differences were also resolved. The first involved the Secretary's authority to utilize funds for scholarships and fellowships. The money for these grants was changed from the annual sustaining grant appropriation to the appropriation authorization for additional research. The second difference concerned the size and composition of the advisory board. The size of the board was limited to nine, and the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey was added as a member.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that S. 635 is an excellent proposal that deserves favorable action by this body. I strongly urge its enactment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 635, and urge its adoption.

My colleagues will recall that S. 635 passed the House, amended, in lieu of H.R. 6788 on May 22, 1972. The purpose of the program authorized in that legislation and agreed to by the conference committee is to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 to provide a more adequate national program of mining and minerals research by providing matching grants and other Federal financial assistance to mining and minerals resources research centers throughout the United States.

The importance of this program to the economic, political, and social welfare of the United States can be succinctly stated. The United States faces three interrelated problems with regard to its mineral requirements. First: our mineral requirements are large and growing. Our per capita consumption is five times the world average and by the year 2000 our consumption is expected to increase fourfold. Second: our mineral technology is advancing too slowly. In fact, it is declining. We have produced very few new recovery processes and techniques since World War II. In fact, other foreign nations have surpassed our ability to come up with new mining and minerals technology. Third and most important: is our lack of trained technical manpower in the mining and minerals technology field. By 1985, 40,000 new mineral specialists will be needed to maintain the present work force of 70,000 specialists, but at the present rate only about 20,000 will be trained.

The language agreed upon by the conference committee on this legislation will go far in turning around our serious deficiency in mining and minerals technology. The language agreed upon by the conferees is substantially the language of the House passed bill.

The conference committee was faced with only three major points in disagreement. The first point involved the legislative format of the program established by the legislation. The House-passed bill established a mining and minerals research program as a separate statutory enactment. The Senate-passed bill established a similar program as an amendment to the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970. Good legislative drafting dictates that such a program be established as a separate statutory enactment supplementing the congressional declarations of the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970. As one of the conferees on this legislation I preferred the House position and sought to maintain that position in the conference. Unfortunately, and for what were in my judgment most dubious reasons I found the House receding from its position on this point. The result is that we will establish this important program as an amendment to a policy declaration.

The second major point of issue involved the designation of the eligible college or university within a State to participate in the program as a mining and minerals resources research institute. The conference committee on this point saw fit to adopt the House language with a clarifying amendment and as is clearly explained in the joint statement of the committee of conference.

The third major issue in the conference concerned the authorization of appropriations. The conferees agreed upon the House passed language with an amendment to reduce the annual sustaining grant to each participating State institute. The effect of this amendment was to considerably reduce the estimated Federal expenditures for this program.

At this point I would say to my colleagues that this program is not excessively expensive if measured or compared to the fundamental and inter-

related problems facing this country in meeting its present and future mineral requirements. The prosperity and future welfare of this Nation is largely dependent upon the development of our mining and mineral resources technology and with due regard for our natural environment.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the adoption and passage of this conference report.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House re-cede from its amendment to the title of S. 635 and agree to the same.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING THE NAME OF PERRY'S VICTORY AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE MEMORIAL NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9554) to change the name of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, to provide for the acquisition of certain lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9554

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, established in accordance with the Act of June 2, 1936 (49 Stat. 1393; 16 U.S.C. 433a), is redesignated the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial.

Sec. 2. Section 3 of the Act of June 2, 1936 (49 Stat. 1393; 16 U.S.C. 433c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase with appropriated funds not to exceed fourteen acres of land, or interests in land, for addition to the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial."

Sec. 3. The following laws and parts of laws are repealed:

(1) Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Act of March 3, 1919 (ch. 116 (40 Stat. 1322)).

(2) Section 4 of the Act of June 2, 1936 (49 Stat. 1393; 16 U.S.C. 433d).

Sec. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "fourteen" and insert "four".

Pages 2, lines 14 through 16, strike out all of Section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not more than \$370,000 shall be appropriated for

the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than \$5,177,000 shall be appropriated for development. The sums authorized in this section shall be available for acquisition and development undertaken subsequent to the approval of this Act.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9554 is a bill which was introduced by our colleague from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) dealing with the site presently known as the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument in the State of Ohio.

This site, which is located on South Bass Island on Lake Erie is dedicated to the great naval engagement which took place on the Great Lakes during the War of 1812 and to the lasting peace which has resulted in the ensuing years. H.R. 9554 is not a complex bill. It does four things:

First, it redesignates the area as simply "Perry's Victory and International Memorial."

Second, it revises the present policy with respect to land acquisition and authorizes the Secretary to purchase lands for the memorial—heretofore, lands could only be acquired by donation or purchase with donated funds.

Third, it authorizes the appropriation of public funds in order to carry out the acquisition program and in order to provide for the public facilities which are needed at the site.

Finally, it abolishes the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission which has not met for more than 20 years.

This bill authorizes the appropriation of \$370,000 to cover the cost of land acquisition involved. This amount is needed in order to pay the fair market value of the lands plus administrative costs and relocation costs associated with Federal land acquisition programs.

For development, the committee recommends that a ceiling be placed on the entire development program for the memorial totaling \$5,177,000. Of this amount, \$2,099,000 is attributable to the lands being acquired pursuant to this legislation and the remainder—\$3,078,000—is attributable to the existing site.

Mr. Speaker, that very briefly describes the bill before the House. It has been reviewed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and I am pleased to speak in support of it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9554 introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

The purpose of H.R. 9554 is twofold: First, it commemorates the victory of Admiral Perry in the Battle of Lake Erie in the War of 1812 and, second, it memorializes the 100 years of peace between the United States, Canada, and Great Britain since the War of 1812.

The memorial at Put-in-Bay, Ohio, consists of 21.44 acres located on South Bass Island. It was constructed under the direction of the Perry's Victory Centennial Commission between October 1912 and June 1915, to commemorate Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry's decisive victory in the Battle of Lake Erie on September 10, 1813, and the 100 years of peace the United States had enjoyed

with Great Britain since the War of 1812. The memorial consists of a towering column of granite 352 feet high and 45 feet in diameter at its base. The top of the column serves as an observation platform from which one may view the spot, 6 miles to the west, where Commodore Perry won one of the most brilliant naval victories in our history. Under the floor of the rotunda at the base of the column are buried three British and three American officers killed in the Battle of Lake Erie.

The memorial and adjacent lands were ceded to the United States by the State of Ohio and accepted by an act of Congress on March 3, 1919. The act also created the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission to administer the site. Then, in 1936 Congress provided for the creation of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, and for its administration, protection, and development by this Department, with the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission serving as a board of advisers.

H.R. 9554 abolishes the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission, which has not functioned as a group for more than 20 years. It also deletes the words "National Monument" from the area's present designation. This area, in itself, has no known historical significance.

The existing residential developments in the village of Put-in-Bay on the west side of the present memorial area encroach upon it to the extent of competing with and detracting from the general appearance and setting of the memorial column and tend to destroy its overall effectiveness. If the view of the marble column, which dominates the memorial area, is to be preserved free from these existing obstructions or other undesirable developments in the future, additional lands should be purchased. H.R. 9554 amends the 1936 act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase with appropriated funds not more than 4 acres of land and interests in land for additions to the area. The 4-acre area with improvements will cost about \$370,000, of which \$35,000 is attributable to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

H.R. 9554 also authorizes the appropriation of \$5,177,000 for much needed development of the memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the committee is H.R. 9554 by Representative LATTA which provides for the redesignation of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument along with various other changes related to the site.

The memorial presently consists of about 21.5 acres of land located on South Bass Island at Put-In-Bay, Ohio. The structure is a massive 352-foot granite shaft which was constructed 100 years after the decisive Battle of Lake Erie which sealed a lasting peace between the United States and its northern neighbor.

At the present time, existing law precludes any expansion of the memorial site except by donations; however, testimony before the subcommittee suggested

that some additional lands were needed in order to protect the character of the memorial from adverse developments. As recommended, this legislation would authorize the Secretary to acquire up to 4 acres of land for use in conjunction with the memorial. Existing cottages on the lands, as well as a few commercial establishments, cause the estimated land acquisition costs to seem relatively high; however, the committee agreed that the acquisition was appropriate in order to preserve the values of the site from adverse encroachments.

The committee has recommended two amendments which will limit the size of the additions to the area and the amounts authorized to be appropriated. I will offer and explain them at the proper time.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Interior has recommended approval of this legislation, and I urge its adoption by the committee.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, at the outset permit me to thank you for calling H.R. 9554, a bill "To change the name of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, to provide for the acquisition of certain lands, and for other purposes." This monument is located in my district and I have personal knowledge of the need for the passage of this legislation. I support it without reservation.

This famous historical memorial located on South Bass Island in Lake Erie, commemorates the decisive victory of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, of "We have met the enemy and they are ours" fame. It was here that Perry won the greatest naval battle of the War of 1812. In addition to commemorating Perry's victory, the gigantic Doric column, which rises to a height of 352 feet, also symbolizes the 3,000-mile unfortified boundary between the United States and Canada and, in a world fraught with unrest and fear, stands today as a symbol of peace and good will between these two nations. The Congress recognized the importance of this great memorial when it created the Commission in 1962, known as the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie and the 150 years of permanent peace and mutual respect that have existed between the United States and Canada. Today, more than ever, we treasure the peace that is enjoyed by our two great nations.

In an act of June 2, 1936 (49 Stat. 1393; 16 U.S.C. 433a et seq.), Congress provided for the creation of the site for this memorial and for its administration, protection, and development by the National Park Service. The existing residential developments in the Village of Put-in-Bay on the west side of the present memorial area encroach upon it to the extent that they compete with and detract from its general appearance and the setting of the memorial column. It is important that we protect and preserve this historic and beautiful memorial free from existing obstructions and other undesirable developments in the future, by acquiring the additional lands necessary for this purpose.

Visitors from all over the world come

to view this great memorial—94,900 visited it in 1971. Many expressions of gratitude and appreciation come to our attention, as well as some of disappointment in that unsightly encroachments should have been prevented, a parking area is not provided, and that a temporary building being used as a visitor's center detracts from the memorial.

H.R. 9554 would provide for the acquisition of portions of the two blocks to the west to extend the memorial area to the municipal docks of Put-in-Bay, which is the visitor approach to the memorial, and to an existing city park. The Department plans to develop a landscaped approach mall from these municipal sites to the memorial. This will afford an unobstructed view of the memorial column. Also, without acquisition of the additional lands, the installation of needed permanent visitor's facilities would have to be placed in an area which would further detract from the appearance and setting of the memorial column.

The seawall is seriously in need of repair to protect the shoreline. The Department plans to repair and extend the seawall upon the passage of H.R. 9554.

The bill, with the amendment suggested by the Department of the Interior and concurred in by me, would require that only 3.21 acres of land be added to the existing memorial. The additional property is estimated to cost about \$370,000, of which \$35,000 is attributable to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

H.R. 9554 abolishes the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission which has not functioned as a group for more than 20 years, even though the 1936 act provides a method of filling vacancies in the Commission. The bill, therefore, repeals those sections of the 1919 and 1936 acts which pertain to this commission.

The actual location where the historical event took place was in Lake Erie, 6 miles due west of where the column stands. Therefore, for the sake of accuracy of designation and in keeping with the practice of the Department, the bill proposes that the last two words, "National Monument" be deleted and that the memorial be called Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs adopted an amendment to my original bill which authorizes to be appropriated not more than \$5,177,000 for development purposes. Directly attributed to the development of the land authorized to be purchased under H.R. 9554 would be \$2,099,000. For the development of the existing site would be \$3,078,000. Mr. Speaker, I might mention that the Secretary of the Interior's development authority for the present grounds is unlimited under the present law. This legislation will permit the Congress to maintain an oversight on the development through the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to express my thanks to the chairman of this great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. ASPINALL, and to each of its members for their many courtesies extended to me during the time they had this legislation under consideration.

Unfortunately, the next Congress will not have this able and distinguished chairman among its Members. Needless for me to say, this Congress and the Nation will be the losers.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and any other Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks immediately preceding the passage of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CUMBERLAND ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9859) to establish the Cumberland Island National Seashore in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of certain significant shoreline lands and waters of the United States, and to preserve related scenic, scientific, and historical values, there is established in the State of Georgia the Cumberland Island National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as the "seashore") consisting of the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Boundary Map, Cumberland Island National Seashore", numbered CUIS 40,000B, and dated June 1971, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may make minor adjustments in the boundary of the seashore from time to time by publication of a revised drawing or other boundary description in the Federal Register.

Sec. 2. Within the boundaries of the seashore, the Secretary may acquire lands, waters, and interests therein by whatever legal method available to him such as, but not limited to, donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from any other Federal agency. The Secretary may also acquire not to exceed one hundred acres of lands and interests in lands on the mainland to provide access to the administrative and visitor facilities for the seashore. Property owned by the State of Georgia or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without transfer of funds to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for the purposes of the seashore.

Sec. 3. For the purpose of providing access from Interstate 95 to the mainland administrative and visitor facilities of the seashore, the Secretary may designate as the

Cumberland Island Parkway a right of way, together with adjacent or related sites for public noncommercial recreational use and for interpretation of scenic and historic values, of not more than one thousand acres of lands, water, and interests therein. The Secretary is authorized to acquire only by donation those lands and interests therein, and other property comprising such right of way and adjacent or related sites as he may designate pursuant to this Act for the development, hereby authorized, of a road of parkway standards, including necessary bridges, spurs, connecting roads, access roads, and other facilities, and for the development and interpretation of recreation areas and historic sites in connection therewith. Lands acquired for the parkway shall be administered as a part of the seashore, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, and subject to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate for the parkway.

Sec. 4. (a) With the exception of any property deemed necessary by the Secretary for visitor facilities or administration of the seashore, any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the property for noncommercial residential purposes, or agriculture purposes, for a definite term not to exceed forty years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever is later. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner: *Provided, however, That when acquiring lands and interests from the National Parks Foundation, its successors and assigns, the Secretary shall acquire such lands and interest subject to the written terms and conditions on which the National Parks Foundation acquired the lands from prior owners thereof, and that such previous written rights and interests shall prevail over provisions of this paragraph.*

(b) A right of use and occupancy retained or enjoyed pursuant to this section may be terminated with respect to the entire property by the Secretary upon his determination that the property or any portion thereof has ceased to be used for noncommercial residential purposes, or agriculture purposes, and upon tender to the holder of a right an amount equal to the fair market value, as of the date of the tender, of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(c) The term "improved property", as used in this section, shall mean either (1) a detached, noncommercial residential dwelling, the construction of which was begun before February 1, 1970 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated, or (2) any property used exclusively for agricultural purposes, including housing incident thereto.

(d) (1) In order to provide an opportunity for the establishment of a natural and scenic preserve by voluntary private action of certain owners of lands within the seashore, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, no lands or interests in lands shall be acquired on Little Cumberland Island without the consent of the owner, for a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, except as specifically otherwise provided herein.

(2) In the event that the owners of land on Little Cumberland Island shall have cre-

ated an irrevocable trust or other method of preservation of the resources of Little Cumberland Island which in the judgment of the Secretary provides for the protection of the resources in a manner consistent with the purposes of which the seashore was established, the Secretary's authority to acquire such lands shall be suspended for such time as the trust is in effect, and the lands are used and occupied in accordance therewith.

(3) If, at any time during the two-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary determines that any lands on Little Cumberland Island are threatened with development, or other uses, inconsistent with the establishment or continuation of the trust herein referred to, then the Secretary may acquire such lands, or interests therein, by any of the methods provided for in section 2 of this Act.

Sec. 5. The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the seashore in accordance with the appropriate laws of Georgia and the United States to the extent applicable, except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, fishing, or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

Sec. 6. The seashore shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (30 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), as amended and supplemented, except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of the Act.

Sec. 7. (a) There is hereby established a Cumberland Island National Seashore Advisory Commission. The Commission shall terminate ten years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) One member appointed from recommendations of the Board of Commissioners of Camden County;

(2) Four members appointed from recommendations of the Ocean Science Center of the Atlantic Commission;

(3) Two members appointed from recommendations of the Governor of Georgia;

(4) Two members designated by the Secretary; and

(5) One member appointed from recommendations of the Georgia Coastal Area Planning and Development Commission.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act upon the presentation of vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the seashore and, in particular, with respect to (1) the provision and adequacy of passenger ferry service, and (2) the desirability of or necessity for bridges or causeways to Cumberland Island.

Sec. 8. Nothing in this Act shall deprive the State of Georgia or any political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction over persons found, acts performed,

and offences committed within the boundaries of the seashore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on lands included therein.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 3, strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That in order to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of certain significant shoreline lands and waters of the United States, and to preserve related scenic, scientific, and historical values, there is established in the State of Georgia the Cumberland Island National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as the "seashore") consisting of the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Boundary Map, Cumberland Island National Seashore", numbered CUIS-40,000B, and dated June 1971, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may after notifying the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and United States Senate in writing, make minor adjustments in the boundary of the seashore from time to time by publication of a revised drawing or other boundary description in the Federal Register, but the total acreage within the boundaries shall not exceed 40,500 acres.

SEC. 2. Within the boundaries of the seashore, the Secretary may acquire lands, waters, and interests therein by purchase, donation, transfer from any Federal agency, or exchange. The Secretary may also acquire not to exceed one hundred acres of lands or interests in lands on the mainland to provide access to the administrative and visitor facilities for the seashore. Any lands or interests therein owned by the State of Georgia, or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without transfer of funds to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for the purposes of the seashore.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of providing access from Interstate 95 to the mainland administrative and visitor facilities of the seashore, the Secretary may designate as the Cumberland Island Parkway a right-of-way, together with adjacent or related sites for public noncommercial recreational use and for interpretation of scenic and historic values, of not more than one thousand acres of lands, waters, and interests therein. The Secretary is authorized to acquire only by donation those lands and interests therein, and other property comprising such right-of-way and adjacent or related sites as he may designate pursuant to this Act for the development, hereby authorized, of a road of parkway standards, including necessary bridges, spurs, connecting roads, access roads, and other facilities, and for the development and interpretation of recreation areas and historic sites in connection therewith. Lands acquired for the parkway shall be administered as part of the seashore, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, and subject to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate for the parkway.

SEC. 4. (a) With the exception of any property deemed necessary by the Secretary for visitor facilities or administration of the seashore, any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their suc-

cessors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the property for noncommercial residential purposes, for twenty-five years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever is later. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner: *Provided, however,* That, in addition, for so long as a right of use and occupancy remains in effect by the donors of land of 100 acres or more, the Secretary shall not, with respect to such lands, develop any public use facilities except for trails, road access, and utilities: *Provided further,* That when acquiring lands, waters, and interests therein from the National Park Foundation, its successors and assigns, the Secretary shall acquire such lands, waters, and interests subject to the written terms and conditions contained in those transactions, including but not limited to options, entered into by the National Park Foundation prior to January 1, 1973, and that such previous written rights and interests shall prevail over provisions of this paragraph.

(b) A right of use and occupancy retained or enjoyed pursuant to this section may be terminated with respect to the entire property by the Secretary upon his determination that the property or any portion thereof has ceased to be used for noncommercial residential purposes and upon tender to the holder of a right an amount equal to the fair market value, as of the date of tender of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(c) The term "improved property", as used in this section, shall mean a detached, non-commercial residential dwelling, the construction of which was begun before February 1, 1970 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of non-commercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated.

(d) (1) In order to provide an opportunity for the establishment of a natural and scenic preserve by voluntary private action of certain owners of lands within the seashore, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, no lands or interests in lands shall be acquired on Little Cumberland Island without the consent of the owner, for a period of one year from the date of enactment of this Act, except as specifically otherwise provided herein.

(2) In the event that the owners of land on Little Cumberland Island enter into an irrevocable trust or some other irrevocable agreement for the preservation of the resources of Little Cumberland Island which, in the judgment of the Secretary, assures the protection of the resources in a manner consistent with the purposes for which the seashore is established, the authority of the Secretary to acquire such lands shall be suspended for such time as the trust is in effect and the lands are used and occupied in accordance therewith.

(3) If, at any time during the one-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary determines that any lands on Little Cumberland Island are threatened with development, or other uses, inconsistent with the establishment or continuation of the trust herein referred to, then the Secretary may acquire such lands, or interests therein, by any of the methods provided for in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the seashore in accordance with the appropriate laws of Georgia and the United

States to the extent applicable, except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, fishing, or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

SEC. 6. (a) The seashore shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), as amended and supplemented, except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of the Act.

(b) Except for certain portions of the seashore deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, fishing, hiking, horseback riding, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the seashore shall be permanently reserved in its primitive state, and no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions not prevailing, nor shall any road or causeway connecting Cumberland Island to the mainland be constructed.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall deprive the State of Georgia or any political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction over persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed within the boundaries of the seashore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on lands included therein.

SEC. 8. The authority of the Secretary of the Army to undertake or contribute to water resource developments, including shore erosion control, beach protection and navigation improvements on land and/or waters within the Cumberland Island National Seashore shall be exercised in accordance with plans which are mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army and which are consistent with both the purpose of this Act and the purpose of existing statutes dealing with water and the related land resources development.

SEC. 9. Within three years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the President, in accordance with subsections 3(c) and 3(d) of the Wilderness Act, (78 Stat 890, 16 U.S.C. 1132 (c) and (d)), his recommendations as to the suitability or non-suitability of any area within the national seashore for preservation as wilderness, and any designation of any such area as a wilderness shall be accomplished in accordance with said subsections of the Wilderness Act.

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,500,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not to exceed \$27,840,000 for development of the seashore.

Mr. ASPINALL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs if this bill, which was originally on the Consent Calendar, and was on the Suspension Calendar, has been cleared with the minority?

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. These bills we are taking up at this time have been cleared with the minority. They have been approved by the minority for the procedure which we are now using. They passed the committee without any difficulty whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado that he and the ranking minority member of the committee have spoken to me about these bills that were listed under suspensions. One or two of them were on the Consent Calendar.

Because they were listed on both, as the chairman of the minority objectors to the Consent Calendar, I asked that they be put over for suspension consideration.

I want to say that on this list we are to pass, by unanimous consent, are bills about which further information has been made available, usually by the chairman or the ranking minority member of the committee, or by Members sponsoring the legislation.

One of the excellent cases in point is H.R. 11449, concerning a disclaimer of interest, Antoine Lerous Grant.

Further information concerning a court of claims ruling was made available by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) which makes it perfectly in order, so far as I am concerned, to consider the bill under unanimous consent. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to present to the Members of the House the bill H.R. 9859 by our colleague from the State of Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY) providing for the establishment of the Cumberland Island National Seashore.

BACKGROUND

Cumberland Island is a fascinating place, Mr. Speaker. It combines some of the Nation's finest beaches with outstanding dunes and beautiful mixed hardwood forests. It offers a variety of recreational opportunities which would be difficult to match in any other part of the country. And it contains some of the most interesting historical and cultural remains of bygone days that it has ever been my pleasure to visit.

Basically, the island is free of extensive development; however, there are some extraordinarily fine old mansions from previous eras which, with proper restoration, can add to the visitor enjoyment of the area. It was the owners of these homes and their heirs, some of whom presently own seasonal or permanent residences on the island, who deserve the credit for maintaining the island in its present pristine condition.

Today, Cumberland Island is wild in appearance, but it is not undisturbed by

man. Evidence of human habitation of the "Golden Isles" of Georgia has been found which indicates that occupation of these islands dates back thousands of years. During the earliest colonial periods, the area was claimed and occupied by Spaniards until the mid-1700's when English domination began.

The cultural contributions of this small island area have been outstanding in subsequent years—through the Revolutionary War, the Civil War and up until the turn of the century. Although the historical values of this area are largely untapped, there is no question about their value as an interpretive element in the overall seashore program.

Because the area is in a mild climate having an abundance of natural moisture, any scars on the terrain made by man in previous decades and centuries have largely disappeared so that the visitor might now believe himself to be in virgin country. This natural character of the area should be retained so that the visiting public can enjoy the peacefulness of the area. The committee bill emphasizes the importance of preserving primitive character of the island and it provides for the unit to be studied for possible future consideration under the provisions of the Wilderness Act. In addition, the committee has recommended the appropriation of sufficient funds to assure the compatibility of any public improvements developed at the site with the natural environment.

Having such a rich mixture of natural values, it is not surprising that the island offers a multitude of recreational opportunities. The broad, clean beaches and the mild surf and pleasant climate make this area one of the finest swimming beaches on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. Speaker, Cumberland Island was reviewed several years ago when a survey was made of the Atlantic and gulf coasts and it was suggested then that it is one of the Nation's most outstanding potential seashore areas. The National Parks Advisory Board has endorsed proposals to make it a national seashore on two occasions—1966 and 1972—and several of the members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation visited the area and were enthusiastic about its potential.

COST

Under the terms of the legislation, the appropriation of \$10.5 million would be authorized for land acquisition. It would be impossible for us to consider this program within this ceiling were it not for the fact that the Andrew Mellon Foundation donated funds to the National Park Foundation which have been used to acquire over 13,000 acres of land on the island. It should also be noted that land acquisition costs may be further reduced if some of the existing landowners exercise their options to retain the use of their present residential properties for a limited period of time.

Development costs include the construction of visitor facilities, restoration of some of the old mansions, installation of necessary beach facilities and the construction of various hiking, bicycle, and horseback-riding trails. There will be no roads constructed on the island and no causeway or bridge is contemplated to

connect it with the mainland, so it will be necessary to provide water-based access for the visiting public. All of these items will require some Federal investment. According to estimates provided to the committee during its hearings, an investment totaling \$27,840,000 will be required over a period of years. Part of this, of course, will not be needed until the land acquisition program has been completed.

RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9859 will assure the protection and availability of one of the Nation's most significant remaining shoreline areas. It is worthy of national recognition and should be made a part of our national park system. I fully support its enactment and urge its adoption by the Members of the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to establish the Cumberland Island National Seashore in the State of Georgia.

Cumberland Island is a remarkably unspoiled seashore area of beach dunes, forests and uplands, and marsh. The outstanding beaches are enhanced by the smooth, gentle, and predictable surf. While these beaches provide excellent opportunities for swimming, sunbathing, fishing and beachcombing, other natural values on the island are conducive to other pursuits, both active and restful, such as horseback riding, hiking, bicycling, and nature study. Cumberland Island is the southernmost and largest of the so-called Golden Isles of Georgia, and possesses well-preserved, natural conditions and the finest beaches of any of them.

In addition to these outstanding natural values, the archeology and history of Cumberland Island warrant special attention. The shell heaps from the archaic period, of 5,000 to 10,000 years ago, mark village sites, and sand mounts containing human burials indicate the presence of prehistoric Indian occupation. Cumberland Island possesses historical values dating from such early occupation through colonial times, the plantation era of the mid-19th century, and into more recent periods. Interpretation of sites, artifacts, and ruins will further enhance the visitors' enjoyment of the area. In sum, Cumberland Island represents an unparalleled opportunity for seashore preservation of an area containing natural, historical, and recreational assets.

The proposed national seashore will comprise not more than 40,500 acres of land and interests in land; 15,664 acres are in State ownership, 660 acres in Federal ownership, and 13,227 acres acquired by the National Park Foundation for the seashore with funds donated by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Approximately 9,943 acres are in private ownership which have 32 improvements thereon.

The estimated cost of acquisition of the privately owned lands is estimated at \$10.5 million and developments costs are estimated at \$27,840,000.

The intrinsic values of the Cumberland Island National Seashore make it an especially valuable national component of our National Park System. The committee anticipates that development of facilities within the seashore should be re-

stricted to those which have the least impact on the environment and yet satisfy the public and administrative needs.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the legislation now before the House is H.R. 9859, by our colleague from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY). This bill authorizes the establishment of a new national seashore consisting of not more than 40,500 acres of the southernmost tip of the chain of Golden Isles off the Georgia coast.

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

Cumberland Island is rich in natural values, recreational values, and historical values. In fact, during a survey of the Nation's shoreline a few years ago, it was recognized as one of the two most outstanding undeveloped seashore areas then existing—Cape Cod being the other.

Since that survey was made, many of the areas which were examined and recommended have been added to the National Park System. Cape Cod, Fire Island, Assateague Island, Padre Island, Cape Lookout, and the Gulf Islands National Seashores have all been authorized by Congress in recent years. Cumberland Island will provide a national seashore unit along the rapidly expanding Georgia coastline which by 1976 will be within reach of 16 million people living within 300 miles. It will also be accessible to the millions of motorists who use the north-south expressway known as Interstate 95 each year.

Recreation will be a major element in the Cumberland Island program. Combining about 20 miles of beautiful, broad sandy beaches with the relatively calm, clean ocean surf will undoubtedly attract many visitors who seek opportunities for swimming, sunbathing, and beachcombing.

The interior of the island, however, offers a much different outdoor recreation opportunity. Although plantations were once extensive on the island, farming has not been a major activity for almost a century and the natural vegetation has hidden most traces of that activity today. For this reason, the inland portion of the island offers opportunities for interesting trails for hiking, bicycling, and horseback riding and, at the same time, creates an opportunity for environmental education and many more passive recreation uses, including picnicking, photography, and nature observation.

The historical values at this area are perhaps as interesting as its natural values. Indian artifacts found in the vicinity suggests that human habitation dates back thousands of years. In early colonial times, the Spanish controlled the island until the mid-1700's when it was taken over by the English. Between the time of the Revolutionary War and the time of the War Between the States, wealthy planters developed plantations and lived on the island until the war and the abolition of slavery made such activities unprofitable. Traces of all of these phases of occupation remain on the island, but little scientific exploration has been completed so that the interpretive potential of this feature of the proposal remains largely untapped.

PRESENT USE

Mr. Speaker, at the turn of the century, many wealthy industrialists became interested in the Golden Isles of Georgia and large holdings on Cumberland Island were acquired by a few individuals. These people, and their heirs, allowed the island to return to its natural condition and keep the island in its relatively undeveloped state, except for the limited areas where they constructed their magnificent homes which still exist and will be interesting elements of the interpretive program for the island.

Were it not for the fact that ownership was concentrated in a relatively small number of people, Cumberland Island, as it exists today, would probably not be available. Fortunately for the American people, these owners have preserved the integrity of this area and I believe that they would continue to do so in the future. As property ownership changes, however, estates are divided and the chances of development and destruction of the quality of this area increase. Already, there have been proposed developments which would have seriously intruded on the natural setting. These developments have been precluded by the generous cash donations by the Mellon Foundation for the acquisition of the threatened lands.

Now, well over half—almost 13,000 acres—of the island is owned by the National Park Foundation and will be donated to the United States for the purposes of the national seashore. Only about 7,000 acres of land remain in private ownership, including over 2,300 acres of marshland. Undoubtedly, some privately owned residences will be temporarily retained under provisions of the bill which permit continued use and occupancy for a period of 25 years or the life of the owners, if they so choose.

COST

Because so much of the land is to be donated, land acquisition costs should not exceed \$10.5 million—and that amount would be reduced if property owners take advantage of the provisions of the bill which permit retention of the use and occupancy of residential properties or which are designed to encourage the donation of large undeveloped tracts of land.

The main cost of this proposal would involve the development of the area for public use and enjoyment. These costs, which would be spread over a number of years as the needs expand would total \$27,840,000. Of this amount, it was optimistically suggested that about \$19,000,000 would be requested during the first 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9859 has been carefully reviewed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. It has the full support of the administration and is very comparable to the bill approved by the other body (S. 2411). Almost everyone who testified before the subcommittee wanted to preserve the values of the area, but there were differing points of view as to how this could best be accomplished.

I am convinced that this area merits the national recognition which H.R.

9859 would give it and I fully support it. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 9859, as amended, by the Members of the House.

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.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2411) to establish the Cumberland Island National Seashore in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2411

An act to establish the Cumberland Island National Seashore in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of certain significant shoreline lands and waters of the United States, and to preserve related scenic, scientific, and historical values, there is established in the State of Georgia the Cumberland Island National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as the "seashore") consisting of the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Boundary Map, Cumberland Island National Seashore", numbered CUIS-40,000-B, and dated June 1971, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may make minor adjustments in the boundary of the seashore from time to time by publication of a revised drawing or other boundary description in the Federal Register, but the total acreage within the boundaries of the seashore shall not exceed forty thousand five hundred acres.

SEC. 2. Within the boundaries of the seashore, the Secretary may acquire lands, water, and interests therein by whatever legal method available to him such as, but not limited to, donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from any other Federal agency. The Secretary may also acquire not to exceed one hundred acres of lands and interests in lands on the mainland to provide access to the administrative and visitor facilities for the seashore. Property owned by the State of Georgia or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without transfer of funds to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for the purposes of the seashore.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of providing access from Interstate 95 to the mainland administrative and visitor facilities of the seashore, the Secretary may designate as the Cumberland Island Parkway a right-of-way, together with adjacent or related sites for public non-commercial recreational use and for interpretation of scenic and historic values, of not more than one thousand acres of lands, waters, and interests therein. The Secretary is authorized to acquire by any means authorized in section 2 those lands and in-

terests therein, and other property comprising such right-of-way and adjacent or related sites as he may designate pursuant to this Act for the development, hereby authorized, of a road or parkway standards including necessary bridges, spurs, connecting roads, access roads, and other facilities, and for the development and interpretation of recreation areas and historic sites in connection therewith. Lands acquired for the parkway shall be administered as a part of the seashore, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, and subject to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate for the parkway.

SEC. 4. (a) With the exception of any property deemed necessary by the Secretary for visitor facilities or administration of the seashore, any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the property for noncommercial residential purposes for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever is later. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner: *Provided, however,* That when acquiring lands, waters, and interests therein from the National Park Foundation, its successors and assigns, the Secretary shall acquire such lands, waters, and interests subject to the written terms and conditions contained in those transactions, including but not limited to options, entered into by the National Park Foundation prior to October 1, 1972, and that such previous written rights and interests shall prevail over provisions of this paragraph: *And provided further,* That whenever an owner of property elects to retain a right of use and occupancy as provided for in this Act, such owner shall be deemed to have waived any benefits or rights accruing under sections 203, 204, 205, and 206 of the Uniformed Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1894), and for the purposes of those sections such owner shall not be considered a displaced person as defined in section 101(6) of that Act.

(b) A right of use and occupancy retained or enjoyed pursuant to this section may be terminated with respect to the entire property by the Secretary upon his determination that the property or any portion thereof has ceased to be used for noncommercial residential purposes, and upon tender to the holder of a right an amount equal to the fair market value, as of the date of the tender, of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(c) The term "improved property", as used in this section, shall mean a detached, non-commercial residential dwelling, the construction of which was begun before August 3, 1971 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated.

(d) (1) In order to provide an opportunity for the establishment of a natural and scenic preserve by voluntary private action of certain owners of lands within the seashore, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, no lands or interests in lands shall be acquired on Little Cumberland Island without the consent of the owner, for a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, except as specifically otherwise provided herein.

(2) In the event that the owners of land on Little Cumberland Island shall have created an irrevocable trust or other method of preservation of the resources of Little Cumberland Island which in the judgment of the Secretary provides for the protection of the resources in a manner consistent with the purposes of which the seashore was established, the Secretary's authority to acquire such lands shall be suspended for such time as the trust is in effect, and the lands are used and occupied in accordance therewith.

(3) If, at any time during the two-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary determines that any lands on Little Cumberland Island are threatened with development, or other uses, inconsistent with the establishment or continuation of the trust herein referred to then the Secretary may acquire such lands, or interests therein, by any of the methods provided for in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the seashore in accordance with the appropriate laws of Georgia and the United States to the extent applicable, except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, fishing, or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

SEC. 6. (a) The seashore shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), as amended and supplemented, except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of the Act.

(b) Except for certain portions of the seashore deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, fishing, hiking, riding, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the seashore shall be to the maximum extent possible preserved in its primitive state, and no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing, nor shall any road or causeway connecting Cumberland Island to the mainland be constructed.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall deprive the State of Georgia or any political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction over persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed within the boundaries of the seashore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on lands included therein.

SEC. 8. The authority of the Secretary of the Army to undertake or contribute to water resource developments, including shore erosion control, beach protection and navigation improvements on land and/or waters within the Cumberland Island National Seashore shall be exercised in accordance with plans which are mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army and which are consistent with both the purpose of this Act and the purpose of existing statutes dealing with water and related land resource development.

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,500,000 for acquisition of land and \$19,010,000 (August 1971 prices) for development, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construc-

tion costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2411 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 9859, as passed.

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. 9859) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and any other Member desiring to do so may be permitted to insert their remarks immediately preceding the passage of the legislation.

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

There was no objection.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 256) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 256

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve and interpret for the benefit of the people the home of Thaddeus Kosciuszko in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, the property at the northwest corner of Third and Pine Streets specifically designated as 301 Pine Street and/or 342 South Third Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, including improvements thereon, together with such adjacent land and interests therein as the Secretary may deem necessary for the establishment and administration of the property as a national historic site. The Secretary is further authorized to acquire by any of the above means personal property used and to be used in connection with the national historic site.

SEC. 2. The property acquired pursuant to the first section of this Act shall be known as the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site, and it shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16

U.S.C. 1, 2-4), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 3, strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, in order to provide for the development of a suitable memorial to General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, great Polish patriot and hero of the American Revolution, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation or purchase with donated funds the property at the northwest corner of Third and Pine Streets specifically designated as 301 Pine Street and/or 342 South Third Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, including improvements thereon, together with such adjacent land and interests therein as the Secretary may deem necessary for the establishment and administration of the property as a national memorial.

SEC. 2. The property acquired pursuant to the first section of this Act shall be known as the Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Memorial and it shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467).

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than \$592,000 for the development of the national memorial.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 256 provides for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Memorial in Philadelphia, Pa.

This legislation is the outgrowth of 45 proposals offered by various Members of the House. Public hearings were held on the measures before the committee and everyone agreed that the national memorial was a suitable method for honoring this great Polish patriot who came to America to help us gain our freedom.

The contributions of Thaddeus Kosciuszko during the Revolutionary War are unquestioned. This man came to the American continent to assist this Nation in gaining its independence when the course of the war was still in question. He was a leader in the field at the battle of Saratoga and contributed at many other important engagements during the war, yet his memory is marked by only a few statues and a rock garden at West Point.

If H.R. 256, or comparable legislation is enacted, it will establish a living memorial to the memory of this great man. It will include the only known place in the United States which remains in existence where Kosciuszko lived. Presently, the modest house at Third and Pine Streets is in poor condition and it will require major rehabilitation and restoration. To make it into a safe and suitable public structure, a substantial investment will be required. It is anticipated that \$592,000 will be needed to convert the existing structure into a meaningful memorial for public use and enjoyment. Some of this money will undoubtedly be used to secure period furnishings and memorabilia associated with Kosciuszko's life and times and the

remainder will be used on improvement of the home itself.

Mr. Speaker, since the owner of the building has indicated that he intends to donate the property, no land acquisition funds are authorized and the bill explicitly requires that any land acquisitions be accomplished by donation or purchase with donated funds.

That very briefly sums up the situation involved in H.R. 256. I commend it to my colleagues and urge their approval of the project.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 256, a bill to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish patriot and soldier, was a figure of outstanding significance to the winning of American independence. He came to America in 1776 to aid the patriot cause. His talents as military engineer, aiding General Gates in the selection and fortification of defensive positions on the Hudson River, contributed importantly to the crucial American victory at Saratoga in 1777. In 1778-80 he performed additional services by fortifying the Hudson at West Point, later home of the U.S. Military Academy. In the final stages of the war, he served with distinction in North and South Carolina. General Kosciuszko returned to his beloved Poland after the American Revolution, but his great services to the American cause have been universally acknowledged by historians ever since. General Kosciuszko returned to the United States briefly in 1797-98. During this visit, he rented two rooms in a Philadelphia boarding house. This building, located at 301 Pine Street, still stands. It is a three-story brick structure in which Kosciuszko stayed from November 29, 1797, to May 5, 1798, when he left for France. It is this house that is now proposed for establishment as a national historic site.

The Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its spring meeting in 1971, concluded that the house at 301 Pine Street does not meet the administrative criteria of national significance as a historical architectural structure.

The establishment of this site as a memorial to General Kosciuszko would be a fitting and proper action of the Congress in commemorating people and events in the Nation's past.

It is estimated that development costs will be approximately \$592,000. No costs are planned for land acquisition, since the property will be donated without cost, including relocation costs, if any, to the United States.

Following the development of the site as a national memorial, we estimate that visitation after 5 years would reach approximately 7,700 per year.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of this bill and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House at this time is H.R. 256. Like many other bills—a total of 45 were introduced—it provided for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Historic Site in Philadelphia, Pa.

BACKGROUND

The National Parks Subcommittee conducted public hearings on this subject on September 8 and later considered the matter in detail in executive session.

Mr. Speaker, Thaddeus Kosciuszko came to this country from Poland in 1776 to help our Nation gain its independence. He is recognized as one of the principal strategists of the Battle of Saratoga which was so important during the Revolutionary War and he served with distinction in North and South Carolina. After the war, he returned to Poland, but he came to the United States again in 1797. During that stay, he briefly took up residence at the Pine Street house in Philadelphia involved in this legislation, but he departed for France after a few months.

No one denies the importance of the role which General Kosciuszko played during the critical period of our early history, but there was some question about the historical significance of the Philadelphia house in relation to the contributions for which he is remembered. To overcome this problem, the Interior Department recommended a compromise which provided for the creation of a national memorial commemorating the contributions of this outstanding individual. This reasonable compromise was acceptable to all who appeared before the subcommittee and to the members participating in the hearing.

As recommended H.R. 256, as amended, will permit appropriate recognition to be extended to General Kosciuszko and will provide a constructive solution to a dilemma which otherwise might dilute the meaning of our system of national historic sites.

The committee amendment provides for a national memorial at the site in question. At the appropriate time, I will offer and explain the amendment in detail.

EXPLANATION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment strikes all after the enacting clause and inserts a new text which conforms with the general concept of the original legislation. Basically, it authorizes the acceptance of the property of Pine Street in Philadelphia for the purpose of establishing a national memorial commemorating the contributions of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko. The property is to be acquired by donation or purchase with donated funds—and I might point out that the owner testified that he intends to donate it.

Once acquired the property is to be administered and developed as a unit of the national park system. Under the terms of the subcommittee amendment, appropriations for the purpose of developing this memorial are to be limited to no more than \$592,000—the amount estimated to be needed to refurbish and restore the site and to convert it to a facility suitable for public use and enjoyment.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, that summarizes the objective of the amendment. I recommend its adoption by the House.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Memorial in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1973) to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just thought it might be advisable to give a brief word to the Members regarding this particular bill because I am sure somewhere along the line some newspaper columnist or some constituent is going to ask about it.

At Third and Pine in the city of Philadelphia there is a small dwelling where our hero, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, stayed for a few weeks. It is a case of "George Washington slept here."

It has no other significance other than the fact the cost of restoration of that modest dwelling to perpetuate this memorial to this hero will cost \$592,000.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1973

An act to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve in public ownership the historically significant property associated with the life of Thaddeus Kosciuszko for the benefit and inspiration of the people of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange in accordance with the provisions of 35(b) of the Act of July 15, 1958 (16 U.S.C. 4601-22 (Supp. V)), the land and interests in land, together with buildings and improvements thereon, located at, or in the vicinity of, 301 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, together with such other lands and interests in land, including scenic easements, as the Secretary shall deem necessary for the administration of the area. The Secretary shall establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site by publication of a notice to that effect in the Federal Register at such time as he deems sufficient lands and interests in lands have been acquired for administration in accordance with the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 2. Pending establishment and thereafter, the Secretary shall administer lands and interests in lands acquired for the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1,

2-4), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 416 et seq.), as amended.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, not to exceed, however, \$592,000 for development of the area, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering and cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1973 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 256, as passed.

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. 256) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. I ask unanimous consent that I and any other Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the passage of this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL ACQUISITION, PISCATAWAY PARK, MD.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 15597) to authorize additional funds for acquisition of interests in land within the area known as Piscataway Park in the State of Maryland.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15597

A bill to authorize additional funds for acquisition of interests in land within the area known as Piscataway Park in the State of Maryland

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 780, 782), as amended (80 Stat. 319), is further amended by deleting "\$4,132,000" and inserting "\$5,657,000".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House at this time—H.R. 15597 by our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR)—provides for an increased appropriation limitation for the area known as Piscataway Park in the State of Maryland.

Everyone knows of the long-term interest of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in this legislation. No one has taken greater interest or been more persistent in attempting to assure the protection of the view from Mount Ver-

non than our friend from Pennsylvania. Largely because of his interest, I think that it is fair to say, this historic view has been preserved up to this time. There have been many threats and many problems over the years that have required the attention of the Congress, but the fact is that the area remains relatively unhampered by unsightly structures.

In order to foreclose future problems, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported a bill (H.R. 10086) earlier this year which included a provision authorizing sufficient funds for the acquisition of all of the remaining lands in the so-called "fee acquisition zone" and for the purchase of scenic easements covering all of the remaining lands in the scenic easement zone. That legislation was approved by the House early this year, but the provision dealing with Piscataway Park was not included in the measure approved by the other body.

In the intervening months, the National Park Service has resolved the litigation involving the controversy at the Marshall Hall site so that scenic safeguards for that significant property are now assured, but a substantial amount of land in the scenic easement zone remains unprotected from potentially adverse developments. While we had hoped that the landowners in this portion of the park would donate the needed easements, that wish has not been fulfilled and adequate protection will apparently not be secured unless and until adequate funds are authorized and appropriated to complete the program started in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15597 does not contemplate any change in the existing boundaries. That decision was made long ago and nothing in this bill will change it. All that this legislation does is authorize the funds which will be necessary to cover the estimated costs involved in the acquisition of scenic easements covering lands which are not presently subject to scenic controls.

COST

I am pleased to advise the Members of the House, that H.R. 15597 involves a smaller increase than the legislation approved by this body last January. There are two reasons why this reduction has been made possible:

First, one of the unknown variables is now resolved and the Marshall Hall property is adequately protected from uses which would mar the view from Mount Vernon.

Second, the Park Service has concluded that it has adequate scenic control over the remaining lands in the fee acquisition zone so that no further fee acquisition will be required.

Under the terms of H.R. 15597, the appropriation ceiling will be increased by \$1,525,000. The bill specifically limits this increase by amending the existing law to delete \$4,132,000 and to insert \$5,657,000.

RECOMMENDATION

As one who has observed and participated in the development of this legislation over the years, I hope that this will complete the program which the Congress originally contemplated. It is unfortunate that the landowners have not donated the scenic easements involved, but I sincerely believe that it is in the best

public interest that we move to complete this program as rapidly as possible in order to avoid greater and more expensive problems in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I support the enactment of H.R. 15597 and urge its approval by the Members of the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as the principal sponsor, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

The purpose of H.R. 15597 is to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the acquisition of interests in land within the area known as Piscataway Park in the State of Maryland.

In 1961, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and administer lands and interests in land along the Potomac River in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., in order to preserve lands which provide the principal overview from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington.

The act of October 4, 1961, as amended by the act of July 19, 1966, established the area known as Piscataway Park in the State of Maryland, and provided for the acquisition of lands and interests in land in two categories. A "fee acquisition area" of approximately 1,058 acres which is along the shoreline approximately 5 miles long and 1,000 feet in depth, and a "scenic protection area" of approximately 1,410 acres, which extends 1,000 to 6,000 feet back of the "fee acquisition area."

In the "fee acquisition area," a number of properties were purchased by philanthropic citizens and organizations and donated to the Federal Government for park purposes. The remaining lands in this shoreline zone were acquired, except for approximately 13 acres which the act provides may be retained in that zone, at a cost of \$4,132,000.

In the "scenic protection area," it was initially contemplated that the landowners would donate a scenic easement to the United States over their property. The landowners in some five or six subdivisions in the area which had restrictive covenants in their deeds, prohibiting development of more than single family residences for every 5 acres, did come forth and donate scenic easements over their properties to the Federal Government. Approximately one-half of the lands in the "scenic protection area" are now under the restrictive covenant of a scenic easement.

Several large tracts of land in this area are free of such controls and the prospects of their intense development remains a very real possibility. One of these tracts—the Marshall Hall property—has been a matter of great controversy for several months in the past and it was this situation that arose public indignation resulting in the Secretary of the Interior filing a complaint in condemnation to acquire scenic restrictions against the Marshall Hall property of Star Enterprises, Ltd.—Joseph I. and Shirley H. Goldstein—on December 23, 1970, in civil action No. 70-1449T, after prolonged negotiations had failed.

Prior to the filing of the complaint in condemnation by virtue of the authority contained in section 2(c) of the act, the Secretary of the Interior advised the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate that such action could cause the appropriation ceiling to be exceeded as the balance of the funds appropriated but unexpended would be earmarked for settlement of the civil action. On April 24, 1972, the civil action by the Federal Government against the Marshall Hall property was settled by agreement of the parties at a cost of approximately \$900,000.

The unfortunate result of this controversy and litigation is the need to provide the Secretary of the Interior with the means to acquire scenic easements on the balance of some 89 tracts within the scenic protection area from those landowners who now see an opportunity to capitalize on their holdings in the area. H.R. 15597 will provide this by authorizing the appropriation of \$1,525,000 in additional funds for the acquisition of interests in land within Piscataway Park.

Now, after a decade of acquisition and negotiation, if the original intent and purpose of this legislation is to be carried out, that is to preserve lands which provide the principal overview from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington, it becomes apparent that the interests in land necessary to accomplish this objective must be acquired.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House (H.R. 15597 by Representative SAYLOR), authorizes an increased appropriation ceiling for the area known as Piscataway Park.

BACKGROUND

As everyone knows, Piscataway Park is the unit of the National Capital Park System located opposite from Mount Vernon. It was established by the Congress in 1961 to protect the view from George Washington's home and from Fort Washington. Since that initial authorization, there have been a variety of proposals which would have marred the setting of Mount Vernon, but so far these have been prevented by the foresight of the Congress a decade ago.

As it presently exists, Piscataway Park is divided into two principal zones—a "fee acquisition zone"—consisting of approximately 1,058 acres of land immediately adjacent to the Potomac River—and a "scenic protection zone"—totaling about 1,410 acres of land contiguous to the fee zone. Except for about 13 acres, all of the fee zone lands have been acquired, but in the scenic zone numerous parcels of land remain free of any development restraints. H.R. 15597 will help cure this defect by authorizing funds for the acquisition of scenic easements covering this area.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND AND COST

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is very comparable to the provision for Piscataway included in H.R. 10086 which was approved by the House on January 31, 1972. That measure authorized an increase totaling \$2,840,000 for the acquisition of fee title and scenic easements for all lands in the park. Since that time the Government has settled its condemnation action on

the Marshall Hall property for approximately \$900,000 and concluded that its present scenic controls adequately cover certain lands in the fee zone so that it is possible to reduce costs attributable to this bill. As recommended, the bill increases the present authorization ceiling by \$1,525,000 rather than \$2,840,000 as earlier recommended.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15597 should solve the problem of protecting the view from Mount Vernon that we have all heard so much about. I understand that the other body is likely to approve this legislation so that it should close the issue. I am convinced that this action is needed and I urge the approval of the bill by my colleagues in the House.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so be permitted to extend their remarks immediately preceding the passage of this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF MAR-A-LAGO NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, PALM BEACH, FLA.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13067) to provide for the administration of the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site, in Palm Beach, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13067

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (a) That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall develop, and administer the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site described in the order of designation date January 16, 1969, as a part of the national park system pursuant to the provision of the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), as amended, at such time as the right to possession of the real and personal property comprising the historic site shall vest in the United States.

(b) The Secretary is directed to use the authority contained in the Act of August 21, 1935 (supra) to enter into such agreements and to take such actions as he may deem necessary to provide for administration and appropriate visitor use, and to make the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site as nearly financially self-sustaining as may be practicable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "shall" and insert "may accept, maintain."

Page 2, lines 1 through 6, strike out all of

subsection (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The Secretary is directed to use the authority contained in the Act of August 21, 1935 (supra) to enter into such agreements and to take such actions as he may deem necessary to provide for administration and for the use of the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site as a temporary residence for visiting foreign dignitaries or heads of states or members of the Executive Branch of the United States Government. Any further use of this property shall be determined by the Secretary after conferring with the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site Advisory Commission.

Page 2, following line 6, insert the following new section:

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site Advisory Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior for terms of three years each, as follows:

(1) One member to be appointed from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the State of Florida;

(2) One member to be appointed from recommendations submitted by the trustees appointed pursuant to the Mar-A-Lago Trust; and

(3) Three members to be appointed by the Secretary, one of whom shall be designated Chairman of the Commission, to represent the general public interest, and two of whom shall be appointed from recommendations submitted by the town council of Palm Beach, Florida.

(c) Any vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, as such, but the Secretary is authorized to pay, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman, the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission and its members in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(e) The Secretary, or his designee, shall, as the circumstances require meet and consult with the Commission on general policies and specific matters related to the administration of the historic site.

(f) The Commission shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members thereof.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13067 which Congressman TAYLOR and Congressman ROGERS joined me in co-sponsoring provides for the statutory recognition of the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site in Palm Beach, Fla.

Mar-A-Lago is the realization of a dream of one of the outstanding ladies of America and it is one of the Nation's great mansions. It was created as a result of the efforts and investment of Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post. She found the site; she worked with the architects and interior designers; and she did much of the planning that makes the place the beautiful spot that it is.

Altogether it includes 17 acres of land. The grounds are outstanding and carefully maintained and the home is a magnificent structure in perfect condition. Located as they are between the ocean and Lake Worth, they blend into a splendid setting. While there is a tremendous view from almost any point on the estate, it still affords the occupant the privacy and security which he may need.

The legislation contemplates the use of

this property as an Executive retreat which would be available to the President when desired or might be used, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for official meetings or by Government officials who need its use for official functions. It would be an excellent place for a temporary residence for visiting foreign dignitaries or heads of state who need the privacy and security which it provides. In short, it would be limited to specific uses of an official nature which satisfy a need, but it would not be generally open for public tours or activities which would require a substantial expenditure of public moneys.

In fact, the property is to be donated to the Federal Government by Mrs. Post along with almost all of its priceless furnishings and works of art. In addition, a trust fund has been established which will yield an income adequate to maintain the property in its present perfect condition.

A tentative agreement—subject only to the enactment of this legislation—has been negotiated between the National Park Service and the Palm Beach County Historical Society which will assure the maintenance of the property without resort to public funds. In the future, if the trust fund is inadequate because of rising costs, then the property can be permitted to revert to the heirs of the donor or a future Congress can decide whether or not to utilize any public funds to retain it in public ownership.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited Mar-A-Lago and can tell my colleagues that it is a national treasure. No other place in this country equals it and it is unlikely that any comparable place will ever be built in the future. Here, in H.R. 13067 we have an opportunity to protect a property before it slips into disrepair or before it is altered in some way as to render it less valuable to the American people. It is a great opportunity and a minimum risk. I heartily endorse the project and urge its adoption by the Members of the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker. I support the passage of this legislation.

The purpose of H.R. 13067 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the Mar-A-Lago estate for use and development as a unique part of our national park system.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior may accept, develop and maintain this famous site, in accordance with its designation as a national historic site, at such time as the right of possession vests in the United States.

Mar-A-Lago is one of America's great mansions. Created by Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, it is located on a coral reef between the Atlantic Ocean and Lake Worth in Palm Beach, Fla. The mansion is surrounded by splendid gardens and beautifully landscaped grounds, comprising approximately 17 acres.

By Order of Designation dated January 16, 1969, issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), the Secretary of the Interior, noting that it possessed exceptional value in commemorating or il-

lustrating the architectural and cultural history of the United States, designated the area as "The Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site."

Mrs. Post has generously indicated a desire to initiate the conveyance of her real and personal property at Mar-A-Lago to the United States upon enactment of legislation that would authorize Federal ownership and administration. Mrs. Post has made testamentary provisions to create a trust having a corpus of certain securities, the income from which will be applied against costs of administration.

The bill, H.R. 10367, also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the necessary agreements to utilize the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site as a temporary residence for visiting foreign dignitaries or heads of state and members of the executive branch of the U.S. Government.

The passage and enactment of this bill provides a unique opportunity for the Congress to participate in preserving one of the truly great treasures in the United States. This beautiful mansion and grounds can be accepted, developed, and maintained at no cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13067 provides for the acceptance of the donation of the mansion of Marjorie Merriweather Post in Palm Beach, Fla.

It is generally known that Mrs. Post owns three outstanding estates—Mar-A-Lago in Florida, Hillwood in Washington, D.C., and Top Ridge Camp in the Adirondacks of New York. Provision has already been made for Hillwood to be donated to the Smithsonian Institution and this legislation, if enacted, will allow the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the Mar-A-Lago estate.

It is difficult to describe in a few words the property which we are considering. The principal building, which measures about 300 feet by 600 feet, was constructed in the early 1920's of reinforced concrete with a stone and stucco veneer. It is a substantial structure in perfect condition. The grounds are meticulously kept and feature beautiful gardens and a terrace.

In every respect, this property is a national treasure worthy of preservation and recognition. While it is not associated with the early history of the Nation it is representative of an era of more modern times which will continue to grow in value in the generations ahead.

As I have said, the real property is to be donated, subject to the retention of a life estate by Mrs. Post. Practically all of the furnishings, except a very few personal items, will be donated with the house. In addition, the subcommittee heard testimony in executive session concerning the provisions of Mrs. Post's will which indicated that a trust fund has been established which will yield an income adequate to maintain the property in its outstanding condition indefinitely without resort to appropriated funds.

Full committee consideration of this legislation was deferred pending resolution of certain questions concerning operation and maintenance of the prop-

erty. We received that information in a letter from Director Hartzog dated August 28, 1972. If this legislation is enacted, and if the Secretary accepts the property, it is anticipated that the Secretary will enter into an agreement with the Palm Beach County Historical Society for operation and maintenance. This is spelled out in a letter of understanding signed by Mr. Hartzog and Mr. Arthur E. Barrow, president of the Palm Beach County Historical Society.

The property would be used primarily for special conferences and meetings, and for temporary residential uses where special security is important. It might be used, for example, by visiting heads of state or, perhaps, as a future winter White House or Governor's conference but it would probably not be open for general public tours. Perhaps, by special arrangement, groups might be toured through the property in accordance with the provisions of the terms of conveyance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give this measure my enthusiastic endorsement and I urge its approval by the House.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks immediately preceding the passage of this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

HOHOKAM PIMA NATIONAL MONUMENT, ARIZ.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8756), to provide for the establishment of the Hohokam Pima National Monument in the vicinity of the Snaketown archeological site, Arizona, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8756

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve and interpret for the benefit and inspiration of the people a site illustrative of the irrigation for over two thousand years of the valleys in central Arizona with water diverted from the Gila and Salt Rivers by the Hohokam and their Pima descendants, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to establish the Hohokam Pima National Monument at and in the vicinity of the Snaketown archeological site on the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona, when he determines that the beneficial interest in sufficient lands to constitute an efficiently administrable unit has been transferred to the Secretary for such purpose. Such national monument shall not exceed two thousand acres.

SEC. 2. In order to effect the transfer referred to in the first section of this Act, the Gila River Indian Community Council (hereinafter referred to as the "council") is authorized to acquire the beneficial interest in such allotted lands as may lie within boundaries designated by the Secretary for the Hohokam Pima National Monument. In exchange, the council may convey to such allottees or their successors in interest the beneficial interest in other lands of no less acreage and value that is held in trust for the benefit of the council or that may be acquired by the council for such purpose outside the proposed boundaries of the Hohokam Pima National Monument. The Council is authorized to transfer to the Secretary the beneficial interest so acquired by the council for the Hohokam Pima National Monument and the beneficial interest in such other lands held in trust for the benefit of the council as the Secretary may designate for the purposes of this Act. The council may likewise acquire beneficial fractionated interests in tracts outside of the proposed boundaries of the Hohokam Pima National Monument. The Secretary on the request of the council and with funds provided by it, may acquire by condemnation on behalf of the council the beneficial interest in any lands within the boundaries designated by the Secretary for the Hohokam Pima National Monument when the council is unable to acquire such interest. The Secretary is authorized to transfer title in the name of the United States in trust for the council to the beneficial interest in public lands of no less acreage and value than the beneficial interest in the lands transferred by the council to the Secretary. The beneficial interest transferred by the council to the Secretary and otherwise acquired by him pursuant to this Act shall revert to the council if the lands to which they pertain cease to be used for the purpose of a national monument.

SEC. 3. (a) The administration and protection of the Hohokam Pima National Monument shall be exercised by the Secretary in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); except that the council shall be permitted to develop and operate revenue-producing visitor services and facilities within such monument in accordance with plans and regulations of the Secretary. Any revenues resulting from the operation of such services and facilities may be retained by the council.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3 through page 2, line 5, strike out all of section 1 and insert the following:

That, in order to preserve and interpret for the benefit and inspiration of the people a site containing significant archeological values, including the irrigation systems in the valleys of central Arizona developed by the Hohokam and Pima Indians, and their descendants, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to establish the Hohokam Pima National Monument (hereinafter referred to as the "monument"). Such monument, which shall not exceed 2,000 acres in size, shall comprise lands in the vicinity of and including the Snaketown Archeological site on the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona, as generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Boundary Map Snaketown National Monument", numbered NM-SNA 20,003-A, and dated October, 1971. The monument may be established by the Secretary when he determines that the beneficial interest in a sufficient amount of land has been transferred to constitute an efficiently administrable unit.

Page 2, line 6 through page 3, line 13, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. (a) The Gila River Indian Community Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") for the Gila River Indian Community (hereinafter referred to as the "Community") may acquire the beneficial interest in any allotted lands located within the boundaries of the monument and may, in exchange therefore, convey to such allottees, or their successors in interest, the beneficial interest in any lands of at least equal value outside the boundaries of the monument which are held in trust for the benefit of the Community. In arranging such exchanges with allottees the Council may acquire beneficial whole or fractionated interests in tracts outside the boundaries of the monument. When the Council is unable to acquire such interests, it may request that the Secretary, on its behalf and with funds which it provides, acquire such beneficial interest in any lands within the boundaries of the monument, and the Secretary may acquire such interest by condemnation.

(b) The Council is authorized to transfer to the Secretary the beneficial interest in any lands held in trust for the benefit of the Community, including such interests as are acquired pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, located within the boundaries of the monument. In exchange for such transfer, the Secretary shall declare that title to public lands of at least equal value which are under his jurisdiction are held in trust for the Community.

Page 3, line 14, after "Sec. 3." insert "(a)" and following line 22, insert a new subsection as follows:

(b) An appropriate portion of any admission fees attributable to such services and facilities may, in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary and the Council, be transferred to the council.

Page 3, lines 23 through 25, strike out all of section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than \$135,000 for the acquisition of lands and not more than \$1,781,000 for the development of the monument.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8756 is a bill cosponsored by our colleagues from the State of Arizona (Representatives UDALL, RHODES, and STEIGER). It authorizes the establishment of the Hohokam Pima National Monument about 20 miles from Phoenix, Ariz.

DESCRIPTION, SIZE, AND LOCATION

This proposed national monument would comprise not more than 2,000 acres of land presently owned by the Gila River Indian community and individual Indian allottees. Generally, it consists of relatively unproductive, flat desert lands. While the lands themselves do not appear to contain any outstanding natural or scenic values which would merit their consideration for inclusion in the national park system, beneath the surface are the remains of one of the earliest cultures of the Southwest.

Here, 300 years before the birth of Christ, the ancient Hohokam Indians had developed a sophisticated culture which included an extensive system of irrigation canals for agriculture. Archeological excavations in the area have revealed that a highly civilized society occupied this region for centuries before the coming of the white man. While enough work has been done to verify the significance of the site, it is believed that only a small portion of this historic resource has been uncovered.

COST

The establishment of this national monument will not require an unreasonable investment of public moneys. All of the lands involved are presently held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Gila River Indian community and individual allottees. The tribal council is anxious to have the area protected and has indicated a willingness to cooperate in transferring title to all of the lands within the monument boundary in exchange for other public lands of at least equal value. For this reason, land acquisition costs will be nominal and will be limited to the administrative and technical costs usually associated with land transactions. It is estimated that not more than \$135,000 will be needed for this purpose.

Development costs will also be relatively modest. It is contemplated that a visitor center will be constructed, that a few roads and trails will be needed and that some in-place exhibits will be installed. Altogether, it is estimated that a total of \$1,781,000 will cover the development costs associated with this project.

RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8756 will assure the protection of a recognized area of great scientific significance. The costs are modest and the benefits will be substantial. I support the enactment of H.R. 8756, as amended, and I urge its approval by my colleagues in the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8756, to provide for the establishment of the Hohokam Pima National Monument in the vicinity of Snaketown archeological site, in Arizona.

The purpose of the bill is to preserve and interpret the nationally significant archeological values and irrigation systems developed by the ancient Hohokam Indian community on the Gila River Indian Reservation in the valleys of south-central Arizona.

The proposed national monument is the site of the earliest known irrigation development in the United States which supported and developed a sophisticated agrarian community some 300 years or more before the time of Christ. The site is neither spectacular or exciting to the layman but to the trained archeologist it is one of the most significant sites in the entire southwest.

Since 1887 traces of the ancient Hohokam civilization have been discovered. Excavation in the area continues to this day. The Pima Indians, descendants of the Hohokam community now inhabit the area near the site and continue to develop a better understanding of their forefathers. The spokesmen for the Gila Indian Reservation strongly support the establishment of the national monument.

The estimated costs for the establishment of this historic site are \$135,000 because the lands involved are only to be acquired by exchange. This will, therefore, require only the payment of administrative and technical costs. On the other hand, development costs are estimated at \$1,781,000 which would include a visitors center, protective and interpretive structures, and a portable shelter as an archeological excavation exhibit.

H.R. 8756 will provide for the preservation of our history which has been "written in the earth" and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House (H.R. 8756) was introduced by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and cosponsored by Representatives RHODES and STEIGER of Arizona.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

The area involved in the legislation is commonly called the Snaketown Archaeological Site. It contains thousands of artifacts and specimens of the Hohokam society which existed in this part of the Southwest for hundreds of years. While fragments of broken pottery are found on the surface of the ground, most of the remnants of this ancient civilization are buried under the soil that has drifted in to bury the historical remains of ancient houses and other evidences of human use and occupation of the land.

All of the area involved is located on lands held in trust for the Indian people who now live in the area and who are believed to be the descendants of the Hohokams. During the public hearings, spokesmen for the tribal council of the Gila River Indian community testified in favor of the enactment of the legislation because they feel that development of the area will help them to better understand their own background and because they believe that the monument will help provide new job opportunities for their people.

The legislation provides that the tribal council may exchange tribal lands for allotted lands within the monument boundaries or that it may purchase, or provide funds to the Secretary of the Interior to purchase, any of the allotted lands. The tribal lands may be exchanged for lands of at least equal value which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment and implementation of H.R. 8756 will not only add a significant archeological site to the national park system, but it should contribute to a better economy for the present Indian landowner. The proposed monument is located in an arid area which has no dependable water supply so that little practical use can be made of the land and no residential use is feasible. If H.R. 8756 is enacted it is anticipated that the tribal council will exchange agricultural lands which it has available for the allotted lands included in the monument. This direct benefit for the allottees will be supplemented by some employment opportunities which will result from visitor use of the monument area.

Altogether, it is anticipated that not more than \$135,000 will be needed to pay the administrative and technical costs associated with the land transfers and not more than \$1,781,000 will be needed for development. This is a modest price to pay for the preservation, protection, and interpretation of this valuable archeological area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of the enactment of H.R. 8756 and I urge my colleagues in the House to support the bill.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so be permitted to extend their remarks immediately preceding the passage of this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITION OF MINAM RIVER CANYON TO THE EAGLE CAP WILDERNESS, WALLOWA AND WHITMAN NATIONAL FORESTS, OREG.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6446) to provide for addition of the Minam River Canyon and other areas to the Eagle Cap Wilderness, Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, to modify the boundaries of the Wallowa National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6446

A bill to provide for addition of the Minam River Canyon and other areas to the Eagle Cap Wilderness, Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, to modify the boundaries of the Wallowa National Forest in the State of Oregon, 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 areas proposed for addition to the Eagle Cap Wilderness as generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed additions to the Eagle Cap Wilderness", dated March 1971, which is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, are hereby designated for addition to and a part of the Eagle Cap Wilderness, Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, Oregon.

Sec. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Eagle Cap Wilderness as revised by this Act with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.*

Sec. 3. The additions to the Eagle Cap Wilderness provided by this Act shall be administered as a part of the Eagle Cap Wilderness by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act: *Provided, That notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 5(c) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1135(c), 78 Stat. 896), the Secretary of Agriculture is*

authorized to acquire privately owned land within the perimeter of the Eagle Cap Wilderness by exchange or other means and without specific further authorization by Congress, where this privately owned land threatens the character of the surrounding wilderness.

SEC. 4. (a) The exterior boundaries of the Wallowa National Forest in Oregon are modified to include the following described lands, containing approximately twenty-three thousand acres:

WALLOWA NATIONAL FOREST
Willamette Principal Meridian

Township 2 north, range 41 east: section 29, all that part south of the Wallowa and Minam Rivers; section 32; section 33, southwest quarter northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter.

Township 1 north, range 41 east: section 3, west half southwest quarter; section 4, south half northeast quarter, northwest quarter; south half; sections 5, 8, 9, 10; section 14, west half, south half southeast quarter; sections 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23; section 24, south half northwest quarter, all of rest of section south and west of Big Canyon Creek; section 25, all west of Big Canyon Creek; section 26, 27, 28, 29; section 32, north half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter; section 33; section 34, north half, southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter; sections 35, 36.

(b) Subject to valid claims so long as these are maintained, all lands now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States in the areas described in subsection (a) of this section which are not now part of the Wallowa National Forest shall be part of such national forest, and shall be administered in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto, with special emphasis on the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities. Money appropriated for Federal purposes from the land and water conservation fund shall be available for the acquisition of property within the areas described in subsection (a) of this section.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "March 1971," and insert "August 1, 1972".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Oregon." and insert "Oregon, which addition comprises an area of approximately 72,420 acres."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "Act:" and the succeeding proviso ending on Page 3, line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the word "Act".

Page 3, line 3 through Page 4, line 10, strike out all of Section 4 and insert in lieu thereof a new section as follows:

SEC. 4. Within five years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review those lands depicted on the map referenced in Section 1 of this Act as the "Wilderness Study Area" comprising about 32,000 acres, commonly referred to as the Lower Minam, and shall report to the President, in accordance with subsections 3(b) and 3(d) of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1132(b) and (d)), his recommendation as to the suitability or nonsuitability of any area within the above area for preservation as a wilderness, and any designation of any such area as a wilderness shall be accomplished in accordance with said subsections of the Wilderness Act.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6446, as amended.

This proposal will add some 72,420 acres of land in the Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, Oregon to the existing 220,416 acre Eagle Cap Wilderness. It also provides for the study and

review of an additional 32,000 acres for their wilderness potential and possible future wilderness designation.

While this area was not classified as a primitive area by the Forest Service, or managed as such, the land designated as wilderness by the committee does possess all the characteristics of a true wilderness. Where past activities of man were in evidence that area has been excluded from the present proposal. The required mineral report has been completed and indicates the absence of commercially valuable minerals.

With one exception the proposed substantially reflects the recommendation of the Forest Service report of May 24, 1972. This exception pertains to the inclusion of some 27,000 acres in what is known as the Little Minam River area. While the Forest Service agreed, this area displayed all the characteristics of wilderness it did not recommend its inclusion because of timber values and the possibility of insect infestation of that timber. The committee was informed, however, that this timber is not now included in the allowable cut calculation and it is further convinced that the 1964 Wilderness Act provides ample authority for control of fires, infestations or diseases in wilderness areas.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend favorable action on H.R. 6446, as amended.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6446, a bill to provide for the addition of certain lands within the Wallowa and Whitman National Forests to the Eagle Cap Wilderness.

H.R. 6446 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to designate 72,420 acres in the Wallowa and Whitman National Forests in the State of Oregon, as additions to the Eagle Cap Wilderness. The bill also provides for the review and study of an additional 32,000 acres for future wilderness designation.

Mr. Speaker, even though the passage and enactment of H.R. 6446 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is not in keeping with the committee's standard posture on wilderness, and even though the administration has been somewhat ambiguous on its position regarding additions to the Eagle Cap Wilderness, I support the passage of this bill. I do so because there are many areas of this country that should be set aside as wilderness for the enjoyment of present and future generations. The executive branch and the Congress have been in my judgment too slow in their consideration of wilderness proposals.

The passage and enactment of this legislation, while having some undesirable points, will in my judgment establish the precedent needed so that the Congress can get on with the business of establishing wilderness areas throughout the United States in accordance with the expressed will of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of this bill.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide for the addition of certain

lands within the Wallowa and Whitman National Forests to the Eagle Cap Wilderness."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 493) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness area the national forest lands adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, known as the Minam River Canyon and adjoining area in Oregon, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 493

An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as a wilderness area the national forest lands adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, known as the Minam River Canyon and adjoining area, in Oregon, 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 Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to classify as additional wilderness those national forest lands containing approximately eighty thousand acres within the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest in Oregon in the Minam River drainage adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness as generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed addition to the Eagle Cap Wilderness dated August 1970" which is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture shall promptly after such classification transmit to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives a map and legal description of the addition to the wilderness area and such description shall have the same force and effect as if set forth in this Act: Provided, That correction of minor clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made. Upon its classification, such addition shall be deemed to be a part of the Eagle Cap Wilderness of the National Wilderness Preservation System and shall be subject to the same provisions and rules as those designated as wilderness areas by the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890), except that any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 493 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 6446, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read:

"To provide for the addition of certain lands within the Wallowa and Whit-

man National Forests to the Eagle Cap Wilderness."

A similar House bill (H.R. 6446) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and any other Member desiring to do so may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the passage of this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING THE UNITED STATES DISCLAIMS INTEREST IN TRACT OF LAND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11449) to provide that the United States disclaims any interest in a certain tract of land.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 11449

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the United States disclaims any right, title, or interest in the following-described tract of land situated within the Carson National Forest, New Mexico, such tract of land being more particularly described as follows:

A tract of land containing 66.78 acres, more or less, beginning at corner numbered 1, which is located on the northerly line of the Antoine Leroux grant, as shown on official survey plat approved by the United States Surveyor General on August 25, 1909, whence corner numbered 69 of the Leroux grant survey bears south 79 degrees 45 minutes west, 20.14 chains;

thence north 79 degrees 45 minutes east, 6.06 chains (400 feet) to corner numbered 2, which is identical with the Leroux grant corner numbered 70 and located at the confluence of South Fork Canyon and the Rio Hondo;

thence north 61 degrees 30 minutes east, 4.20 chains (277.20 feet) to corner numbered 3 which is identical with corner numbered 71 and mile corner numbered 13 of the Leroux grant survey;

thence north 44 degrees 30 minutes east, 27.70 chains (1,828.20 feet) continuing along the northerly line of the Leroux grant survey to corner numbered 4;

thence south 09 degree 47 minutes east, 22.73 chains (1,500 feet) to corner numbered 5;

thence south 51 degrees 23 minutes west, 36.36 chains (2,400 feet) to corner numbered 6;

thence north 11 degrees 15 minutes west, 22.73 chains (1,500 feet) to corner numbered 1, the point of beginning.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to prepare and execute without consideration any instrument necessary to carry out the purposes of subsection (a).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I support enactment of H.R. 11449.

This proposal would settle a long-standing title dispute between private citizens and the Forest Service that arose

in connection with an old 1742 Spanish land grant which was confirmed by Congress in 1869.

Due to an erroneous survey in 1909 a patent issued in 1911 included some 6.95 acres of land which apparently was not a part of the land as described in the original Spanish land grant. However, the private owners have long relied upon the integrity of a Federal patent and the issue of ownership was not raised until recently when much of the land within the original 1742 grant was reconveyed to the Federal Government.

The Forest Service now maintains that, notwithstanding long years of undisputed possession and a Federal patent, the 6.95 acres never legally passed out of Federal ownership. This small area lies north of the Rio Honda. There is no dispute as to some 60 acres of land lying south of the river. In this case there is no evidence of fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the individual owners. They all acted in good faith and have had undisputed possession of the land for many years. Any error in the survey or the land patent was the responsibility of the Government. The landowners should not now be penalized for this error. They were entitled to place reliance upon the accuracy and integrity of a land patent issued by their Government. They could not do more.

Earlier in connection with similar legislation in the 91st Congress, that is S. 202, the U.S. Court of Claims decided that it would not be inappropriate or a mere gratuity for the United States to relinquish title to this land.

I fully agree with this decision and recommend enactment of H.R. 11449.

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.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2674) to remove a cloud on the title to certain lands located in the State of New Mexico, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2674

An act to remove a cloud on the title to certain lands located in the State of New Mexico

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with the opinion, findings of fact, and conclusions of the trial commissioner of the United States Court of Claims in Congressional Reference Case Numbered 4-69, Richard Grainger and Margaret N. Grainger, his wife; Patrick W. Hurley and Elois A. Hurley, his wife; Robert Kennaugh and Betty W. Kennaugh, his wife; John F. McGill and Phyllis McGill, his wife; Mrs. Mary J. (Leon) Pierce, a widow; and William Turbett and Cynthia A. Turbett, his wife, against the United States, filed September 18, 1971, the United States hereby disclaims any right, title, or interest in or to the following de-

scribed tract of land situated within the Carson National Forest, New Mexico, such tract of land being more particularly described as follows:

A tract of land containing 67.68 acres, more or less, beginning at corner numbered 1, which is located on the northerly line of the Antoine Leroux grant, as shown on official survey plat approved by the United States Surveyor General on August 25, 1909, whence corner numbered 69 of the Leroux grant survey bears south 79 degrees 45 minutes west, 20.14 chains;

thence north 79 degrees 45 minutes east, 6.06 chains (400 feet) to corner numbered 2, which is identical with the Leroux grant corner numbered 70 and located at the confluence of South Fork Canyon and the Rio Hondo;

thence north 61 degrees 30 minutes east, 4.20 chains (277.20 feet) continuing along the northerly line of the Leroux grant survey to corner numbered 4;

thence north 09 degrees 47 minutes east, 22.73 chains (1,500 feet) to corner numbered 5;

thence south 51 degrees 23 minutes west, 36.36 chains (2,400 feet) to corner numbered 6;

thence north 11 degrees 15 minutes west, 22.73 chains (1,500 feet) to corner numbered 1, the point of beginning.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to prepare and execute without consideration such instruments as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of subsection (a).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2674 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11449, as passed.

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. 11449) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and all other Members desiring to do so may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend his remarks on any of the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

FAMILY PLANNING AND POPULATION RESEARCH

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

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the legislative process is the means by which the people of the United States are assured their basic rights and freedoms, and I believe that one of the most fundamental freedoms of all mankind is the right to determine one's family size.

We have not always had this freedom in our country. In the early 1900's men and women were jailed for dispensing contraceptive information and devices by those who wished to impose their personal moral values on others. One such public moralist was Anthony Comstock, head of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice and author of the proposals, translated into law by the Congress in 1873, prohibiting the use of the U.S. mail for the transportation of contraceptive devices or information pertaining thereto.

These "Comstock laws" were repressive; they were passed during an era famous for its public dictation of standards for private personal conduct. Through the years as attitudes changed and concepts of individual freedoms were enlarged the courts steadily eroded the restrictions imposed by the law until they became almost meaningless. However, the threat of arrest or suit was ever present as long as the law remained on the books defining birth control information and articles for the prevention of conception as "obscene or immoral." I did not think that such laws, even though rendered ineffective by various judicial decisions, should be permanently inscribed in Federal statute law.

Therefore, one of the first bills that I introduced as a freshman Congressman in 1965 was for the repeal of the "Comstock Laws." It was from the background material that I amassed for this bill and the long months of trying to shepherd it through the various steps that a bill must follow after introduction, that I began to realize that the removal of the Comstock restrictions on contraception was merely a necessary first step. Comstock repeal was only a modest beginning toward real and meaningful progress in the field of family planning and, in the larger sense, in the area of personal freedom.

At this same time, as a freshman member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I was privileged to have the opportunity to work with the newly established Office of Economic Opportunity, an agency dedicated to the alleviation of poverty through service programs for low-income families and individuals in the United States. I found in my committee work, that time and again, OEO community representatives, and local program directors would voice their concern about the lack of support at the Federal level for the provision of family planning services. This was not a criticism of OEO; indeed, the demand for federally subsidized family planning services grew, at least in part, from the pioneering efforts of the agency under the direction of the first OEO Director Sargent Shriver. Indeed, OEO was the first Federal agency to support the provision of family planning services through the granting of \$8,000 to the

Corpus Christi, Tex., Community Action Agency in 1965.

However, progress was slow in meeting the increasing demand for family planning services. In 1966 OEO had funded only 14 family planning programs, concentrated in only 5 States. Part of this was due to the newness of both OEO as an agency and of the relative unavailability of resources for such programs. Agency officials had no idea how far they could go to support family planning services openly. They were apprehensive about the Congressional climate. In turn, we, in Congress, had no idea of the kind of opposition, or the kind of support, these programs might generate.

However, I rapidly became certain that both the need and the demand for subsidized family planning services far outweighed any other considerations. I was also made aware, during this period of time, that the few Federal programs, outside of OEO, for family planning services were fragmented, uncoordinated efforts. The highly significant Harkavy report on both the services and research efforts of the Federal Government was presented by me before former Senator Gruening's hearings on the population problems and crisis in 1967; I also testified at those hearings that the Congress would have to take steps to bring about any coordinated and significant change in programs; that OEO programs alone could not accomplish the job. Therefore, when in 1967 OEO officials testified that only \$2.5 million had been committed to services—approximately one-fourth of 1 percent of the total OEO budget—I decided to sponsor the establishment of family planning services as a national emphasis program through the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. As you know, this proposal became law, and as a result, OEO was able to launch a significant family planning services program.

The first major task of the OEO program was to gather information. Little was known of the characteristics of the potential patient population, except that they were poor. Little was known as to the facilities which might be able to provide the necessary services. OEO commissioned the development of a county-by-county study of the need for family planning services in the United States, which as far as I know, was unique in concept at that time and remains a milestone in the annals of American health care. This study was praiseworthy if only because it documented the need for subsidized services by more than 5 million women in the United States. However, the study did more than that. It gave to the health field and to the U.S. Congress a valuable model for the assessment of other health care needs in the future.

OEO later repeated this study in 1969 and a third such nationwide survey is currently underway under the supervision of HEW. These studies have enabled us to measure quite accurately the progress which we, as a nation, have been making in the provision of family planning services. It was evident, from the first study which documented the extent of the need that OEO available financial resources would not be adequate to the task and that other agencies, principally

HEW, would need to be involved in the support and delivery of services. It became evident, as well, that the new programs were experiencing a high degree of acceptance and positive support from local communities and enthusiastic response and utilization by poor patients everywhere.

The extent of the need for voluntary family planning services was recognized by the President in his message to the Congress which requested the establishment of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. I did not feel the establishment of the commission alone was sufficient to meet the needs at hand. I testified before the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives during hearings on the commission bill that although "a few legislative authorities already exist which support family planning programs, they are not sufficient to cover the recommendations of the President." The President had said, in his July 18, 1969, message to the Congress, that—

No American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition. I believe, therefore, that we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning services within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them, this we have the capacity to do.

Therefore, simply a call to further study by a commission, when the urgent and immediate need for services had already been abundantly documented and acknowledged by the White House, was just not acceptable to me or, as we were to discover later, to my fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I responded by introducing my bill H.R. 11550 on May 21, 1969; this bill had the stated purpose of promoting "the public health and welfare by expanding, improving and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal." I emarked on the effort to guide the bill through the maze of the legislative process, joined at first by only 40 of my colleagues; later we were joined by nearly 100 of our colleagues in sponsoring the family planning services and population research legislation.

The purpose of my bill was twofold. First it was designed to provide family planning services to those Americans who wanted them but could not afford them. Second, it was designed to benefit all the people in this country by supporting the development of new contraceptive methods. My bill proposed new authorization for a 5-year period, for family planning services and population research. These programs were to be administered through the creation of a new agency, the National Center for Population and Family Planning, also proposed by the bill. This new HEW agency would "supervise public information, program planning and development, manpower development and training, supervision of field services, reproductive physiology research, behavioral research and grants management for both research and services." The center was to have sole responsibility within HEW for the family planning services and population re-

search programs. It was to have a director and a deputy director and regional population and family planning advisers. It was also to perform certain advisory functions for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, including preparations of program plans and of legislative recommendations when needed.

The bill proposed the provision of comprehensive voluntary family planning services to "all persons desiring such services" through the following programs:

Special project grants for family planning services to be made by the center to public agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions to assist in the establishment and operation of voluntary family planning projects. This section authorized \$450 million over a 5-year period for these special project grants.

Formula grants for family planning public health services to be made by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to State health agencies to "assist the States in planning, establishing, maintaining, coordinating, and evaluating family planning services." The bill authorized \$70 million to be used for these grants to States, provided that the States had submitted and had approved by the Secretary, State plans for a coordinated and comprehensive program of family planning services.

Grants for the training of the necessary professional, nonprofessional, and new careers manpower required to fulfill the objectives of the services programs to be made by the national center to public and private agencies. The bill authorized \$20 million over a 5-year period for this program.

The bill also proposed a program of grants for population research; these grants were to be used in order "to promote research in the biochemical, contraceptive development, behavioral and program implementation fields related to population and family planning through grants by the national center to public agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions and contracts with groups, associations, institutions, and individuals or corporations for the conduct of such research." The bill proposed an authorization for this program of \$335 million.

In addition, the bill proposed a program of grants for the construction of population research centers and for the operation of such centers relating to research in human reproduction, sterility, contraception, effectiveness of service delivery, population trends, and other aspects of, or factors which affect, population dynamics. The bill provided an authorization of \$80 million for these purposes.

However, some of these programs I have described were either revised or deleted in order to reflect amendments from the various members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. For instance, the committee decided that, since HEW had little experience in providing family planning services on an extensive nationwide basis, the legislation should contain only a 3-year authorization so that the fledgling programs could be monitored closely and revisions and reforms introduced into the programs before any noneffective mechanisms could become institu-

tionalized. Therefore, instead of having operating authority until fiscal 1975, programs were to come up for renewal at the end of fiscal 1973.

The language creating a new national center for population and family planning was deleted on the basis of an HEW request for the chance to strengthen the administration of the family planning services programs and of the population research programs through normal administrative channels already extant rather than through new ones created by law. Finally, after the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment under the able leadership of Congressman PAUL ROGERS, assisted by the able members of the minority such as Representatives TIM LEE CARTER and ANCHER NELSEN had spent many long hours drafting an excellent report on the legislation and after the legislation had been refined by the full Commerce Committee led by Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS, the committee report was published; the bill was scheduled for a vote on November 16, 1970. This was nearly 18 months after I first introduced my bill.

I must admit that the cosponsors of the bill and I had not realized it at the time, but by introducing the legislation, we prompted a general discussion of the responsibility of the Federal Government for the provision of birth control services. This had not really been given serious consideration and full discussion by all the Members of the House of Representatives. My 1967 amendment to the OEO bill had been an attempt to reveal the plight of poor men and women everywhere who must face the possibility of indeed, the probability, of supporting ever increasing families on limited incomes with no knowledge of methods or hope for help in controlling their own fertility. However, it had been but a little known, minor amendment to a large and controversial bill. The entire House of Representatives had, therefore, to become aware of the issue, be provided the facts, consider the responsibility of the Federal Government in this area, and be persuaded that the proposals under consideration were in fact the best vehicle for the delivery of services.

In view of the size of the task, I have always believed that the House Commerce Committee is to be commended for the excellent and timely handling of the legislation. Without the good efforts of its chairman, Representative STAGGERS, the subcommittee chairman, Representative PAUL ROGERS, and its members, success would not have been ours. I believed all along that my colleagues here in the House, with their basic respect for the freedom and dignity of men and women, would support passage of the legislation. What I could not know was the overwhelming extent of support. The vote on this bill convinced me once again that serving the public alongside colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives is the most privileged honor any man can be given in this country. More than 298 Members of this esteemed body voted with me on that day and only 32 Members went on record in opposition. By December of 1970, the bill had become law.

The act, wisely I believe, called for the

submission by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a 5-year plan for the provision of family planning services and population research within 6 months of the enactment of the legislation. To my knowledge, this was the first time that an administrative agency had been asked to explain in great detail to the Congress how Federal resources would be used to benefit the health of the American public.

There were many delays in the drafting of this plan. It was not presented to the Congress until October of 1971, a delay of nearly 4 months beyond the statutory requirement. This delay in submission was accompanied by a delay in funding. The first funds to be used for special project grants for family planning services authorized by the new law were not requested in time to be included in the regular appropriation for HEW for fiscal 1971. Instead, only a small amount—\$6 million—was requested in a supplemental passed in June 1971. It was not until passage of the fiscal 1972 appropriations which contained an amount of \$48 million in new funds for special project grants under the law that the program was finally able to get underway. This was nearly a full year after passage. As a result, the program has not been established, maintained, and strengthened with the orderly phasing in of services as set forth in the 5-year plan.

For instance, the HEW 5-year plan had recommended that the budget for the HEW National Center for Family Planning Services be set at \$35 million in fiscal year 1971; instead, as I have pointed out, it was only \$6 million. Then, based on having had the larger amount available in fiscal year 1971, the 5-year plan proceeded to recommend levels of \$82 million in fiscal year 1972 and \$133 million in fiscal year 1973. Funding for the OEO program of family planning services was to remain at about \$24 million each fiscal year.

On the strength of these amounts being appropriated and used for the program, HEW estimated the number of patients to be served at 2.9 million women in fiscal year 1971, 3.8 million women in fiscal year 1972, and 4.7 million women in fiscal year 1973, thereby reaching in steady progressions the targeted number of women—6.6 million—by fiscal year 1975.

Reality, in terms of appropriations and the commensurate number of patients served, paints quite a different picture. "The Progress Report on the 5-year plan" of the National Center for Family Planning Services reported:

There will be almost 300 projects funded by the end of FY 72. They are estimated as being able to provide services for about 1.5 million individuals.

Therefore, the programs of the National Center for Family Planning Services actually provided services to about one-half of the number of patients estimated by the 5-year plan. The same holds true for fiscal year 1972. It is too early to tell what the revised patient enrollment will be for fiscal year 1973.

Funding also has not progressed according to the 5-year plan as might be deduced from the patient load figures.

The OEO program has steadily declined to about \$13 million this fiscal year. The administrative responsibility for "mature" OEO family planning services projects—those more than 2 to 3 years old—has been transferred to HEW without a commensurate transfer in funds from OEO.

Therefore, the funds of the National Center for Family Planning Services have been used to continue support for old family planning services projects instead of being used to help establish new ones reaching new patients. In fiscal year 1973, it is estimated that only about \$81 million in new funds will be available for the extension of family planning services programs; this is \$50 million less than the \$133 million recommended in the 5-year plan. The 5-year plan had pointed out:

The development of the service capacity depends upon the substantial expansion of service programs across the country, and by all providers of health care: hospitals, health departments, voluntary agencies, and private physicians . . . Development of service capacity over the next few years must emphasize availability in smaller cities and non-metropolitan areas in order to correct the current imbalance in the distribution of services which are concentrated in large metropolitan areas.

However, the lack of available financial resources has greatly slowed the development of the service capacity. The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, on which I served as one of the two members of the Commission from the U.S. House of Representatives, reported the following in March 1972, concerning family planning services programs:

With a relatively modest federal investment, organized family planning programs have succeeded in introducing modern family planning services to nearly 40 percent of low-income persons in need. The majority of those in need remained unserved, however, and the number of hospitals, health departments, and voluntary agencies not providing services remains substantial. No organized services have been reported in half of all counties in the country . . . The five-year plan, prepared in accordance with P.L. 91-572, makes clear that the delivery of services to those who need and want them is feasible and within the capabilities of our existing health system. The achievement of this objective will clearly require additional federal authorizations and appropriations . . .

As a result, the delivery of family planning services to all those who are in need of them cannot possibly be accomplished by 1975. Programs will have to be extended and funding increased for at least 3 years beyond that date if the programs are ever to accomplish their established goals.

Sole blame for the failure of services delivery to measure up to the 5-year plan cannot be placed on just delayed and insufficient funding. In a recent report prepared by the House Republican Task Force on Population Growth and Ecology, Subcommittee on Population Growth chaired by Representative PIERRE DU PONT, the following observations were made about the administration by HEW of the family planning services programs:

To strengthen the direction and administration of the program, the HEW Deputy As-

sistant Secretary for Population Affairs was given line authority, through the HEW Office of Population Affairs, for the Health Services and Mental Health Administration (HSMHA) family planning services program, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) population research program . . . The administrators of the services and research programs, therefore, have dual line responsibilities—one to the Deputy Assistant Secretary and one either to the NIH Director or to the HSMHA Director. This new authority was to be exercised through the appointments of an Assistant Administrator of HSMHA for Family Planning Services and an Assistant Director of NIH for Population Research, both of whom would serve as special assistants to the Deputy Assistant Secretary. However, to date neither of these appointments has been made nor has adequate staff for the Office of Population Affairs been hired to enable the Deputy Assistant Secretary to carry out the duties mandated by the legislation. This creates a less than clear administrative organization, poor program stability, and inadequate coordination and liaison. It results in insufficient and fluctuating staff levels in both services and research which can contribute to lack of continuity in these programs.

This confusion of administrative authorities, described by Senator BOB PACKWOOD, at the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee hearings, as HEW's "Rube Goldberg" arrangement, does not further the progress of either the family planning services or the population research programs. When the legislation was under consideration HEW officials conceded the need for more coordination and more accountability with respect to family planning services and population research programs. However, in a letter from HEW to Senator EAGLETON, who chaired the Senate hearings on the bill, HEW argued against consolidating both services and research in a single agency on the grounds that such a consolidation would take too much time, estimated by HEW later as about an 18-month delay. Instead, the Department proposed that the coordinating and administrative focus for these activities be housed in the Office of Population Affairs through the two special assistants mentioned previously. In addition, all budget items for population activities were to be assembled as a special category within HEW's budget presentation and were to be defended separately by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for population affairs. Finally, the staffing of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs was to be strengthened considerably. The Congress ultimately accepted this substitute legislative proposal by HEW on the grounds that it would avoid the 18-month delay during reorganization, though some of the bill's sponsors in both the House and the Senate doubted the practicality of this rather unique administrative arrangement.

Unfortunately our doubts proved well founded. The administrative arrangements were characterized at the Senate hearings by the Deputy Assistant Secretary as "rather awkward." Although the Deputy Assistant Secretary reported that he had no difficulty in exercising the authority given to him under the law he conceded that "we have made it work because both Dr. Marston, Director of NIH, and Dr. Wilson, Administrator of HSMHA, have a feeling that I will work

reasonably with them and not contravene their authority." It is certainly questionable whether, even under ideal circumstances, this type of dual authority and dual reporting, could be made to work since the directors of the services and research programs are more likely to respond to their respective agency heads who control their budget and their progress up the bureaucratic ladder than to an isolated office that contains little more than theoretical policymaking authority. This was made clear when the Deputy Assistant Secretary before the Senate hearings repeatedly stated that he was unable to speak for the administration on the critical policy issues raised by the 5-year plan. Furthermore, the arrangement never received a full test of workability since the two special assistants—one for NIH and one for HSMHA—were never appointed. Apparently the "normal administrative channels" which HEW sought to use are so hopelessly snarled that programs can only be weakened by the internecine battles of bureaucrats. Thus, the promise of stronger and better administration was never kept. I have been deeply concerned by HEW's failure to fulfill the assurances given to the Congress nearly 2 years ago. The Department clearly affords family planning services and population research too low a priority, a priority that simply will not enable it to receive the coordinated, unified, central direction, and impetus that the Congress intended. Continuation of this administrative morass involving several branches of HEW can only lead to confusion and division which is hardly conducive to obtaining an appropriate level of appropriations or to maintaining the high and effective profile which is urgently needed.

Problems with administration, have served to hamper the progress of the Center for Population Research program of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, authorized by the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act. In the report of the House Republican Task Force on Population Growth and Ecology, which I referred to previously, the following comments on the administration of the Center for Population Research were made:

The lack of clear, high-ranking bureaucratic lines on matters such as the determination of budget leaves population research in a very tenuous position, for what is everybody's business is usually nobody's business. Another example of the effects of low funding levels and lack of status of the agency is the difficulty of recruiting and securing personnel. As a result, the federal population research program for development of new contraceptives has been without a director for over six months. Furthermore, the instability and lack of status associated with such research has made it seem less attractive.

Additionally, the programs of the Center for Population Research suffer not only from the administrative problem described, compounded not only by the necessity of having not one but three "bosses," but also from the spillover effect of these problems on funding. No administrator responsible solely for population research is able to have final say in the budgetary process. Because the Center for Population Research coordi-

nates only one out of the five research program areas currently being explored by NICHD, the Director of the Population Research program has very little to say with respect to his funding levels. Indeed, the extent of his involvement is usually the formulation of suggested levels for program operations. These suggestions are submitted to the Director of NICHD. He then determines which budget levels to use and forward them to the NIH Director. The final decisions for the program are then formulated by the Director of NIH and his budget people. Since there is no direct line of responsibility between the Director of NIH and the Director of Population Research programs, no special advocate of population research is able to plead the case for their programs. As I pointed out earlier, the Director of the Center for Population Research does report directly to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs. However, since both policy and budget requests for the population research programs are monitored and determined by the Director of NIH, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs cannot be expected to play a really significant role in the overall formulation of the budget for NIH. Furthermore, when the budget of the United States is published, it does not contain any specific reference to a funding level for population research within the NIH/NICHD discussion. Reliable data on expenditures for any year are difficult to ascertain from any of the available public documents, and may vary a great deal. Proposed budget levels and justifications for population research are also generally discussed as estimates, even by the Center for Population Research, and consequently must be accepted on good faith by the public, including those of us in Congress who are involved and concerned, until published with broad agency justifications by the House Appropriations Committee, usually 6 full months after the President's budget appears.

In addition, the submerging of the population research program within NICHD must always lead to restrictive budgeting since any agency normally seeks to maintain equity among the programs falling under its administration. As a result, the population research program probably cannot continue to grow on its own without some commensurate growth in the other institute programs. The \$44 million budget request for this fiscal year for population research is already some \$30-plus million below the amount recommended by HEW in its first 5-year plan for population research. It is almost \$50 million below the amounts recommended by the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The long-range effect of all the administrative mish-mash, and inadequate funding associated with population research, on family planning services programs is extremely serious. Because of these deficiencies in administration and in funding, and because of the lack of priority assigned to both the family planning services and population research programs by HEW, I am introducing today legislation which proposes along with the renewal and expansion

of the programs authorized by the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970, the formation of a new agency within HEW built on the model of National Institute of Mental Health for the administration of these two significant programs. Under my bill, all family planning and population research programs in HEW could be brought together in a single unit directly under the Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs on the same level as the FDA, NIH, and HSMHA. My bill would, therefore, combine policymaking authority and control over day-to-day operations for both research and services in the hands of a single administrator placed near the top of the HEW organizational chart. This is in keeping with the recommendations of President Nixon who stated, in proposing his plans for Government reorganization:

How the Government is put together often determines how well the Government can do its job. Our Founding Fathers understood this fact—and thus gave detailed attention to the most precise structural questions. . . . Good men and good money can be wasted on bad mechanisms. By giving those mechanisms a thorough overhaul, we can help to restore the confidence of the people in the capacities of their government.

The reorganization I propose in my bill would accomplish the following two major objectives:

First, it would provide family planning services and population research programs with a better administrative position from which to command the necessary resources.

Second, and more importantly, a single agency headed by a director with line authority over both services and research programs would be able to coordinate these programs so that both research and services were directed efficiently toward common goals.

To me, the second objective is the more important because I believe that the future of family planning services in this country and, indeed, throughout the entire world, depends upon the ability of the population research program to produce a safer, less expensive, more convenient, easier-to-use, more effective contraceptive. This was also a stated goal of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. As a former Commission member, I know that research and services designed to help people in this country escape involuntary pregnancy was fully supported by the Commission. Indeed, some of the proposals contained in my bill are based on the recommendations of the Commission to strengthen family planning services and population research. John D. Rockefeller 3d, distinguished chairman of the Commission, in his letter of transmittal to the President and to the Congress described all the recommendations in the following manner:

The recommendations offered by this Commission are directed towards increasing public knowledge of the causes and consequences of population change, facilitating and guiding the processes of population movement, maximizing information about human reproduction and its consequences for the family, and enabling individuals to avoid unwanted fertility.

But, as the Commission noted, family planning services programs cannot ade-

quately meet the voluntary fertility control needs of all the people in the United States, and of people all over the world, unless new contraceptives are developed. We know that present family planning services programs expend a great deal—estimated to be about one-third of project resources—for education and follow-up to help people understand how and when to use the various family planning methods; one-third of all the funds. In programs in areas where the people have had little or no formal schooling, the proportion of funds that must be expended for education is even greater, sometimes close to 50 percent. And there are other problems associated with present modern methods of contraception. Initially, world health leaders praised the oral contraceptive and the intrauterine device—IUD—as the answer to all the family planning services problems. And no mistake about it, these two methods represent revolutionary breakthroughs for the field of family planning services.

However, there are increasing indications that we cannot rest on our accomplishments and ignore the need for developing better methods of fertility technology. The oral contraceptive is an expensive method to dispense through a service program. It requires, besides continuous medication, periodic medical examinations, and monitoring. Furthermore, approximately 10 to 15 contraindications and possible side-effects are associated with the oral contraceptive, some of which, such as thromboembolism, may be very serious. For all these reasons, it has been found that 36 to 58 percent of women who begin using the pill discontinue use within 18 months or must shift to another method.

The IUD also has problems associated with it. The problems include inability to tolerate the device and excessive vaginal bleeding. Altogether, 20 to 30 percent of the users abandon the IUD after 18 months of use.

All of these factors signal the need of a new breakthrough in contraceptive technology. Yet it has been 16 years since the last major breakthrough occurred. The Population Commission recommended that \$200 million be utilized annually for basic and applied contraceptive research and that the Federal Government provide the major portion of these funds. The Commission also recommended that these funds be used not only for the development of new fertility technology but also that they be used for the establishment of university-based population research centers where experts from all related fields, including demography and social science as well as reproductive biology, could work on a multidisciplinary basis to develop the most effective plans to deliver the new methods of fertility control their technology would produce.

Furthermore, the creation of university-based research centers subsidized by the Federal Government would give the field the opportunity to attract and train a sufficient number of researchers so urgently needed. The HEW 5-year plan pointed out that, at present, population research programs are often the stepchildren of Ob-Gyn. departments of medical schools. There they are submerged just as the Center for Population

Research of NICHD is submerged. As I have pointed out, this lack of visibility and status leads to low budgets and uncertain continuity and makes it difficult to attract the trained researchers of the caliber needed for success in the field. We need at least 10 to 15 major population research centers in this country training at least 400 to 600 researchers annually if we are to begin to make progress in the field. The Government program at present supports only six for a total of less than \$3 million; only about 200 researchers are trained per year under the Center for Population Research program.

In order to support these expanded research efforts and to fulfill the commitment of the HEW 5-year plan the legislation introduced by me today calls for an expenditure of \$1.8 billion for family planning services over a 5-year period and of \$963 million for population research. Authorizations for the two programs are based on the best estimates of both HEW officialdom—employed in the development of their 5-year plan—and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. This legislation will assure services to all those desiring them but unable to afford them and a concentration of funds for programs to develop new fertility control technology.

The legislation also establishes a new agency in HEW; it further directs that the programs of the existing National Center for Family Planning Services be removed from under the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, where its program director has no voice in the determination of policy and budgetary priorities, and be placed under the aegis of the new agency. This would avoid the administrative confusion discussed earlier, and would allow the Director of HEW Family Planning Services programs to act as an advocate in the highest councils of HEW.

The legislation also proposes the removal of the population research programs for NICHD and the formation of a new Institute for Population Sciences to be administered also by the new agency. This proposal has the endorsement of many experts in the field. It was first discussed and included in H.R. 11550, my original bill. I had included language for such a reorganization on the basis of the recommendations of the report of the Committee on Population and Family Planning of President Johnson which called for a strengthening of the Office of Population Affairs and the formation of a National Institute for Population Research as well as increased and expanded family planning services.

Later, a panel under the chairmanship of Assistant Secretary Roger Egeberg also urged that the population research be freed from the bondage of obscurity afforded it in NICHD. Therefore, when I propose the formation of this new agency, composed of the National Center for Family Planning Services and the National Institute for Population Sciences, I do not think it a radical idea, but one that has been sufficiently debated and discussed; its time has come. It goes parallel to the proposal for renewal and expansion of family planning

services programs now serving about 3 million American women and endorsed by both the major American political parties in their platforms for the Presidential campaign this year:

DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM

Family planning services, including the education, comprehensive medical and social services necessary to permit individuals freely to determine and achieve the number and spacing of their children, should be available to all, regardless of sex, age, marital status, economic group or ethnic origin, and should be administered in a non-coercive and nondiscriminatory manner.

REPUBLICAN PARTY PLATFORM

Since 1969, we have increased the Federal support for family planning threefold. We will continue to support expanded family planning programs and will foster research in this area so that more parents will be better able to plan the number and spacing of their children should they wish to do so. Under no circumstances will we allow any of these programs to become compulsory or infringe upon the religious conviction or personal freedom of any individual.

We have traveled a long way since 1965 when I introduced my first bill for Comstock repeal. We have progressed a little further down the road toward assurance to every man and woman of their basic right to freely determine their own family size. The task is not finished, however. There are still nearly 42 million American women, and as many men, in need of improved methods of contraception in this country alone. Nearly 4 million women have not yet received the subsidized family planning services they want and need. Regrettably, endorsements in political platforms cannot be immediately converted into budgets, personnel and programs in the field servicing people. But they do signify an endorsement by the great American people of the ideal of individual freedoms and of responsibility to assure through the processes of a democratic government.

The legislation I introduce today represents a pledge to the people of the United States to continue together our joint congressional efforts on their behalf to see that they have the opportunity to freely determine their own family size. We must promise to carry on the campaign for services and research until we believe that job is done.

Until then, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join together in pledging support for these programs. I ask that we join together in affirming the right of all men and women to be free from involuntary fertility and to gain the knowledge and the means by which they may truly exercise the right to choose whether or not to bear or forgo children. Until we have secured this right for the people of this Nation, and indeed for all mankind, we cannot consider the men and women of the world to be truly free.

THE WATERGATE CAPER

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, we have heard a great deal of lamenting and beating of

the breast concerning the orders of both Judges Richey and Sirica designed to protect the right to a fair trial of the individuals who have been indicted as a result of what has become known as the "Watergate Caper."

It has become rather intriguing to me that the number of persons who have prided themselves in the past on being great civil libertarians are now willing to sacrifice the civil liberties of persons accused of crime on the alter of political expediency.

It seems that in a political year the principles of Larry O'Brien are of more concern to some of my colleagues than rights established under the Constitution of our country and decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and lesser courts.

It has apparently escaped the attention of many of my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, whose tearful laments most loudly echo in the Halls of Congress, that a leading Democratic spokesman, namely the senior Senator from Massachusetts, has himself expressed a reluctance to investigate the matter until after the criminal proceedings have been terminated. I will take this occasion to insert in the RECORD an Associated Press wire service report dated September 30.

In this news report, which notably has escaped the attention of Washington's leading newspapers, the Senior Senator disavowed any plans to hold hearings because of the possible compromise of the criminal prosecution now pending. The wire service report follows:

NEWARK, DEL.

Senator Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., one of the few Senators who could conduct a congressional probe of the Watergate Affair, said Saturday he does not plan to hold hearings at this time on the Watergate Affair.

Kennedy is one of the few Senators in a position to hold such hearings due to his position as a subcommittee chairman.

Said the Massachusetts Senator—in his words—"the administrative practices subcommittee would be interested in seeing if any bugging law would have been violated. We are reviewing the material that has been collected primarily in the media and if we thought we could turn up new material, we would conduct our own probe."

The Senator stressed there are no plans at present to hold open hearings because of the criminal prosecution pending in the case.

Added Kennedy—again in his words—"this is a criminal indictment and we must be sensitive to the fact that any adverse publicity might impinge on a fair trial."

HON. PRESCOTT SHELDON BUSH

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. McKinney) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McKinney. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Connecticut where this morning I attended the funeral of former U.S. Senator, Prescott Sheldon Bush. I am sure that all the Members of the House join me in mourning the loss of this great American. As you know, Mr. Speaker, "Pres" Bush served his beloved State of Connecticut and his Nation in the other body from 1952 to 1963.

Those dates, however, do not reflect either the beginning of his life in the service of the people nor do they mark

the end. Mr. Bush first came to public office in 1933 when he was elected to the Greenwich, Conn., Republican Town Meeting. His obvious talents were soon recognized and 2 years later he was named moderator of the RTM, a post to which he was unanimously reelected for the next 17 years.

On completion of his Senate term he "retired"—and I use the word advisedly. Mr. Speaker—from the realm of elective office. He did not, however, retire from his dedication to work for what he felt was best for his Nation.

For the past 2 years I have had the honor to serve the congressional district in which he resided. During that time, I heard from Pres Bush regularly—by mail and by phone—and never was there a time when his comments were not incisive and thoughtful and his judgment sound.

As a nationally recognized expert in the fields of housing and finance, you can well understand, Mr. Speaker, what a great help he was to me as a Member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. His willingness to offer his expertise, however, was not limited to Congressmen and I am sure there are many who could offer corroborating testimonials today. Certainly, it has been noted in the past few days that he was a confidante of the late President Eisenhower. I can add that he also offered his assistance to a freshman member of the Connecticut State House of Representatives—me. In 1967, when I was first elected to public office, I heard from Pres Bush offering encouragement, advice, and as always, "What is best for the people."

I think the point is clear, Mr. Speaker: Pres Bush ignored titles and social standing when he felt he could help; the question never was "Who is in need?" The fact was a need existed and Pres Bush was there.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, he lived for most of his life in Greenwich—a community which is probably one of the most affluent in the Northeast. Some would expect that with that type of background he would be a monetary affairs expert and the assumption would be correct. However, his greatest achievements came in the areas of housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal. Again, Mr. Speaker, Pres Bush saw a need and he was there.

The story of his life is one of "doing—doing for others" and I could go on and on recounting a long list of accomplishments. However, there is only one accomplishment in life with true meaning and that is the understanding and love of one's fellow man. There is little doubt that Pres Bush accomplished that. Mr. Speaker, we have not only lost a great statesman; we have lost a wonderful human being.

ANY CHANCE FOR CLEAN DRINKING WATER?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1970, I introduced the Pure Drinking Water Act—

this being in the 91st Congress. Since that time, three sets of hearings on safe drinking water legislation have been completed. The House Public Health and Environmental Subcommittee discussed the Pure Drinking Water Act and related legislation in May 1971, and again in June 1972; the Environment Subcommittee of the other body met on the same proposal in March 1972.

Although the other body sometimes justifies its dilatory habits as part of the "careful deliberation" necessary to protect the Republic against ill-considered legislation, the Pure Drinking Water Act seems to suffer from too-careful deliberation in the House. This musing comes at a time of considerable public interest in the safety of drinking and bottled water, and in the wake of a number of reports and news articles which shed serious doubt over the adequacy of present drinking water safeguards against waterborne diseases.

On the basis of the same testimony which has twice been presented to the House, the other body has passed its bill, the Safe Drinking Water Act, while advocates of the House measure prepare to draft new statements, write more letters and appear at yet another set of hearings during the 93d Congress before this bill can be adopted.

If this is the only way to get enactment of this measure, I am willing to start over again—the same can be said, I am sure, for many other of my colleagues who support this proposal. But we do not have to duplicate what has already been done. S. 3994 is already in our hands and can be considered at any time during these late days of the session.

Today's Washington Post includes an editorial titled, "Any Chance for Clean Drinking Water?" which I will insert in the RECORD for my colleagues. By answering this question, the 92d Congress can consolidate its environmental record. We have already passed the strongest, best funded water pollution legislation ever. What we did for the Nation's navigable waters we must now do for the household tap by passing the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all of my colleagues to help us move to quick consideration of S. 3994, the Safe Drinking Water Act.

The editorial follows:

ANY CHANCE FOR CLEAN DRINKING WATER?

There has been no lack of attention given to the nation's polluted water, and hardly anyone doesn't have personal experience of a filthy river, lake or stream. It is often surprising, however, to notice how few citizens think twice about another body of water that is endangered: their own drinking water. In recent hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on the Environment, Dr. J. H. Lehr of the National Well Water Association noted the potential hazards: "Overconfidence or apathy seems to pervade the public's attitude with respect to drinking water. Common daily experience plus a current myth about the future falsely implies that the quality, safety and adequacy of our municipal water supply systems are above reproach. Perhaps the myth can be stated as follows—"Everyone knows we have launched a massive water-pollution-control effort and that waterborne disease outbreaks are a thing of the past. This statement is simply not true . . ."

Alerted to the dangers, the Senate has passed the Safe Drinking Water Act. Similar legislation has been in the House, but it is not certain that action will be taken in time for the proposal to become law. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have an opportunity in the next few days to get the bill to the floor for a vote. The legislation passed the Senate with little difficulty, meaning that the issue in the House is not the bill itself but whether or not it will get out of committee.

The need for national drinking water standards is shown by several alarming events. Last July, a public health official in Boston reported an unhealthy amount of lead may be getting into that city's drinking water. Between 1961 and 1970, there were at least 128 known outbreaks of disease or poisoning attributed to drinking water. An official of the Environmental Protection Agency has reported that some 8 million Americans drink water that is potentially dangerous because it does not meet federal mandatory standards.

Other reports, all ominous, keep appearing. Unless the House joins the Senate to assure the public that its drinking water is safe, many unsuspecting citizens will continue to quench their thirst with water containing several types of chemicals, bacteria, viruses, toxic metals and other contaminants.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ANTI-HIJACKING ACT OF 1972, H.R. 16191

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the recently passed H.R. 16191, the Anti-Hijacking Act of 1972.

I was unfortunately detained by previous commitments and was unable to vote on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present, my vote would have been an unequivocal yea, for the passage of this legislation. This bill is of vital importance if we are to rid the sky of this awesome menace that has plagued us. This has brought not only hazard to and loss of property, but most of all hazard to and loss of life, and torment to the families of those who are attacked.

One has only to look at the hijacking statistics to see the abrupt increase of 1972 over 1971 hijacking figures. The total number for 1971 was 59 hijackings, domestic and foreign. The total, as of August 31, 1972, was 50 incidents, with a third of the year remaining. What is more alarming is the increase in the U.S. figures; in the 8 months January through August 1972 there were two hijackings more than in the whole of 1971.

H.R. 16191, puts teeth into the Hague Convention, in dealing with criminal acts aboard aircrafts. This bill would establish jurisdiction over hijackings, requiring the release of hijackers for prosecution, or legal action by the country which has the hijackers in custody. The Anti-Hijacking Act of 1972, in addition, authorizes the President to take remedial action against countries that fail to abide by the terms set forth by the Hague Treaty. It calls for suspending air service to foreign countries that encourage hijackings. It empowers the Secretary of Transportation, to restrict or cancel operating authority of airlines whose gov-

ernments do not apply the security measures set forth by the Hague Treaty.

We cannot afford to lose another life. We must not be terrorized by political fanatics, by mentally disturbed individuals who use violence to accomplish their purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the Anti-Hijacking Act of 1972, stands paramount at this point in time. I call on my colleagues in the House and Senate conference committee, to iron out their differences as expeditiously as possible, enabling the Anti-Hijacking Act of 1972, to take effect as a major deterrent against hijacking in the air.

DAVE JENKINS

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, as a rule, there are mixed feelings when a talented and capable individual leaves the service of the Federal Government. In this case that person is Dave Jenkins who recently resigned as Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior for Congressional Liaison. Dave joined the Interior Department after serving 2 years as my administrative and legislative assistant. His assistance to me particularly on matters that pertain to my work on the Judiciary Committee was excellent. He is a very diligent, industrious, and extremely hard-working individual and I would like to go on record as wishing Dave every success in his new position as assistant director of governmental relations for the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. I am sure his fine record of achievement will continue.

CONGRESSMAN RODINO'S MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE 92D CONGRESS, OCTOBER 10, 1972

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as in the past I feel it incumbent upon me to report to my constituents on my most important legislative activities in this Congress. In January 1971 I became chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, which in addition to these matters is responsible for other important legislation.

The House has passed several of my bills to eliminate inequities and relieve unintended hardships and suffering for many people. These are: Allowing citizens of countries such as Ireland and Italy to compete fairly with other nations for visas; changing the age for children's citizenship from 16 to 18; and waiving the language requirements for persons over 50 with 20 years residence. Action is expected this week on my bills to permit early citizenship of parents of servicemen slain in wars and hostilities and to reduce to 2 years the U.S. residence requirement for children born abroad of parents one of whom is an alien.

For almost 2 years my subcommittee

investigated the major problem of illegal aliens, during which we held hearings throughout the country. We discovered that there may be as many as 2 million aliens illegally here, working at jobs needed by jobless citizens or legal aliens, and even in some cases receiving Federal job training and welfare payments. My subcommittee developed a bill to deal with the problem realistically and fairly, and it recently passed the House.

Another very vital bill my subcommittee developed has been approved by the full Judiciary Committee, and I am hopeful of House passage. It provides a \$50,000 death gratuity to the survivors of public safety officers who die in the line of duty. It is long overdue to properly protect the families of public safety officers and to recognize the sacrifices and suffering they have endured in the public interest.

Drug abuse has been for years a priority issue to me. After long efforts, my amendment to authorize the President to cut off foreign aid to any country that does not cooperate with the United States in combating illegal drug production and traffic became law in early 1971. It is already producing results. The recent extradition by Paraguay of Auguste Ricard, a notorious, convicted drug smuggler, was accomplished finally when the President threatened to use his power under my amendment to cut off aid to that nation. I am also continuing strenuously my efforts to obtain an effective rehabilitation program for drug addicts. I have urged the Judiciary Subcommittee to take immediate action on my bill to provide direct emergency aid to local governments to fight narcotics addiction. A massive treatment program is urgently needed to treat addicts convicted of crime or those seeking treatment so they will not be forced again to lead a life of crime to feed their insidious drug habit.

In previous Congresses I was one of the authors of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and the bill creating the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Yet despite the laws and funds approved by Congress, lack of effective Federal commitment over the past 4 years has resulted in new record highs for every single category of major crime.

Finally, we have achieved some action indicating positive concern in the 10th District, with Newark's designation as one of eight special high-impact crime areas. Under this program Newark will receive \$20 million over a 5-year period to fight crime. A similar \$20 million special drug abuse law enforcement program has been approved for the Newark area. These special programs, combined with my drug rehabilitation legislation, should help greatly in the uphill fight against drug abuse which is so closely related to our high crime rates.

Unemployment is beyond any doubt a grave crisis for the Nation, for the September figure just released places the rate at 5.5 percent. Clearly, the President's new economic policy is having little effect on unemployment and the inflation that continues to erode the income of all citizens. Food and housing costs continue to soar, and while Congress has extended unemployment com-

pensation benefits, this is merely stop-gap action.

My primary answer to our tragic unemployment problem is my Jobs Now program to create public service jobs not only to put people to work at once, but also to provide essential public services for our communities in the areas of education, health, urban renewal, law enforcement, environmental control, transportation, and recreation.

The revenue-sharing bill, of which I was an original sponsor, will also bring some urgently needed funds into the 10th District: Newark would receive \$8,437,328; East Orange \$993,593; Glen Ridge \$41,305; and Harrison \$260,588. It contains provisions to prevent duplication and to assure that the funds will be used for new activities, and not simply to release funds spent on present programs.

Another of my major concerns in this Congress has been the development and proper funding of essential health programs. The American people are certainly aware they are not receiving the kind of health care they should expect, and that they are paying too much for what they do receive. I have sponsored a comprehensive health security program, and I am heartened by indications that it will receive early consideration in the next session. I have also supported long needed measures to combat specific diseases and some of these bills have already become law. These are my bills to launch an all-out attack on diseases of the heart and blood vessels and lungs; the sickle cell anemia bill to establish programs for detection and prevention of this blood disease that primarily affects black citizens; and my bill to authorize a similar program for Cooley's anemia, which primarily attacks citizens of Italian and Greek descent.

Still awaiting action, however, is legislation to create a national blood bank program to assure a supply of clean, healthy blood, to provide expanded aid for kidney disease victims; to begin a massive program to combat the epidemic spread of venereal disease; to provide adequate funds for our TB control program; and a bill to authorize use of our maximum resources to find the cause and how to prevent the tragic sudden infant death syndrome—the so-called crib death.

All Americans are consumers, so many measures I have already mentioned would fall into this category. However, I must single out one bill I sponsored that, unfortunately, appears to have no possible chance for enactment this session. This bill, the Consumer Protection Agency Act, passed the House, though in a weaker form than I favored. A continuing filibuster in the Senate appears to spell its defeat in this Congress. The effort to pass such an urgently needed bill will certainly be renewed in the next Congress, and I fully expect to be in the forefront of this fight.

These brief comments are, necessarily, only highlights of my legislative activities and it is impossible in this short statement to list many other measures I actively sponsored and supported, such as the 20 percent social security increase and the raise in veterans' compensation

rates. Also space will not permit me to comment properly on such vital measures as the housing bill, the water quality bill, education legislation, and other legislation essential to improve the quality of life for all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, my efforts in all these areas will not cease, and I hope later to have the opportunity to inform my constituents of the general record of the 92d Congress and my role in its accomplishments.

THE U.S. ENERGY CRISIS, WHY?

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard an excellent address presented by Judge Jim C. Langdon, a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas, before the 44th annual meeting of the New Mexico Oil and Gas Association in Albuquerque, N. Mex. Mr. Langdon spoke of our energy crisis. Because of the extreme importance of this topic, I include Mr. Langdon's address in its entirety in the RECORD as follows:

THE U.S. ENERGY CRISIS, WHY?

America's current energy crisis didn't begin yesterday, last month, or even last year. Its origins extend back at least ten years and perhaps as long as fifteen to twenty years ago.

Answers to some of the problems of today and tomorrow may be found in the past. Let's look back to the period during and immediately following World War II. How can we account for the tremendous growth of the Oil and Gas Industry? All the necessary incentives were present . . . an expanding United States economy, a strong demand for more and more crude oil; and, most important of all, a favorable political and economic climate for the oil industry itself.

With ample investment (high risk) capital available, an army of oil field workers was recruited. Tens of thousands of exploratory wells were drilled of which number only about one in nine were commercially successful, although about one in five encountered some oil or gas.

Studies conducted in Texas for the period 1966 to date show that exploratory drilling must be relied upon if we are to fill the widening gap between anticipated demand and the determined ability of Texas wells to produce. From this study, it has been concluded that each exploratory well drilled, whether successful or not, added 34 barrels daily or 12,410 barrels annually to our producing capacity. The figure, of course, is an average based on the total number of exploratory wells drilled and new production experienced in Texas since 1966. In the 1930's the oil industry found 275 barrels of oil for each foot of exploratory wells drilled. In recent years that figure has fallen to 35 barrels. There is not much comfort in such figures, but they do provide a yardstick to measure the effort we must make if we are to meet the anticipated petroleum demands of the future.

Although the exploratory effort following World War II was directed primarily to the discovery of new oil reserves a great many new gas fields were discovered in the process, together with a vast amount of additional associated gas in the oil wells. Since there was little, or no market, for the gas, many operators were glad to dispose of it for whatever price they could obtain. Tremendous gas reserves were purchased at prices far below the reasonable cost of finding and replacing

such gas reserves. It was looked upon as some form of a windfall or bonus by both the seller and the buyer . . . a most unfortunate concept that plagues the gas industry to this day.

Soon a network of gas pipelines began to stretch out from the oil and gas fields to homes and industry all over America. Our cleanest, cheapest, most convenient fuel—natural gas—had finally been introduced to the American consumer and quickly became a best seller. Since it was cheaper than either coal or crude oil it replaced these two commodities wherever such replacement was practical.

Following the 1954 Supreme Court decision in the Phillip's case, the Federal Power Commission embarked upon a disastrous gas price fixing experiment which denied gas companies the "windfall" profits they might have obtained as a result of early contracts and in fact fixed gas rates so low, that demand for natural gas increased enormously, while the incentive of gas operators to explore for new reserves . . . was severely damped.

Someone in the fifties, while much of the foregoing was taking place; the United States ceased to be a net exporter of crude oil and became an importer. Thereafter an ever increasing percentage of the domestic demand for petroleum would be supplied by foreign crude imports as well as finished petroleum products.

The Oil Import Program established by Presidential Proclamation on March 10, 1959 was a step in the right direction.

From the beginning, however, the program was destined to become something less than a total success. The lure of an endless supply of "cheap" foreign crude oil and products was just too much for some of our politically motivated national leaders and academically irresponsible economists, each acting under the guise of protecting the consumer interest, had soon riddled the import program with exceptions.

The decade of the sixties began with a nationwide industry survey of the extent of "distress capacity" of both oil and gas. Opinion surveys revealed that distress capacity was identified as the most frequently mentioned of all petroleum industry problems, accompanied as it was by an erosion of crude oil and product prices. Many operators simply went broke or got out while they were still ahead. Their crews just quietly left the petroleum industry and moved into other hopefully more rewarding activities. A more tragic event could hardly have occurred, especially for America. Due to the lack of an adequate National Energy Policy (professionally and intelligently administered), this nation lost, perhaps permanently, its ability to meet its petroleum energy requirements.

The short lived 1967 Israeli-Arab War clearly demonstrating just how totally unreliable foreign crude oil imports could become in an emergency situation failed to convince the critics.

The decade of the seventies began with all the old problems and a distressing array of new ones. Testimony could be heard almost any hour of any day at the federal level before any one of a dozen or more, of the more than sixty federal agencies concerned with energy matters.

Consumer advocates charged that there was no natural gas shortages, that this was a myth created by the gas industry and the gas producing states. Market demand rationing and the domestic oil industry in general continued to be attacked by Professor M. A. Adelman and a half dozen or so other economic professors and disciples of his brand of economic gospel. Professor Adelman was by far the most ubiquitous of the bunch. He seemed to wander from one agency to another and one committee to another, obviously always in great demand and anxious to lend his great wisdom to the nation

as a whole rather than the narrow confines of a class room.

Looking back on some of the Adelman statements made with such vigor and conviction so short a time ago renders them even more ridiculous in the light of current events. He charged that market demand rationing was wasteful because it fostered expensive excess capacity and the development of small easily found fields which were quickly converted to stripper wells rather than encouraging the expansion of large low cost fields. Believe me some of that excess capacity would sure look good if we had it now. He predicted that the extremely low cost Alaska crude would lower United States energy costs and strengthen the industry.

I am not sure just how low the cost of Alaskan crude oil and gas is likely to be when it finally reaches the lower 48 states, if it ever does, but I am not convinced that it will lower United States costs and strengthen the industry's ability to compete as Adelman predicted.

The latest burden, that of environmental protection, is a burden and responsibility that the oil and gas industry voluntarily assumed more than thirty years ago, before it was popular to do so and certainly long before some of the oil industry critics had even heard the word "ecology" or the phrase "environmental protection." If the words mean what I think they do, it simply means that people and industry will confine their wastes, collect and properly dispose of them and in effect clean up after themselves.

Unfortunately, environmental protection has become an overriding national issue, fanned by professional agitators into a form of hysteria that has already stampeded the Congress, state legislative bodies, and countless industries into hasty improvident actions that will protect the environment . . . not one iota, and may even prove destructive to it, while costing the tax-payers and industry a great deal of money.

For more than a year, CBS Newsman Walter Cronkite has been asking his audience in a doomsday-like voice, "Can the world be saved?" The form of the question and the tone of his voice strongly implies that the earth is doomed. Generally, during the course of his news program he reruns some of the old film on the Santa Barbara oil spill, or some other petroleum industry accident or disaster upon which he can place the blame for the sorry state the world finds itself today, and each time he concludes his remarks with the words—"And that's the way it is!"

Unfortunately, a large part of the public has become convinced "that is the way it is," and as a result the petroleum industry has suffered great damage. Public attitudes created by such programs make it not only possible but popular for many members of Congress to support punitive legislation aimed solely at the petroleum industry. Restrictions on the use of lead in gasoline, strict liability for oil spills (even those without fault or negligence), drastic cuts in the depletion allowance, economic sanctions against the industry particularly in the area of gas rate regulation and extreme government pressure to suppress price levels of domestic crude oil and products.

Today this nation is faced with severe shortages of natural gas and crude oil. When the people finally realize that the shortages are real and that their own comfort and welfare may be affected—they will look for someone or something upon which to place the blame. If you have guessed that the petroleum industry will be blamed—I predict that you have guessed correctly. The Proxmires, the Kennedys, the McGoverns and many other well known petroleum industry antagonists will scream that the industry never even hinted or otherwise warned them that such a calamity could come to pass—that the nation can ill afford to leave the serious business of providing the nation's petroleum

needs in such irresponsible hands. It will then be argued that complete government control of the petroleum industry is the answer.

Just a few days ago (September 18) President Nixon issued a proclamation greatly enlarging crude oil import quotas and authorizing the importation of considerably increased volumes of finished products. This amendment and the regulations issued by the Department of Interior to implement it contained two factors that disturbed me.

First, the amendment further increased the amount of finished products that may be imported by independent deepwater terminal operators. I recognize that these businessmen have had some temporary trouble obtaining all the products they want, and that we must find a way to get them the products they need. I, therefore, agree with the purpose of this extra allocation of the finished products. I disagree, however, with the way in which it is being done.

The plan imposes a double threat to our national security. First, exploration for oil and gas reserves has diminished so sharply that we are now becoming increasingly dependent upon insecure foreign oil, and the United States will have to find ways to encourage new exploration if our country is not to become dependent upon foreign powers. This, however, is a longer range problem. Secondly, the United States petroleum industry is not building the refinery capacity necessary to meet its requirements for finished products. If we continue this trend, more and more of the refineries that ought to be built within this country will be built overseas.

In the short term, we cannot stop this trend. It takes a long time to build a new refinery, and it may be three or four years before we see the shortage of domestic refinery capacity reversed. This reversal, however, will never take place if we permit marketing companies to import more and more finished products. If guarantees existed that these allocations could later be taken away, I would not be particularly worried. Allocations of this sort, however, usually get bigger—not smaller. I suggest that the national interest could be better served if this temporary need for products' importing was accomplished by temporarily allowing crude importers to convert an increased share of their tickets to finished products.

This distinction between giving increased allocations to marketers or to refiners is important. Marketers are unlikely to have these allocations taken away from them, and since they are not in the refining business, are equally unlikely ever to build refineries. Refiners, on the other hand, will build refineries if they are given the incentive to do so. Only in this way will we reduce our dependency on foreign facilities.

During the first six months of 1972, the average daily demand for refined products in the United States was 16,209,000 barrels while the maximum daily refining capacity, including the products of gasoline plants, totaled only 15,103,000 barrels daily. This nation can no more afford to depend upon foreign refining capacity than to become excessively or totally dependent upon foreign sources to meet its petroleum requirements. We must cease exporting our refining capacity and the American jobs it provides, but I can assure you that the practice will continue as long as finished petroleum products are permitted to be imported without a cutoff date or other such practical incentive for us to do it ourselves.

It is a good bet that shortages of gasoline will develop on the East Coast this fall and winter due to inadequacy of existing refining capacity and there will probably be a clamor to satisfy these shortages with low-cost foreign gasoline. Unfortunately, there probably won't be any "low cost" foreign gasoline to be found.

A second part of the September 18 procla-

mation also bothers me. In the proclamation companies were told that they could obtain additional import rights by borrowing against their expected 1973 quotas. This offer was made at a time that crude supplies are clearly unable to satisfy demand, and at a time that shortages have already caused severe reductions in normal crude and product inventory levels. I do not object to the concept of borrowing against next year; I do, however, object to relying fully on this mechanism at a time when our country is particularly short of both producing capacity and crude oil inventories. A better solution for the security of the country would have been to issue enough foreign quotas so that some rebuilding of our crude inventories could take place immediately. The system of borrowing against next year gives no incentive in this direction. A significant increment of new 1972 quotas, however, would have given these incentives since if not used in 1972, these import rights would expire.

For more than 15 years, certainly since the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case, the gas industry has had to withstand the assault of some outstanding but misguided consumer advocates—folks like Joe Swidler and Lee White, both former chairmen of the FPC, who in my opinion have led this nation down the primrose path to the energy crisis now confronting us. Strangely enough these two people, and Professor Adelman, whose views on energy and consumer protection have been so utterly and completely discredited by time and events, continue to be called by House and Senate Committees for their expertise in the field of energy and to bolster the unchanging and unchangeable views of folks like Senators Philip Hart, Muskie, McGovern, Kennedy, and others.

As an example, on August 24 I attended a meeting of the Gas Committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners meeting in Nevada. The Honorable Dale Saffels, Chairman of the Kansas Corporation Commission, and I co-sponsored a resolution aimed at correcting some of what we believed to be the basic causes of the energy crisis we are now discussing.

The resolution contained six main points, briefly stated as follows: (1) Urging the opening up of state and federally controlled offshore areas for immediate exploration and development; (2) The initiation of an immediate and intensive program for the further exploration and drilling of areas in the outer continental shelf, in the Gulf of Mexico as well as the Atlantic areas; (3) The defeat of legislation designed to lessen or abolish the depletion allowance or other legislation that would discourage or slow down exploration; (4) Encourage deeper testing of known oil fields at both state and federal levels; (5) To accelerate action to remove obstacles to the importation of crude oil and natural gas from Alaska and Canada and requesting federal courts to exercise judicial restraint before interfering with such action, and finally (6) Suggesting that the FPC establish a more realistic price for domestic gas in order to stimulate increased drilling for gas in this country.

Joe Swidler, Chairman of the New York Public Service Commission voted against the resolution on the grounds that the language of the resolution, particularly that in which the Congress was admonished to defeat legislation designed to lessen or abolish the depletion allowance, was too blunt.

Willis Ward, Chairman of the Michigan Commission, stated in effect that he did not believe the energy crisis was as serious as it was being made to appear, that he agreed with the position stated by Mr. Swidler and therefore voted against the resolution.

Mr. Archie Smith of the Rhode Island Commission also opposed the resolution and requested that he be recorded as voting against the resolution for two reasons:

"The first is the use of the words 'realistic price' because I don't think I am in

the position to say that present rates for gas coming from existing wells is unrealistic.

"Second, more important than that, speaking for the State of Rhode Island and I think the other coastal New England States probably feel largely the same—I will not vote for any resolution calling for drilling on the Atlantic coastal shelf without some provisions for adequate protection for interference with the ecological and environmental factors."

In spite of the opposition cited above, the resolution was adopted by a voice vote, an indication that some folks are finally beginning to wake up to the facts of life.

Now at this point in time, I can't really blame Mr. Joe Swidler for voting against the resolution—he is just maintaining his consistent position of opposing anything that might solve or alleviate the energy shortage. Mr. Willis Ward can't be faulted either because up to now he hasn't seen any sign of an energy crisis in the State of Michigan and besides who is a greater authority on the subject than Mr. Swidler—he is the man who tells the Congress every week or so what needs to be done. So Mr. Ward casts his vote with Mr. Swidler.

I must admit, however, that I was offended by Mr. Archie Smith's assigned grounds for his opposition to the resolution. The State of Texas is proud of its own coastline and beautiful beaches and I'm sure we are just as anxious to protect them from pollution as Mr. Smith is to protect the shores of Rhode Island and the New England coast. In fact, in Texas, we have imposed strict rules and regulations upon the industry which we strictly enforce. Many of these rules have been enforced for more than thirty years and are still protecting and preserving our coastal ecology and environment. The gas produced in Texas pays the cost of providing this protection and the bill is high. The people of Texas are paying a large part of that bill because we consume more than half of the gas produced in Texas and pay a higher price for our Texas gas than Mr. Archie Smith is required to pay for the same gas that reaches him in Rhode Island through an interstate gas pipeline at a price below the more realistic or unrealistic price that Texas consumers are willing to pay for their own gas.

At this point I would like to quote an article from the June 1972 Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, in which Sherman A. Wengerd of Albuquerque quotes our mutual friend Wallace Pratt who once said:

"We must compromise between ruining the ecology and keeping ourselves alive. We can only live at the expense of the ecology, for the moment we began to plow the first field or took the first dog into domesticity, we began to interfere with the ecology! We must strike a happy medium between ruining the ecology and survival, but we don't realize how much it's going to cost us. And we are a part of the ecology too. We have just as much right to live as the seals and the whales have—and no more."

Mr. Pratt probably gives the human species more credit than it deserves when he says "Man is the only animal that thinks, laughs, remembers and recognizes cause and effect relations." I'm sure some of us measure up to those high standards but a lot of us don't. If we had measured up, perhaps we might, as a nation, have long ago understood and recognized the cause and effect relations that account for the condition of the world and Walter Cronkite could abandon his disturbing and persistent question—"Can the world be saved?"

PROSPECTS FOR INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I enclose remarks I made to the International Monetary Market of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange last Friday on the prospects for international monetary reform:

THE ROAD TO NAIROBI

After a year of dalliance, the United States has finally indicated its willingness to lead the way to international monetary reform.

In his address to the Governors of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Washington last week, President Nixon said: "The United States of America will continue to rise to its world responsibilities, joining with other nations to create and participate in a modern world economic order."

Later during the meetings, said the President, Secretary of the Treasury Shultz would outline the U.S. proposals to reform the monetary system. And the Shultz speech proved to be a welcome departure. It showed a willingness to lead, without being bossy or doctrinaire.

I applaud this casting aside of U.S. obstructionism.

Since August, 1971, the overriding attitude of the United States in discussions with other countries on common economic problems has been to insist that we must be granted virtually everything we requested, or we would refuse to participate in any type of monetary agreement and would consider closing the American market to imports.

True, the United States did finally compromise last December when the terms of realigning exchange rates among industrial countries were finally nailed down at the Smithsonian Institution. But the American concession—in the form of a modest increase in the dollar value of gold—had been preceded by four months of totally unnecessary wrangling. It was followed by lethargy, and then by endless contention about the forum and the agenda for the negotiations.

The Presidents' decision of August 15, 1971, to suspend convertibility of foreign officially held dollar assets into gold, and to let the dollar float on exchange markets, was unavoidable. In fact, the Administration should have acted sooner—before a massive deterioration in the U.S. trade balance coupled with a hemorrhage of short-term capital outflows forced its hand. It cost the U.S. some \$200 million in the days immediately before August 15 to defy reality and support the dollar at its old parity.

The August 15 actions were not only late, but loaded with unnecessary abrasives. Not only did the Administration introduce a 10 percent import surcharge, coupled with a discriminatory tax investment credit, it also dug in its heels about the amount by which strong currencies should be revalued upwards, and about whether a decrease in the nominal gold value of the dollar was going to be part of the realignment compromise.

Thus the realignment issue was debated for four months. During that period exchange controls tended to proliferate. Trade was increasingly hampered by uncertainties about further intensification of controls, and the possibility of future exchange rate changes. Finally, in December, the steady deterioration in international political relations caused the White House to decide that an agreement to restructure exchange rates was imperative. We finally got the December 18 Smithsonian accord.

Then, following the Smithsonian agreement, the U.S. Treasury was once again overcome by lassitude. The momentum that existed in the wake of the Smithsonian accord could have been used to help get discussions on more fundamental reforms under way. Despite the language of the final communiqué—"discussion should be

promptly undertaken . . . to consider reform of the international monetary system over the longer term", no initiative was forthcoming from the United States.

During the first few months of 1972, the Administration encouraged speculation about the proper forum and agenda for the negotiations. Various U.S. spokesmen emphasized the need to link monetary reform with reduction of barriers to trade—particularly foreign restrictions retarding the entry of exports from the United States.

A welcome break with this exclusive concentration on the economic self-interest of the United States came in Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur F. Burns' speech before an international banking conference in Montreal last May. In his speech, Burns listed ten points as "some of the more essential conditions and problems of international monetary reform." The notable characteristic of Burns' presentation was that he was clearly concerned with devising an international monetary system that would preserve the multilateral payments mechanism and that the other countries, as well as the United States, would find acceptable.

During the summer the IMF finally agreed that the monetary reform negotiations would be conducted by a Committee of Twenty, constituted in the same fashion as the Board of Executive Directors of the International Monetary Fund, to "give full attention to the interrelationship between these matters [i.e., reforms of the international monetary system] and the existing or prospective arrangements among countries, including those that involve international trade, the flow of capital, investment, or development assistance, that could affect attainment of the purposes of the Fund under the present or amended articles." Had the United States not been dragging its feet, the same Committee would have been set up early this year. Broadening the mandate of the Committee of Twenty to include more than merely monetary reform was hardly worth a delay of fundamental negotiations for more than six months.

EXCHANGE RATES

Let us now turn to the specifics of Secretary Shultz's constructive proposals.

He first recognized that most countries would want to maintain a par or central value for their currencies, suggesting that permissible margins of fluctuation around these values should be "sufficiently wide to dampen incentives for short-term capital movements and, when changes in central values are desirable, to ease the transition."

He noted that the Smithsonian agreement took a step forward in widening the band of exchange rate fluctuations, and suggested that in building a symmetrical system, "the permissible outer limits of these margins of fluctuation for all currencies—including the dollar—might be set in the same range as now permitted for nondollar currencies trading against each other."

This statement has two interesting implications. First, according to the Smithsonian agreement, the dollar value of any other currency can rise above or fall below its parity level by a 2 1/4 percent—for a total band spread of 4 1/2 percent. This arrangement means that the values of any two nondollar currencies may change with respect to one another by as much as 9 percent. A change of this size would occur if one currency fell from the top to the bottom of its 4 1/2 percent dollar band and the other currency did the reverse. A 9 percent range of fluctuation for the dollar would be substantially larger than anything the world has yet seen for a major currency.

The second, and perhaps more interesting, implication concerns the structure of the international monetary system. If all currencies, including the dollar, are to enjoy precisely the same range of fluctuation, then

all must be pegged to a single standard of value—presumably in this case special drawing rights (SDRs). Thus, SDRs would become the established unit of value under a reformed system. One way to achieve this result would be to make the SDR the common medium of intervention that central banks use in exchange markets. But this may be pushing the Secretary's statement too far. Instead, he may have in mind that a system of multiple currency intervention in exchange markets could be established to give the dollar the same range of fluctuation as other currencies. Multiple currency intervention is an intriguing technique theoretically. It would certainly swell the volume of transactions handled by exchange dealers, including some members of this audience. But I, at least, am skeptical about its practical applicability.

THE RESERVE MECHANISM

In recommending reform of the reserve mechanism, Secretary Shultz anticipated a greatly expanded role for special drawing rights, along with continued use of reserve currencies. Virtually all restrictions on the use of SDRs among monetary authorities would be eliminated. "Careful study," he continued, "should be given to proposals for exchanging part of existing reserve currency holdings into a special issue of SDRs, at the option of the holder." Thus, the United States now seems willing to see a major funding of liquid dollar assets now held by foreign monetary authorities, one that would be acceptable to other countries and at the same time would not impose intolerable obligations on the United States.

Although the Secretary looked forward to "orderly procedures . . . to facilitate a diminishing role of gold in international monetary affairs in the future," he did not offer any specific suggestions for phasing out gold as a reserve medium. I had hoped for a suggestion to modify the March, 1968, two-tier gold agreement to permit monetary authorities to sell gold in the private market. Permitting sales, while maintaining the prohibition on purchases of gold by central banks from South Africa and on the free market, would have a number of desirable effects.

First, such sales would reduce the free market price, and thus help ease apprehensions that currently exist about the viability of the Smithsonian monetary arrangements. In addition, a lower free market price would make monetary authorities less reluctant than they now are to use their remaining gold reserves and their SDRs in international settlements.

Second, sales by central banks—without purchases—would decrease the global stock of monetary gold reserves. A gradual decline in the stock of gold reserves would help advance the long-run U.S. objective of phasing gold out as a monetary reserve asset.

Third, official sales would demonstrate that gold has no immutable intrinsic value. The private price of gold is based on a limited number of transactions in an extremely thin market. This market is protected by the umbrella of the March, 1968, two-tier agreement and the December 1969, IMF-South African accord. From 1934 into the 1960's, it was the United States which guaranteed the value of gold. More recently, this duty has been shared cooperatively among several industrial nations. It is time, now that we have special drawing rights created by the IMF, to begin withdrawing the mantle of official protection over gold.

Fourth, as the largest official gold holder in the world, the United States would profit from a share of the sales in the private market. At the end of July, the United States had \$10.5 billion worth of gold, Germany held \$4.4 billion worth, France \$3.8 billion, Switzerland \$3.2 billion, Italy \$3.1 billion, the Netherlands \$2.1 billion, and Belgium \$1.7 billion. No other nation, including Canada

and Japan, held as much as a billion dollars worth of gold.

In addition to advocating the resumption of official gold sales in the private market, Secretary Shultz might well have served notice that the United States will oppose any renewal of the 1969 agreement on IMF purchases of gold from South Africa. Without a renewal, this agreement will expire in a little more than 2 years.

An end to official gold purchases from South Africa is consistent with the long-run objective of the United States to phase out gold as a monetary reserve medium. Ultimately, gold should become a commodity like any other.

Its value should be determined by the economics of mining and refining it, on the one hand, and by demand for industrial and artistic uses and for investment as a personal store of wealth, on the other. Neither the United States nor the International Monetary Fund should be saddled beyond the term of the existing agreement with the responsibility of guaranteeing South Africa's market for that country's chief export commodity.

Sales of gold in the free market by monetary authorities could begin immediately without waiting for negotiated reforms of the IMF Articles. Similarly, an announcement of U.S. opposition to renewal of the agreement with South Africa could come at any time—the sooner the better.

Mr. Shultz also failed to advocate that in a reformed international monetary system, special drawing rights should be accepted for all transactions between the IMF and member countries that now require payment in gold. I believe that special drawing rights, created by the International Monetary Fund and regulated in amount by its members, should become the unrivaled reserve asset in a new system.

LINKAGE BETWEEN SDR'S AND DEVELOPMENT AID

Although arguing strongly for a substantially expanded role for SDRs under a reformed system, Secretary Shultz failed to mention an issue that must be resolved to the satisfaction of the developing countries if any amendment of the IMF Articles is to be accepted. Without some change in the SDR distribution mechanism that channels an increased proportion of these assets to poor nations for the purpose of helping finance their development efforts, any suggested reform is likely to be voted down. Amending the IMF Articles requires the approval of 60 percent of the member countries. Currently developing countries account for about 80 percent of the Fund's membership, and that percentage is growing continuously. Thus, the package of reforms that is negotiated must please the developing world. An essential ingredient in any acceptable package is some form of link between SDR creation and development finance.

Because of these realities, it is unfortunate that Secretary Shultz did not mention the "link" issue in his speech and commit the United States to a positive stance on some type of such arrangement. Secretary Shultz could well have associated himself with the remarks of Anthony Barber, the Governor from the United Kingdom. Mr. Barber said, "The arrangements to provide such a link would have to be part of that wider reform and would have to be consistent with its objectives, not least because, if they were not, that would probably itself frustrate the prime purpose of providing extra real resources for developing countries. We would have to make sure that any such scheme was not inflationary; that it would not lead to pressures for excessive creation of SDRs beyond what prudent internationally agreed judgment regarded as appropriate to the prospects for world liquidity as a whole. But if these conditions can be met, then I say today that the United Kingdom will be

in favor of providing a reformed system for some form of link."

Thus, the British committed themselves to a link provided that specific criteria can be met. The United States should do likewise.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS ADJUSTMENT PROCESS

On measures to strengthen the balance-of-payments adjustment mechanism, Secretary Shultz said, "I believe disproportionate gains or losses in reserves may be the most equitable and effective single indicator we have to guide the adjustment process." I agree that large changes in reserve stocks are probably the best single indicator of when adjustments in exchange rates are necessary. Professor Robert Triffin of Yale University has been suggesting a mechanism of this type for some years.

Somewhat surprisingly, however, Secretary Shultz failed to mention the important qualification that actual changes in reserves must be adjusted to account for the impact of reversible short-term capital flows before trends in the size of reserve holdings can be used as an accurate reflection of a country's payments position.

The Secretary mentioned various sanctions that could be applied to deficit and surplus countries that refused to alter their exchange rates when reserve increases or decreases seemed to indicate that an adjustment was desirable. The IMF could withhold borrowing privileges and SDR allocations from deficit countries. Surplus nations permitting their reserves to rise disproportionately might lose the right to demand conversion of reserve balances into SDRs or other assets. "In the absence of a truly effective combination of corrective measures," he suggested, "other countries should ultimately be free to protect their interests by a surcharge on the imports from the chronic surplus country." To all this I say "Right on." If the member countries of the IMF had in recent years been less delicate in their relations with one another, and if they had had the courage to apply the scarce currency clause to chronic surplus nations, we would not have plunged so deep into the morass from which we are now attempting to extricate ourselves.

CAPITAL AND OTHER BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS CONTROLS

Let me cite with particular approval a brief section from the Secretary's remarks on capital and other payments controls:

"If trade controls are permitted temporarily in extreme cases on balance-of-payments grounds, they should be in the form of surcharges or across-the-board taxes. Controls on capital flows should not be allowed to become a means of maintaining a chronically undervalued currency. No country should be forced to use controls in lieu of other, more basic, adjustment measures."

I have long felt that import quotas, as are now permissible under the GATT, are totally unsatisfactory as a means of controlling imports for balance-of-payments purposes. Indeed our existing controls on direct investment abroad and on lending by banks overseas ought to be phased out as part of the international monetary reform package, accompanied by domestic tax reform measures to undo unfair inducements to excessive U.S. foreign investment. Ultimately trade and capital flows, by ourselves and others, should be free to respond to opportunities throughout the world.

RELATED NEGOTIATIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Trade negotiations under the GATT, which Secretary Shultz said he hoped would begin next year, "need not wait on monetary reform, nor need monetary reform await the results of specific trade negotiations."

This newly announced willingness on the part of the Treasury to divorce trade from monetary issues is encouraging. The United

States cannot enter into true negotiations on trade with our GATT partners until authorizing legislation is passed by the Congress. Even if the Administration presents an innovative, well-drafted trade bill early in the next session—and I hope it will—a major feat of legislative productivity will be required to complete action on this bill in 1973. Not only will trade be an issue of prime importance, but also tax reform and perhaps social security and welfare as well. It would be most unfortunate to postpone implementation of monetary reforms that would substantially improve the system only because agreement had not yet been reached on trade issues. Five years was required to negotiate the Kennedy Round of tariff cuts. Even if only two years is expended negotiating the next trade agreements, we cannot postpone monetary reform until 1975 or later.

Near the conclusion of his speech, Secretary Shultz observed that he had several times "stressed the need for a comprehensive new set of monetary rules." He went on to say, "Those rules will need to be placed under the guardianship of the IMF, which must be prepared to assume an even more critical role in the world economy."

If we are to have a strong International Monetary Fund charged with the responsibility for monitoring the balance of payments of each major country or group of countries, and the duty to suggest exchange rate adjustments from time to time, the United States should do everything possible to reinforce the analytical capabilities, the independence, and the objectivity of the Fund.

For these reasons, I hope that the Administration will reverse its position of opposition to the reappointment of Managing Director Pierre-Paul Schweitzer for another term.

Under Schweitzer the special drawing right facility was brought into being. More than a year ago Schweitzer first proposed dollar devaluation, and a set of changes in exchange rate parities that was virtually identical to the one adopted months later at the Smithsonian. The IMF staff under Schweitzer developed early this year the idea that the group to negotiate monetary reform be patterned after the twenty-member Board of Executive Directors. He has been a constructive force in helping to maintain international monetary order, and to develop a new, more vigorous role for the IMF under a reformed system.

In short, it would be hard to imagine an IMF managing director whose guidance has been more consistently in the long-term interest of the United States. The gentle touch at the keyboard of this renowned nephew of Dr. Albert Schweitzer has helped to orchestrate the music of the monetary spheres during these difficult years. It ill behoves the United States, at this stage of the Unfinished Symphony to be heard shouting "Shoot the Piano Player."

DOLLAR CONVERTIBILITY

The Secretary pledged the United States to the eventual restoration of dollar-reserve asset convertibility. After an appropriate transitional period during which the United States demonstrates its capacity to meet its reserve and balance-of-payments commitments, this country "would be prepared to undertake an obligation to convert official foreign dollar holdings into other reserve assets as a part of . . . a system assuring effective and equitable operation of the adjustment process." To me, this is a reasonable statement of when the United States should be prepared to restore convertibility. I do not see how our foreign economic partners could have expected or asked for more.

THE FUTURE U.S. ROLE

Only the United States can provide the leadership necessary to assure that a sound international monetary reform is actually negotiated. No other country can do it.

The British are concerned about the problems of entering the Common Market and whether the pound will still be floating or at what rate it will be pegged when they go in.

Germany is looking forward to an election late this year in which the current government will face a severe challenge.

Although the French Governor's address at the IMF meetings was far more conciliatory than earlier pronouncements to come from Giscard d'Estaing, the past history of French attitudes hardly makes them the logical leaders in reforming the international monetary system.

Similarly, the Japanese are at the moment unprepared to take the lead. They also face elections shortly, and are greatly concerned with their relations in Asia, with the United States, with the People's Republic of China, with the Soviet Union, and with the developing countries of that area. But the Japanese must play a highly significant role. As the nation whose competitive prowess is most widely respected throughout the world, no one else will accept any particular regime to introduce greater exchange rate flexibility unless the Japanese are also willing to subscribe fully.

Thus, the burden rests upon the United States. Secretary Schultz's speech, if it is followed, not by inaction but by a genuine U.S. effort to negotiate, signals our willingness to accept that burden. He set up the objective of agreement upon "the main outlines of a new system" by the time of next year's annual meeting in Nairobi. It is a worthy goal. It is achievable if all the parties put forth their best effort. For us, let the watchword be, "Nairobi or Bust."

JULIA HENDERSON VISITS THE UNITED STATES

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I wish on behalf of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to hail the visit to the United States of Julia Henderson, Secretary-General of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the private voluntary organization with member associations in 79 nations around the world dedicated to the provision of family planning services, information, and education. Its fundamental approach is through the support of voluntary and autonomous national family planning associations in each country. Since its founding in 1952, the IPPF has clearly established international leadership in the field of human health and well-being. Mr. Speaker, as you know, many of our colleagues have long been interested in the goals of the voluntary family planning movement in this country, and those goals are exemplified on an international scale by the outstanding work of the IPPF. We in the United States and people around the world owe much to their dedicated efforts.

Since 1959 all five Presidents and former Presidents representing both parties have supported programs for population research and voluntary family planning. The Congress, also with bipartisan support, has passed a half-dozen significant pieces of legislation in this field, including—by a vote of 298 to 32—the landmark Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 for domestic programs—of which I had the privilege of being the original House

sponsor in 1969. Since 1968 Congress has earmarked over a half billion dollars in successive Foreign Assistance Acts for population and family planning programs in the developing countries; for 1972 and 1973 these earmarkings amounted to \$125 million each year. During this same period, the IPPF has been steadily expanding its efforts in the private sector to promote economic and social progress through voluntary family planning.

Large numbers of people the world over are unable to control an important part of their lives—the number of children they wish to bear. The persistence of this problem reflects an effective denial of freedom of choice and equality of access to the means of safe and effective fertility control. A fundamental human right—freedom from unwanted childbearing—is denied when governmental steps are not taken to assure each person the fullest possible access to methods of controlling reproduction. In addition, the freedom of future generations of humankind is compromised by such a denial of freedom to the present generation. Maximizing this personal freedom and opportunity—the mission of IPPF—means in essence that the solutions to international population problems do not need to be imposed on an unwilling citizenry but rather can evolve through the fulfillment of a fundamental right.

During the decade of the 1960's, population growth became recognized as an issue requiring not only words but action. The 1966 Declaration of Population of the United Nations, signed by the heads of 30 governments, declared the importance of bringing population growth under control. This was followed by the beginning or acceleration of many national population programs throughout the world. In the last 3 years the United Nations itself has undertaken major work in the population field through the U.N. Fund for Population Activities. During 1970 and 1971, the Fund provided assistance to some 60 countries for identifying their needs and preparing population projects. UNFPA, supported by the world's developed nations, has received pledges and contributions from nearly 50 governments totaling \$45 million dollars. I am proud, as indeed all of us should be, that our Government has pledged to match, dollar for dollar, the contributions of other nations to the Fund, with a target of \$100 million by 1974—U.N. World Population Year. The World Bank has organized and expanded its capability to serve developing countries in the population field. Robert McNamara, President of the World Bank, has stated:

It is important to understand why an institution such as the World Bank is concerned with the population problem. The reason is simple. No other single problem is a greater threat to the prospects for economic and social progress in the developing world. The World Bank is an international development agency, and for it to be indifferent to the inescapable consequences of rampant population growth in the poorer nations would amount to its being indifferent to the larger goal of development itself.

This growing worldwide cooperation is deeply encouraging; yet facts of world

demography suggest that only a beginning has been made. More than two-thirds of the nearly 4 billion people on earth live in the less developed countries. In those countries the numbers of women between 20 to 29 years of age, prime childbearing years, will increase tremendously in the 1970's and even more so during the 1980's. Several weeks ago, the World Bank, in its annual report, stated that poverty is increasing in underdeveloped countries—despite gains in total production and income—in large part because of rapid and accelerating population growth. And despite much lower life expectancies and much higher infant and maternal mortality, the growth of population in the underdeveloped world is two and a half times greater than in the developed nations, where much higher industrial and agricultural production is providing an increasingly better standard of living.

Nor have industrialized nations been immune to demographic pressures. As UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim has pointed out:

Swollen cities, the drain of talent from regions of low development to centers of affluence and heavy internal migrations have all left their mark.

As we commend the dedication and accomplishments of the IPPF, we must also realize that it alone cannot accomplish the tremendous task. There now exists an international consensus on the need for voluntary family planning services for men and women the world over. The help of all public and private health-related organizations must be enlisted. All interested aid-giving governments must continue to join forces and expand their efforts. The United Nations, through its Fund for Population Activities, the World Health Organization; the Food and Agriculture Organization; UNESCO; and the International Labor Organization—the World Bank and the international business community; religious institutions all over the world; our own AID all have their part to play as these diversified programs gain momentum.

Here at home, a tremendous amount of work needs to be done. We have undertaken a major national effort to provide subsidized family planning services to an estimated 6.6 million medically indigent women in the United States. I believe our Nation can be proud of its achievements in the field of family planning services.

The effort we have begun must be greatly expanded and sustained. Today I introduced a measure to renew and expand the legislative authority for the HEW program which expires this fiscal year. This legislation is imperative if we wish to achieve our national health goals and enable all persons to exercise their fundamental human right—freedom of choice concerning family size—and so I once again call upon my colleagues in this distinguished body to support renewal and expansion of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970.

What is necessary for American women in terms of health care is important for women all over the world. The recognition of this need is growing at an extraordinary rate. For example, 10 years ago

in Pakistan, the concept of birth control was so alien in that country that a new word had to be invented for it. Today, with a national family planning program, Pakistan is experiencing a significant decline in the birth rate and a marked decrease in its extremely high infant and maternal death rates. But in that country, and all over the world, we have only just begun to develop the technology and the services that are so desperately needed.

The IPPF has no intention of abandoning the pioneering role which has so distinguished its early years; but support for its efforts must continue to grow. Responsible individual action, enlightened governmental policies and true international assistance and cooperation are required. Population programs have been estimated to need between \$4 and \$5 billion annually—or approximately \$1 per person for the entire world. As we approach U.N. World Population Year in 1974, I believe that we must focus our attention on appropriate voluntary and humanitarian measures concerning population and human freedom. As our own Population Commission has pointed out, every increase in population makes social, economic and health problems more difficult to solve. We must take every possible step to insure that each child is a wanted child who can be properly cared for and educated in a healthy and peaceful world.

REAL ESTATE TAX RELIEF FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. Hicks) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Emergency Real Estate Tax Relief for Senior Citizens Act. This act will provide immediate relief to the millions of our senior citizens whose very ability to live in their own homes or to rent suitable apartments is being imperiled by ever increasing real estate taxes.

Two weeks ago the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations found that the situation being forced upon many of our elderly citizens by high real estate taxes is a national disgrace. The Commission reported that the 6 million elderly homeowners in our country are paying an average of 8.1 percent of their incomes in real estate taxes whereas the typical urban family of four pays only 3.4 percent of its income for real estate taxes.

The Commission also found that the plight of the elderly poor was almost catastrophic. For the 1.3 million elderly homeowners who have incomes of less than \$2,000 the property tax took an average of 15.8 percent of their incomes; and in the Northeast where the property taxes tend to be the highest, low income homeowners on the average paid almost 30 percent of their incomes in property taxes. Since Massachusetts ranks among the top 10 States in terms of real estate tax burden, our senior citizens are being especially hard-pressed.

This situation is truly disgraceful. We are making insufferable the lives of many

of our elderly citizens by imposing on them steep real estate taxes which are out of all proportion to these citizens' ability to pay.

Several States, including Vermont and Maine, have recognized the injustice of this situation and have passed State laws providing a circuit breaker for real estate taxes paid by senior citizens. This circuit breaker means that a senior citizen does not have to pay more than a certain percentage of his or her income for real estate taxes and if he or she does pay over this percentage in local taxes he or she receives a check from the State government for the excess.

The bill I have introduced today has as its purpose to provide immediate relief—for this year only—to the millions of elderly citizens who are not covered by these present State laws, including the senior citizens in Massachusetts; and my second purpose is to encourage all the States to pass this type of legislation within the next 12 months. Only 14 States to date have enacted circuit breakers. But I believe that my bill—as a temporary emergency measure—will highlight the plight of our senior citizens and thereby encourage many more States to enact circuit breaker laws for our senior citizens.

The National Emergency Real Estate Tax Relief for Senior Citizens Act provides that if any individual, 65 years of age or older, pays more than 5 percent of his or her income and the spouse's income for real estate taxes during 1972 the Federal Government would send him or her a check for the difference between the amount equal to 5 percent of total income and the amount actually paid.

In other words, an elderly couple with a \$10,000 income would not have to pay more than \$500 a year for real estate taxes. If they paid less than \$500 a year, there would be no rebate from the Federal Treasury. But if they paid more than \$500 a year and their State does not have a circuit breaker, then the couple would receive a rebate of the difference between what it paid and \$500.

In case of renters the bill provides a presumption that 30 percent of the annual rent paid to a landlord goes to real estate taxes. The renter would compute 30 percent of the total rent paid in 1972; and if this 30 percent exceeds 5 percent of household income, the renter would be entitled to a similar rebate from the Federal Treasury.

The bill excludes from income social security and public assistance payments, veterans' benefits, and widow's benefits. These exclusions will thereby entitle these individuals to greater relief from real estate taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to begin immediate consideration of this bill. We owe no less than that to our senior citizens.

AGAINST ABOLITION OF STRIP MINING

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Kee) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6482, as drafted, is a 56-page bill to provide for

the regulation of surface coal mining for the conservation, acquisition and reclamation of surface areas affected by coal mining activities, and for other purposes.

I am vigorously opposed to this proposed legislation which, as written, addresses itself to the strip mine operators of my home State of West Virginia, and much of the Appalachian region. The message can be reduced to four little words with a great big meaning which we all understand—abolition of strip mining. It is the solemn requiem for hundreds of small businesses which have provided gainful employment and the necessities of life for thousands of men and their families.

Poverty, hardship and suffering are not new to the Appalachian region. It was for so long a way of life in this entire area. The Congress of the United States has a very proud history of having at long last responded to the needs of the people. It has passed legislation over the years that has relieved much poverty and suffering. I am grateful for the opportunity to have actively participated in these accomplishments.

I am gratified to be able to associate myself with many of the noble goals and objectives of H.R. 6482, but I must wash my hands of those portions that would arbitrarily and capriciously destroy the thousands of jobs with mining and associated industries and create an Appalachia worse than anything history has known. I do not want this stain on my hands.

The tax dollars of those very people who are being caught up in this abolition movement have contributed substantially to the development of new technology which, if used to their advantage, would make this whole thing so very unnecessary. Reclamation is possible. Reclamation is being carried out in a most impressive fashion today. Abolition is not necessary. We have the know-how. Let us have the heart—let us have the determination and let us go that extra step for the future of America.

It is my firm opinion, as demonstrated by history without question, that the coal industry is absolutely vital to our national security. Coal is the only energy resource that we have that we know is adequate to meet our Nation's energy for the next several hundred years. Right now we have acknowledged a serious shortage in natural gas and oil. There is a great shroud of mystery surrounding the exact state of affairs as to how grave our shortages are. These are carefully guarded trade secrets within the oil and gas industry.

Gas and oil come to us from the same companies: Humble, Continental, Sohio, Sunoco, Texaco, Gulf, et cetera. These companies are also in the coal business. They have the power to operate from one end of the United States to the other and to expand into foreign countries. They are strong. This legislation makes them even stronger. It knocks the small operators and their employees out of the way and eliminates the competition. By passing legislation which will eliminate the small operator, the fact is clear that Congress is establishing for the corporate giants what it has said they cannot create for themselves—a monopoly.

A final word on the energy crisis. We are already dependent upon oil imports to meet our energy needs. We are in a position of importing and relying on imports from countries which are in themselves unstable and which could cut our supplies off entirely today or tomorrow. Can we afford to place our country in that kind of jeopardy? I submit that it is politically and economically unsafe, unwise, and unpatriotic to do so.

I can only urge each of you to consider this proposal very carefully before you cast your vote for a measure that could well eliminate as much as one tenth of our Nation's total energy supply.

A vote for this bill is a vote for monopoly of our energy supply by big business and against the small businessman. A vote for this bill is a vote against free enterprise.

STRIP MINING MUST END

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, 1972, at pages 32828-32831, I retailed the reasons for my opposition to H.R. 6482, a bill originally scheduled to be taken up on October 2 under suspension of the rules. Not until the morning of October 2 did Members even get to see copies of the bill.

H.R. 6482 is now listed as No. 11 on the suspension calendar, and will probably come up for a House vote Wednesday or Thursday. I do not like the procedure under which this bill comes to the floor, barring amendments and requiring a two-thirds vote after only 40 minutes of debate. Furthermore, I do not have much faith in the Department of the Interior, which has been charged with the enforcement of this bill. This production-oriented Department has twiddled its thumbs while public and Indian lands under its own jurisdiction have been strip mined in such a way as to cause widespread landslides, siltation and acid pollution of streams, and destruction of valuable topsoil. Yet the pending legislation does provide some useful tools which, if actually employed, might prevent the worst damage from coal strip mining. If the legislation fails, then the Nation will at least be convinced that regulation will not work and abolition of strip mining of coal is the only sensible solution.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had plenty of time to bring this bill before the Committee on Rules before September 25, which would have allowed full and orderly debate, with opportunity for amendment, instead of this last-minute rush procedure. But Congressmen have now had the bill for 8 days, and they ought to be able to assess its strong and weak points.

Two sections of the bill will bring great relief to the long-suffering people of the Appalachian region. There is an effective prohibition of strip mining on slopes over 20 degrees unless the coal operator can demonstrate affirmatively that sedimentation, landslides and stream pollution

can be prevented. Also, there is a potentially useful section of the bill sponsored by my colleague from Montana, Representative JOHN MELCHER, which prevents the creation of a permanent spoil bank on slopes greater than 14 degrees.

The coal industry is now publicly fighting this bill and has urged all Members of Congress to oppose it.

For example, all Members of the House received the following telegram from the President of the American Mining Congress and the National Coal Association, as follows:

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Coal industry strongly urges defeat of strip mine bill H.R. 6482. This is punitive, unrealistic bill which would summarily halt much of vital U.S. coal production.

J. ALLEN OVERTON, Jr.,
President, American Mining Congress.
CARL E. BAGGE,
President, National Coal Association.

In addition, on October 6, the American Mining Congress sent the following letter to all Members of Congress:

AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., October 6, 1972.

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are sending you this communication to alert you to the fact that there is grave danger that in the rush to meet Congressional commitments prior to adjournment, the national economy and national security may be jeopardized through adoption of legislation which contains serious and unnecessary threats to the ability of the mining industry to furnish the increasing amounts of energy and minerals our nation so sorely needs.

We refer to legislation to regulate surface mining. H.R. 6482 and S. 630 have been reported on the floor of the House and Senate.

The American Mining Congress, the national trade association representing all branches of the mining industry, has presented to both the House and Senate Interior Committees its basic policy position on this matter (as determined by the executive officers of its member companies)—

The American Mining Congress supports legislation establishing federal guidelines for the regulation of surface mining. These guidelines must be sufficiently broad that they do not impinge on the power of the various states also to regulate—for only in this way can our laws respond rationally to the almost endless diversity of mining methods and conditions. And any federal surface mining law should be consistent with the National Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970.

At a meeting of concerned member companies of the American Mining Congress, representing both coal and metal production, held in Washington on October 4, the pending legislation, so far as then known to us, was evaluated in the light of the above principles and found seriously deficient. This assessment covered not only the reported bills, H.R. 6482 and S. 630, but also a number of amendments (some printed and some still being drafted) which we understood would be offered on the floor.

H.R. 6482, now pending for action in the House, applies only to coal surface mining. Mr. Carl Bagge, President of the National Coal Association, and I advised members of the House of Representatives by a joint wire today that the coal industry strongly urges defeat of H.R. 6482. This measure is punitive and would in many cases frustrate sound reclamation and summarily halt much of the needed, vital U.S. coal production.

In the Senate, S. 630, reported by the Senate Interior Committee and now procedurally ready for further Senate action, would apply to all minerals. That measure needs substantial revision—including particularly revision of the requirement that surface land be restored to a use or condition comparable or superior to its use or condition prior to mining. This would literally make it impossible to establish any new large open-pit mine in the United States.

It must be recalled that over 96 percent of the nation's minerals other than coal, and over 45 percent of our coal requirements are produced by surface mining. Those necessary legislative revisions, to assure continuance of that mining, are too important and too complex and technical to be carefully examined and considered in the short period of time remaining in this session. The complexities involved are illustrated by the fact that on July 18, 1972, the mining industry found it necessary to present to Chairman Jackson and the members of the Senate Interior Committee a recommendation for 27 minimum changes required to be made in S. 630 (in the form substantially as reported) in order to attain workable legislation.

Let me underscore that when we say, "minimum changes required to be made", we are advising you that it is the considered best judgment of the mining industry that the concepts embraced in the 27 suggested amendments must be included if a surface mining measure is to be workable—for this industry to continue to supply the energy and materials necessary for our economic well-being and the maintenance of our requisite national defense posture.

A viable mining industry is the keystone in the arch of the American enterprise system. Hasty, ill-considered, end-session-rush legislation of the kind now before the Congress would be clearly inimical to that system, and thus inimical to America's best interests.

We therefore urge that Congress defer final action on this subject until there is time to develop the kind of sound legislation which can protect the nation's environment and at the same time preserve the ability of the mining industry to meet the nation's energy and mineral needs.

Sincerely,
J. ALLEN OVERTON, Jr., President.

I also received, as did other Members, the following communication dated October 6 from our colleague, Hon. JAMES KEE:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 6, 1972.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: It is expected that H.R. 6482, The Strip Mining Reclamation Bill, will be called up under suspensions possibly Wednesday evening, October 11th, or Thursday afternoon, October 12th.

As the Committee Report 92-1462 shows, I joined with Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall in separate views.

I respectfully enclose for your consideration a copy of my remarks which I intend to deliver on the Floor of the House in opposition to H.R. 6482 as presently drafted.

If you agree with my position, I will be grateful to you personally, if you will join with me in voting against H.R. 6482.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES KEE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot generate much personal enthusiasm for a bill which has a number of fatal defects, such as the fact that jurisdiction for enforcement is placed in the toothless Department of the Interior. I still believe very firmly that abolition is the only answer to the destruction of land caused by the strip mining of coal. I have today sent a letter

to each of the co-sponsors of my abolition bill, the text of which follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1972.

Dear Fellow-Sponsor of Abolition of Coal Strip-Mining:

Although I am very reluctantly going to vote for the Committee-reported bill, H.R. 6482—on the grounds that it might slow down the worst forms of strip-mining devastation—I am still convinced that the only genuine solution to the continued ripping up of the land is the total abolition of the strip mining of coal.

When the House bill is debated, I intend to make it perfectly clear that the only sensible long-range answer to strip mining is abolition. My vote for H.R. 6482 will only be affirmative because we have no other alternative in 1972, and the suspension of the rules will not allow an abolition amendment to be offered.

I hope that you will not only hold firm in your position for abolition, but will also consider some additional argument into the Record to support this goal. The two points most frequently raised by those opposing abolition are: (1) the energy crisis—where are we going to get the coal to power our society if we abolish strip mining? and (2) jobs—you wouldn't want to wipe out an entire industry and all this employment, would you?

To the first argument, I point out that the reserves of deep-minable coal are eight times as large as the strip-minable coal. Furthermore, there are 16 states where low-sulfur deep-minable coal reserves greatly exceed the stripable coal. In West Virginia, there is ten times as much deep-minable coal as stripable, and in Montana, the ratio is 8:1, for example. Also, if we are so short of coal and have to rip up the land to strip it, then why are we exporting 10 percent of the annual coal production?

To the second argument, on jobs, it takes three or four more jobs to produce a ton of deep mined coal than to strip mine. Also, the war in Vietnam supplies thousands of jobs not only in the service but in manufacturing napalm, etc., and you don't find many people who want to continue the war rather than phase out those jobs and utilize these people in more constructive pursuits. So we ought to stop bombing our own land and put these people to work on building roads, houses, hospitals and other constructive tasks.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

In addition to action this Congress takes on strip mining, it is important to protect public and Indian lands and national forests, and I have therefore introduced the following resolution to stop strip mining in national forests and on public and Indian lands, and to halt deep mining in national forests:

H.J. RES. 1322

Joint Resolution to prevent surface mining operations on public lands, and deep mining in national forests

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Secretary of the Interior be and hereby is authorized and directed (a) to forbid prospecting, exploration, development, or removal of coal deposits by surface mining methods on all public lands and acquired lands of the United States and on all Indian lands, (b) to suspend pending applications for coal permits and leases unless the applicant agrees not to explore for or remove the coal deposits by surface mining operations, (c) to suspend all coal permits and leases on such lands which are in effect on the effective date of this resolution and which authorize exploration or removal of the coal deposits by surface

mining operations, and (d) to prohibit underground coal mining in public and acquired lands in the national forests.

COMPENSATION FOR LONGSHORE-MEN AND HARBOR WORKERS

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12006, a bill which I sponsored to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, is on the Suspension Calendar for consideration by the House this week.

This bill, which will provide broad and far-reaching improvements in the act, has the strong support of labor, management, and industry, as evidenced by the following letters and telegrams which I have received. I am also including a copy of a letter sent to each Member of the House today which is signed by Chairman CARL D. PERKINS of the full Committee on Education and Labor, Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE, Hon. MARVIN L. ESCH, Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER, and myself.

The letters and telegrams follow:

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO continues to fully support the Daniels Bill H.R. 12006 which provides the following additional benefits for our rank and file.

- (1) Increases the maximum weekly benefits in the first year to \$167.00 from \$70.00.
- (2) Provides for free choice of doctors by the employees.
- (3) Provides for the payment of attorney's fee to be paid by the employer in contested cases.
- (4) It eliminates the maximum of 24,000.00 on temporary total disability claims.
- (5) It extends coverage which was limited to the ship in the old bill—to the piers, wharves and terminals.

The executive council—the highest governing body of the ILA which includes representatives from all major ports considered the bill on September 14 and no opposition was raised by any member of the council.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS W. GLEASON,
President, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
2181 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, strongly urges passage of the Daniels bill H.R. 12006 which will amend the Longshoremen's and Harborworkers Compensation Act. This legislation is urgently needed to provide our injured longshoremen with a reasonable amount of compensation during periods of unemployment resulting from injury or illness sustained in the course of their employment. The bill provides for a substantial increase over the present maximum of seventy dollars per week which is beneath the poverty level and extend coverage of the bill to adjoining piers, wharves and terminals where longshoremen are employed. With the extension of coverage, our members will not have to rely on State compensation statutes, many of which provide rates of compensation which are totally inadequate. We request

that you and all other Members of the House lend support to the bill to insure its passage.

THOMAS W. GLEASON,
President, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

New York Shipping Association, Inc., and International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, jointly urge your support of H.R. 12006 providing long overdue benefit increases for injured workers and other urgently needed adjustments in the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. Bill has full support of management, labor and the administration.

JAMES J. DICKMAN,
President, New York Shipping Association, Inc.

THOMAS W. GLEASON,
President, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Labor and Education Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Officers of International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union urge adoption of H.R. 12006 amending the Longshore and Harbor Workers Compensation Act.

HARRY BRIDGES,
President, I.W.U.

Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of our 175,000 members and other workers of the District of Columbia we congratulate you on reporting act, H.R. 12006, the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Act which continues to cover the workers of the District of Columbia under workmen's compensation.

The Greater Washington Central Labor Council and its affiliates whole heartedly support your legislation and urges the Members of the House to adopt your bill.

GEORGE W. APPERSON,
President, the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL
ORGANIZATIONS.

Washington, D.C., September 28, 1972.
Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIELS: On Monday, October 2, the House of Representatives will vote on H.R. 12006, a bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act. The AFL-CIO urges that you support this bill. It has the support of the International Longshoremen's Association and all other AFL-CIO affiliates where membership is covered by the bill.

The companion bill, S. 2318, has already passed the Senate and if the House acts favorably on Monday, long overdue improvements in the workmen's compensation benefit structure for approximately 800,000 workers can become a reality. The basic legislation, the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, was last amended in 1961. It covers longshoremen and harbor workers, ship repairmen, workers in private industry in the District of Columbia, workers employed in nonappropriated fund instrumentalities (P.X. etc.), American workers employed on defense bases overseas—who are primarily building and construction trades workers—and workers employed on the outer continental shelf.

After 12 years without amendment, the Longshoremen's Act has become outdated. The amendments, proposed in H.R. 12006, are

consistent with recommendations of the National Commission On State Workmen's Compensation Laws, and upon enactment would restore this federal workmen's compensation program to its former place of prominence in the field of workmen's compensation.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

WASHINGTON BUILDING AND
CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1972.

Hon. DOMINICK DANIELS,
Chairman, Select
Labor Subcommittee, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DANIELS: On behalf of the Washington Building and Construction Trades Council, representing 30,000 building tradesmen and the labor movement in the District of Columbia, I wish to thank you and all the members of the Committee for your support of H.R. 12006.

Passage of this bill will mean that injured workers in the District will, once again, enjoy the benefits of one of the most progressive compensation acts in the country.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH F. CURTICE,
Executive Secretary.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and
Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Careful reconsideration demonstrates proposed benefits warrant surrender of longshoreman third party unseaworthiness claim.

JACOB RASSNER.

ASHCRAFT & GERALD,

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1972.

Hon. DOMINICK DANIELS,
Chairman, Select Labor Subcommittee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: For the past 20 years, we have specialized in the handling of workmen's compensation cases, exclusively for injured employees, in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. We have recently had the occasion to review the long overdue proposed amendments to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The reported amendments are set forth in H.R. 12006 as amended.

It is our opinion, after reviewing the bill, that it is an excellent one and should be passed in its entirety. We further feel that, with regard to third party actions, the proposed amendments eliminating unseaworthiness as a basis for third party actions is equitable as long as third party actions can be maintained based on common law negligence. This is, in fact, the basis for liability in these cases in virtually every state and also eliminates some of the inequities present under the existing Act. As previously stated, the proposed amendments found in H.R. 12006 as amended should be passed.

Very truly yours,

LEE C. ASHCRAFT.

ROYSTON, RAYZOR, COOK & VICKERY,
Houston, Tex., September 25, 1972.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIELS: On behalf of all employer segments in the shipping and stevedore industry in all areas of the country for whom we speak (see attached list), we urge your support for the above bill to amend the Federal Longshoremen's & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

This bill, after hearings, was favorably reported unanimously by your Committee on

Education and Labor. Its companion measure in the Senate, S. 2318, also after extensive hearings, was favorably reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and was then unanimously passed by the Senate. The bill has the support of, and is endorsed by, the Administration.

This proposed legislation deals with and resolves two interrelated cardinal problems which have plagued the industry and precluded any Congressional action since 1961: (a) third party actions with an attendant circular liability, and (b) outdated compensation benefits. Additionally, this bill extends coverage of the Act to protect additional shoreside maritime workers and provides for administrative reforms both as to the rights of workers and the operation of the Department of Labor.

While admittedly neither management nor labor has had its own way in the proposed legislation, it was arrived at through countless discussions and meetings and represents a compromise with which each of us believes we can live:

(a) On third party actions, we have sought to place an employee injured aboard a vessel in the same position he would be in if he were injured in a non-maritime employment ashore and have thus preserved for him an action against a vessel for negligence;

(b) On increased benefits, we have been guided by the recommendations of the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation laws contained in its report issued July 21, 1972, and believe the provisions of the bill are consistent with this report.

We have no doubt that the proposed legislation will evoke anguished cries from those individuals who stand to gain at the expense of the employee by continuance of the present Act and a refusal to enact these badly needed changes. Our industry, both management and labor, however, as was made fully evident during the hearings, cannot stand the continuance of the status quo. It is for this reason that we have worked so long and hard to arrive at legislation to which management and labor could each subscribe; and we so commend it to you.

Respectfully yours,

DENNIS LINDSAY,
EDWARD D. VICKERY,
JAMES A. FLYNN,
THOMAS D. WILCOX,
FRANCIS A. SCANLAN,
Executive Committee of National
Maritime Compensation Committee.

MEMBERSHIP OF NATIONAL MARITIME
COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

Boston Shipping Association, Inc.
Great Lakes Terminal Association.
Hampton Roads Maritime Association, Inc.
Lake Carriers Association.
Master Contracting Stevedores Association
of the Pacific Coast, Inc.
Mobile Steamship Association, Inc.
National Association of Stevedores.
New Orleans Steamship Association.
New York Shipping Association, Inc.
North Atlantic Ports Association.
Pensacola Steamship Association.
Philadelphia Marine Trade Association.
Portland Shipping Association, Inc.
Savannah Maritime Association.
Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore,
Inc.
Tampa Steamship Association.
West Gulf Maritime Association.

HOUSTON, TEX.

Hon. DOMINICK DANIELS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

At its final business meeting following its American Merchant Marine conference the Propeller Club of the United States assem-

bled in its 46th national convention unanimously passed the following resolution "The Propeller Club of the United States strongly endorses HR 12006 to amend the Longshoremen's & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and noting its counterpart S. 2318 has been passed by the Senate, strongly recommends that HR 12006 be passed by the House of Representatives at the earliest possible time." The Propeller Club respectfully requests and urges your full support of this important legislation.

JASPER S. BAKER,
National President.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.
Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

The international officers of ILWU and the Coast Labor Relations Committee representing the entire Longshore division including the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii urge you to vote for adoption of HR 12006 amending the Longshore Harbor Worker Compensation Act.

WM. H. CHESTER,
Vice President, ILWU, Assistant to the
President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1972

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The House Suspension Calendar has listed for consideration H.R. 12006, a bill that contains long overdue changes in the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The House Education and Labor Committee unanimously reported the bill after three days of extensive hearings involving interested parties from all segments of management, labor and others involved in workmen's compensation.

H.R. 12006 will provide broad and far-reaching improvement in the benefit structure, coverage and administration of this 47 year-old workmen's compensation program. The benefits under this statute which covers more than 800,000 workers including workers, employees in the District of Columbia, at overseas bases (primarily construction workers), in nonappropriated fund employment, and in projects on the Outer Continental Shelf have not been improved for 12 years. A Fact Sheet which explains the major provisions of this bill is attached for your information.

Claims have been made by certain individuals that the Committee Bill eliminates the right of longshoremen to bring third party actions against vessels on which they are injured. That is absolutely untrue. The fact is that the Committee Bill preserves the rights of injured longshoremen to sue third parties, including vessels, whose negligence caused injury to the longshoremen. In that respect, the Committee Bill leaves the longshoremen in exactly the same position as land based employees. The Committee Bill eliminates only the vessel's liability without fault under the so-called "unseaworthiness" doctrine, and the indemnity agreements and warranties under which stevedores have been held liable for damages payable by vessels far in excess of compensation benefits.

Under the Committee Bill, vessels will have the same duty as land based employers to provide a safe place to work for longshoremen, and if a vessel or its crew is negligent the vessel will be liable as a third party to the injured longshoreman for unlimited damages just as would a land based employer.

H.R. 12006 is endorsed by the AFL-CIO, the International Longshoremen's Association (whose 115,000 membership is covered by the Act), the International Longshore-

men's and Warehousemen's Union (whose 20,000 members are also covered by the Act), and by the overwhelming number of employers, port associations and others in the maritime industry. The bill has the strong endorsement of the Administration and is consistent with the recently issued bipartisan recommendations of the Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Programs.

We believe you will agree that such solid unanimity of view is rare among these groups. They consider H.R. 12006 to be in the best interest of the injured worker, the United States maritime industry, and the economy of our country.

We urge your support and vote for this bill which will provide a modern workmen's compensation program for a substantial number of American workers.

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS.
DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.
ALBERT H. QUIE.
MARVIN L. ESCH.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.

FACT SHEET

The major improvements provided by H.R. 12006 are the following:

Restore the opportunity for most injured workers to receive 66 2/3% wages when incapacitated by a work injury;

Immediate increase in maximum limit on weekly payments for injured workers from \$70 to \$167 a week;

Increases thereafter in the weekly limit will be based on the recommendation of the Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Programs over a four-year period;

Automatic adjustment of benefit levels on an annual basis to reflect increases in cost of living;

Improved medical service and rehabilitative assistance and opportunities for injured workers;

Increased benefits to survivors of workers killed as a result of job injuries;

Substantial upgrading of benefits to injured workers or survivors, presently receiving payments—now as low as \$25 per week in some cases;

Improved financial structure for providing payments to injured handicapped workers;

New mechanisms for the Secretary of Labor to provide assistance to workers so that they may obtain the maximum benefit due them under the Act.

These provisions are regarded as essential to a model workmen's compensation program by industry, labor and experts in workmen's compensation.

H.R. 12006 modifies third party suits by outlawing indemnity actions or agreements that result in the stevedore paying most or all the third party award. Also, in order to successfully sue a vessel, a longshoreman must now establish that the vessel was, in fact, negligent. This is the same standard applicable in all land based, non-maritime third party suits.

THE GREEK JUNTA IN ACTION: THE DISSOLUTION OF TWO ASSOCIATIONS

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Niall MacDermot, O.B.E., Q.C. is the Secretary General of the International Commission of Jurists and a former Minister of State in the Government of the United Kingdom. He was educated at Rugby, Balliol College, Oxford and Inner Temple, Lon-

don. A British barrister-at-law, he was first elected to the House of Commons, representing Lewisham North in 1957. He represented Derby North from 1962 to 1970.

In May of this year, Mr. MacDermot went to Athens as an observer of proceedings to dissolve two Greek voluntary associations. Following my remarks are Mr. MacDermot's comments on the May 16, 1972 hearing.

This report confirms what many Americans recognize. Greece today is not a free nation. It is governed by a military junta which does not tolerate even the mildest constructive dissent.

The report follows:

REPORT AND COMMENTS ON PROCEEDINGS FOR THE DISSOLUTION OF TWO GREEK ASSOCIATIONS

(By Niall MacDermot, Q.C.)

REPORT

1. I attended these proceedings as an international observer on behalf of the International Commission of Jurists, having notified the Minister of Justice in advance of my intention to do so. At the hearing I made my presence known to the Judges, the Procurator-General, the Counsel for the Prefect and Counsel for the Defence. I had the assistance of interpreters throughout the hearing.

2. The proceedings were brought by the Chief Administrative Officer or Prefect of Athens against the Society for the Study of Greek Problems and the Greek-Europe Youth Movement, asking for an order for the dissolution of both associations.

3. These were civil proceedings before the Court of First Instance of Athens. The Court comprised three judges presided over by Judge Mekalas. As questions of public order were involved the Public Prosecutor, Mr. Klisiaris, intervened in the proceedings. The Society for the Study of Greek Problems was represented by Mr. George Mangakis and the Greek-Europe Youth Movement by Mr. Golinopoulos (who was a member of the Board of the Society for the Study of Greek Problems) and Mr. Bouloukos. The hearing took place in the evening. The court sat at 7 pm. The proceedings against the associations began at 8:45 pm and concluded at 1 am.

4. There was room in the court for about 150 to 200 persons. The proceedings were supposed to be in public but a large part of the "public" comprised police officers either in uniform or in civilian clothes. Entry into the court was controlled by the police. A number of young people who sought to enter the court were arrested and released a few hours later. Others had their identity cards impounded and were turned away and told to call and collect them from the security police on the following morning.

5. A number of distinguished personalities were present in court who had come to give evidence on behalf of the associations, but in the event only one of them was allowed to do so. These included the former Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. Panayotis Canelopoulos, four former Ministers of Justice, MM. George Mavros, Demetrios Papaspyrou, who was the last Speaker of the Greek Parliament, Constantine Kallias and Constantine Papacostantinou; a former Vice-President of the Supreme Court, Mr. A. Floros; the Professor Emeritus of Political Economy at Athens University, Mr. Xenophon Zolotas; the Professor Emeritus of Theology, Athens University, Mr. Gerasimos Consideris; and a well-known publisher, Mr. Christos Lambakis.

6. The conduct of the proceedings was somewhat informal. The witness sat immediately in front of the presiding judge, and tended therefore to speak softly. Accord-

ingly he was surrounded by a tight group of 20 or 30 journalists and spectators who wished to hear all the evidence. Desultory and ineffectual efforts were made by police officers to persuade these people to sit down on the benches. Press and television photographers were present and no-one made any attempt to control them. At one moment while a witness was giving evidence a foreign television cameraman took close-up pictures of the witness and of the judges from a distance of three or four feet. I was given to understand that this latitude by the court was unusual.

7. The two associations had been formed and registered in accordance with the law in 1971. Their activities consisted in holding public meetings at which distinguished public figures, some from outside Greece, were invited to lecture on some subject of current interest. The lectures were followed by discussions in which the public could participate. A list of the speakers and lecture titles at the meetings held by the Society for the Study of Greek Problems is at Appendix A. Lord Gardiner, former Lord Chancellor of England, was due to address the Society on 29 May 1972 on "The International Protection of Human Rights". It is believed that this precipitated the action taken against the two associations.

8. The proceedings were based on Article 21 of Law No. 795 of 1971 on Associations, which provides as follows:

"Article 21.

Associations (a) whose object or activity is contrary to the territorial integrity of the State, or to the constitutional regime or to the established social order, or to the security of the State, or to the political and individual rights of the citizens and (b) which follow objects other than those defined in their statutes, or whose objects or functioning have become illegal or immoral or contrary to public order, shall be dissolved by an order of the Court of First Instance."

9. The formal demand of the Prefect for the dissolution of the Society for the Study of Greek Problems asserted, *inter alia*, that it had from the beginning deviated from its object in devoting itself to politics, that it had tried to form a political movement which is at present forbidden, that it criticised and attacked the National Government, that it wanted to perpetuate political passions and the party spirit and to create a climate of tension. It also asserted that the Society had carried on an illegal activity prejudicial to public order, the security of the State and the political and individual rights of citizens, that it had fomented demonstrations tending to undermine the confidence of the people in the State, public education, the economy and the established order in general. (The list of tendentious acts of this kind included the lectures of Monsieur Jean Rey and Herr Gunther Grass.) The assertions in the demand for the dissolution of the Greek-Europe Youth Movement were similar, but emphasis was laid on the alleged left-wing and anarchistic tendencies of the Movement.

10. The first hour the proceedings was taken up by an application by the defence for an adjournment. The first ground of the application was that the President of the Society for the Study of Greek Problems, Mr. Pesmazoglu, a distinguished Professor of Economics, and two members of the Board of the Society, Mr. Koumantas, a former Assistant Professor of Civil Law, and Mr. Peponis, former Director-General of the Greek Television and Radio Corporation had recently been arrested and banished to remote mountain villages without being charged with any offence, and that the case should be adjourned till they were released so as to be able to give evidence to support their society. The second ground of the application was that the formal copy of the proceedings

served upon the Society for the Study of Greek Problems did not correspond with the original.

11. Counsel for the Prefect resisted the application on the grounds that the associations were carrying on illegal activities which were endangering public order. Counsel for the Society made a vehement protest against this submission.

12. The Court refused to grant an adjournment and in ordering that the proceedings should continue stated that the oral evidence would be limited to one witness on behalf of each party.

13. In his opening speech, counsel for the Prefect stated that the dissolution of the two organisations was being requested on the grounds that they had overstepped the bounds of their original objects and were attempting, through meetings and other activities, to make propaganda against the constitutional order and the national economy with a view to undermining public confidence and causing unrest.

14. Evidence was heard first in the case against the Greek-Europe Youth Movement. The witness for the Prefect was the head of the section of the security police in Athens concerned with youth questions, Mr. Constantine Karapanayotis. He stated that the association was formed in January, 1971, with the aim of promoting the intellectual development of its members. He claimed that in the 25 meetings held by the association, the lecturers had all been "communist sympathisers", had put forward anarchist ideas and Marxist theory and had tried to turn public opinion against the established order. The Youth Movement had also published a review containing communist articles, including one by Che Guevara.

They had also published material from an edition of Plato's "Sophists" with an introduction by Glinos, who was formerly a member of the Greek Communist Party. The witness stated that the meetings were held with the intention of creating unrest among students. Asked by the President whether they had created student demonstrations, the witness said that some members of the association were arrested at three demonstrations which had taken place recently. (This was a reference to some demonstrations in which students had demanded the right to elect their own student council in place of the present nominated council.) The witness went on to say that the Greek-Europe Youth Movement had been supported by the Society for the Study of Greek Problems "which is also about to be dissolved". Pesmazoglu, Koumantos and Peponis had given talks to the Youth Movement. (These three persons are described in para. 10 above. None of them could remotely be described as "communist sympathisers".) The witness said he had attended some meetings himself. The rest of his evidence was hearsay based on police information.

15. Under cross-examination the witness was pressed to particularise the general allegations he had made but refused or was unable to do so. Examples of some of the questions and answers are as follows (as noted at the hearing):

Q. What was objectionable in the lecture which was given on "Contemporary and traditional cinema"?

A. It had political overtones.

Q. In what way?

A. I can't remember.

Q. What about the lecture on "Modern Music" given by Mr. Sizilianos?

A. It was stated that any form of dictatorship should be crushed (general laughter).

Q. What did you disagree with in the lectures?

A. The subject was always connected with social questions or the established order.

Q. What do you object to in Glinos' edition of Plato, the contents or the translator?

(Counsel pointed out that the work was published under the Metaxas dictatorship.)

(No answer.)

When asked to name members of the Greek-Europe Youth Movement who took part in the student demonstrations, the witness named six persons, but it turned out that only one of them belonged to the Movement.

The witness was unable to give an example of anything subversive said by Mr. Pesmazoglu, Mr. Koumantos or Mr. Peponis in their speeches to the students.

Q: Is Mr. Pesmazoglu left, right or centre?

A: You know better than I do.

Q: Was anything said by Mr. Pesmazoglu communistic?

A: No.

Q: What was the communist element in his talk on the stages of European unification?

A: Nobody said Pesmazoglu was a communist.

Q: Are you saying he was trying to overthrow the established constitution of the country?

(No audible answer.)

16. The witness called on behalf of the Greek-Europe Youth Movement was a former Athens University Professor, Mr. Zervos. He denied that the movement was "communistic". They had invited notable foreign personalities to lecture to them, such as the Polish mathematician Puratowski, who spoke on a purely scientific subject. The witness had himself given a purely nationalist lecture on Missolonghi on Greece's National Day, October 28, in the presence of senior officers. He had not been asked any questions or heard any comments of the kind that would be expected if the police officer's evidence was correct. The students were lively and exuberant as young people are, but they were not the revolutionary types.

The witness commented that "your Minister told students to express their views". (This was a reference to a speech made by Mr. Byron Stamatopoulos, Under-secretary to the Premier, in Patras a few days earlier. According to press reports he said: "The Government considers you mature enough to have rights. The revolution leans to the young men, to the new powers . . . You have every right to freely express your opinions not only regarding problems faced at the University, but we also want you to think about and express yourselves on matters of Greek foreign policy.") There was no challenge to this witness' evidence in cross-examination.

17. In the closing speeches, counsel for the Prefect said that they were asking for the dissolution of the Association for having overstepped the bounds of its original function. It had become a political organisation acting against the established regime, and in practising anti-government politics, it was trying to stir up the people to revolt. Counsel for the defence, Mr. Goflinopoulos argued that in the police officer's evidence, he had not given a single example to establish the truth of the allegations he was making.

18. Mr. Theodore Mantzavas, the police witness against the Society for the Study of Greek Problems, was then called. He said that the association was founded in February, 1971, with the aim of studying contemporary Greek problems. He had attended the first meeting which took place in "Parnasso". Among those who spoke were the President, Professor Pesmazoglu and Mr. Xidis (a former Greek Ambassador). They were casting aspersions upon the present regime, saying that no economic progress had been made during the years 1967-70. That they were being subversive was shown by the lengthy applause at the end of each paragraph. At the Jean Rey meeting, about 600 people were present, including the President of the Society. Their satisfaction at what he said was obvious. Though he came

[to Greece] as a guest, he criticised the regime.

19. The following are examples of the witness' answers to questions by the President of the Court and by counsel for the Prefect:

President. What recent events led to the arrest and banishment of the President of the Association?

A. The discussion about the Greek language, in which they were ironical about the existing legislation. (This is a reference to the government policy seeking to replace the present-day vernacular Greek by a form of Greek more akin to classical Greek.)

President: What was the effect of this?

A: They created such a crazy atmosphere in the audience that I had the impression that when they left they could do anything, even overthrow the regime.

President: Tell us what you know about Pesmazoglu.

A: Ever since the foundation of the Association the activities of Pesmazoglu have been clearly political.

President: Give concrete examples.

A: I have in mind indirect political activities. He published petitions for the release of political prisoners.

President: Do any documents exist?

A: In a lecture he said that a democratic procedure was necessary to fulfill the aims of the Association.

Counsel for the Prefect: What were they trying to achieve?

A: Their position was clearly against the government.

Q: In his lecture, a Mr. Louros . . . (referring to a well-known Professor).

Defence (Mangakis) (interrupting to object): The University Professor! "A Mr. Louros . . ." What's all this? (disturbance in the courtroom)

President (ringing the bell): Silence please . . .

Defence (Mangakis): But, Mr. President, it is not possible, "a Mr. Louros . . ."

President: Witness, continue.

A: Mr. Louros had said that we needed a government elected by the people.

Counsel for the Prefect: Were any declarations against the government made in those meetings?

President: He has already said so.

Q: Were they trying to arouse feelings?

A: Yes.

Q: Do you know that Pesmazoglu was not given a passport? Why?

A: Because of his political activities.

The following are extracts from the cross-examination of this witness by Defence Counsel:

Q: Do you know who the first president of the Association was?

A: I don't know.

Q: It was Papastefanou, President of the Nationalist Lawyers' Association. Tell me, what do you know about the first meeting in "Parnassos", the subject of which was "Greece-Europe"?

A: They said nothing was getting done in our country. That was the general theme. What should we do?

The witness agreed that the Society had printed and published all the lectures given to the Society, together with a summary of the discussions.

Q: Were those outside the aims and objects of the Association?

A: Yes, I didn't see any problem being studied.

Q: In all the Association's publications, can you find a single phrase that could be described as being "against the regime"?

A: I have no guarantee that all that was written is exactly what was said.

Q: You mean it was falsified?

A: Yes.

Q (handling over two publications): Is there in here a single falsified sentence? You must have read them.

A: I cannot vouch for their accuracy.

President: Take this report of the Gunther Grass lecture. How is it different from what was said?

(No audible answer.)

Defence Counsel: If there was something "bad", the newspapers would write about it for publicity reasons, and I apologise to the members of the Press who are here. Can you point out one word against the established regime?

A: It depends upon the effect they had on the public. The climate, the atmosphere of subversion was created.

Q: When you say they were "against the present situation", what do you mean?

A: The present situation—the constitutional situation—as you like.

Q: Were they against the government or the Constitution?

A: They were against the established order.

Q: What is that?

A: Against the regime.

Q: What made you think they would try to overthrow the regime?

A: On the faces of the gathering it was obvious they were going to undermine the regime.

Q: Was there any incident at any of the meetings?

A: There was no incident—but they were capable of it.

Q: Is a person who invites someone to speak responsible for what he says?

A: Yes, of course.

Q: Then the Press Secretary to the Prime Minister is responsible for what Gunther Grass said when he was invited to debate with him on television?

(No answer.)

Q (quoting from one of the published lectures): "The condition of progress is the functioning of democratic procedures". Is that subversive?

(No answer.)

20. Mr. Panayotis Canellopoulos, former Prime Minister of Greece, was called as the witness on behalf of the Society. He said he had followed all the activities of the Society closely. He was not present at the meetings, as he had not attended any public meetings since the coup d'état. He had, however, read newspaper reports of the meetings and also the Society's publications, which included the full text of the lectures. There was not one word in them which would justify the State in its application for the dissolution of the Society. All the lectures were on a high intellectual level. Jean Rey holds a prominent position in Europe. He was at one time President of the Commission of the European Community. At that time he (the witness) was president of the delegation responsible for the entry of Greece into the European Common Market. Jean Rey, who had also been a Minister in Belgium, is now being represented as being involved in an attempt to provoke agitation! This is what is so absurd. The people planted by a government in a crowd to applaud are not considered to be provocative, as opposed to the spontaneous applause during a meeting. His evidence concluded as follows:

President: You said you didn't take part in any meeting?

Witness: No, but I read the texts of the lectures.

President: Defence?

Defence (Mangakis) to witness: Do you have anything to add?

Witness: Yes. I was interrupted by the President. I would like to add that the activities of the Society have been represented as intended to overthrow the government. At least in the evidence about the conduct of the Society no such thing is mentioned. It is an absolute lie that the Society has been engaged in anti-national activity. If the activities of the Society are anti-national, then, all that I have been saying has been even

more anti-national and I cannot think of anybody who would not be considered anti-national under those circumstances. They say "Speak and criticise". But this seems to be a trap, because if anyone does speak he is arrested and put in jail. If the Court decides that the Society has gone too far, then I have gone even further. In this case it is not the Society which is on trial. It is Greek justice.

21. At the conclusion of the case the Public Prosecutor, Mr. Kiliaris, asked the Court to order the dissolution of the two societies which he said were undermining the established order. He conceded that some of the answers of the police witnesses under cross-examination had been unsatisfactory, but nevertheless asked the Court to accept their evidence about the dangerous nature of the societies. It was not what had been said at the meetings but the atmosphere which encouraged people to act in a way which was dangerous to public order. By their activities "they sow the seeds of doubt".

22. At the conclusion of the hearing the President said that written evidence could be submitted within the next three days.

23. On Tuesday, 23 May, an order was made dissolving both associations.

COMMENTS

24. Subject to the three matters mentioned below, it may be said that the case appeared to be fairly conducted. The defence were given the opportunity to cross-examine the police evidence and to present their own case. The President of the Court was reasonably patient and did not intervene at any great length, leaving the conduct of the proceedings to Counsel for the parties. It was obvious from the press attendance, apart from my own presence, that there was considerable international interest in the proceedings and the President was at pains to conduct the trial fairly.

25. The three matters on which I think it right to comment are as follows:

(1) Although it was within the power of the Court to limit the oral witnesses to one for each party (since these were civil and not criminal proceedings), it seems more than surprising that the order should have been made in a case of such importance and complexity. Its effect was to make it virtually impossible for either side to present their case properly. In particular, it was impossible for the Defence to call the witnesses they would have needed to call to be in a position to refute all the very general accusations made against the associations.

(2) It was most unsatisfactory in a trial of this kind for so much of the police evidence to have been hearsay evidence, which, therefore, could not be properly tested in cross-examination. Again, I understand it was within the power of the Court to permit this as the proceedings were civil. But, as one of the Defence Counsel (Mr. Mangakis) pointed out at the hearing, if the evidence given by the police was correct it would mean that the members of the associations had committed criminal offences. If they had been tried on criminal charges, much stricter rules of evidence would have applied and defence rights would have been better safeguarded. The Court and the Public Prosecutor seemed unperturbed by the inability of the police witnesses to particularise the general allegations they were making, much of which was based on hearsay information.

(3) The pressure to complete the oral proceedings on the same evening that they began made it impossible to enquire properly into the many serious issues raised in the case. I was surprised at the brevity of the cross-examination. When I commented to the defence lawyers that if I had to cross-examine these police witnesses before an English court I would expect my cross-examination to last several hours, their answer was that they

would have been stopped if they had attempted to do this. This was supported by the fact that one of the defence counsels was stopped by the Court when he had been cross-examining a police witness for about ten to fifteen minutes.

26. The three factors just mentioned combined to produce an atmosphere of unreality about the proceedings. No one present seemed to contemplate for a moment that the Court could do otherwise than make the order asked for by the Prefect with the support of the Public Prosecutor. The proceedings gave the impression of a ritual which had to be gone through before the order for dissolution of the associations was made. Certainly, by the standards of proof to which one has become accustomed in countries living under the Rule of Law, it is difficult to see how the police evidence could have been thought sufficient to establish the propositions which required to be proved in order to make out the case for dissolution under Article 21.

27. In this connection it seems that the phrase "contrary . . . to the constitutional regime or to the established social order" in Article 21 is construed by the Court as well as by the police as meaning "contrary to the Government." It will have been observed that one of the grounds on which the order was sought against the Society for the Study of Greek Problems was that "it criticised and attacked the National Government." Neither the police witnesses, nor the Court seemed able or willing to draw a distinction between activities which were subversive of public order and activities which were critical of the regime. The attitudes which were revealed at this trial demonstrated even more clearly than the result of the trial how far Greece has departed from the principles of the Rule of Law, and how paper thin is the facade of greater freedom of expression.

Geneva, June, 1972.

APPENDIX A

Public meetings of the Society for the Study of Greek Problems

1. April 29, 1971, at Parnassos Conference Hall; Subject: "Greece-Europe"; Speakers: N. Athanasiadis (Professor of Technology), Nikos Kyriazidis (Secretary General of Department of Coordination), Alecos Xydis (Ex-Ambassador), I. Pesmazoglu, and Anghelos Terzakis (Author).

2. May 31, 1971, at Hilton Hotel; Subject: "Ideological Basis of European Unity"; Speaker: Jean Rey (former President of European Commission).

3. November 1, 1971, at Hotel Alpha; Subject: "Our Glossary Problem"; Speakers: Alex. Argyriou (Author and Engineer), I. Th. Kakridis (former Professor of the University of Salonika), K. Kouloufakos (Editor), A. I. Peponis, and T. Sinopoulos (Author and Doctor).

4. November 22, 1971, at Hotel Alpha; Subject: "George Seferis, Nobel Laureate"; Speaker: Manolis Anagnostakis (Poet and Doctor), Yannis Dalla (Poet), Rodis Roufos (Author), T. Sinopoulos and Th. Frangopoulos (Author).

5. January 17, 1972, at Hotel Alpha; Subject: "Problems of Education: Humanitarian Culture and Professional Knowledge"; Speakers: K. Alavanos (Lawyer), Eli Yiotopoulou-Sissilianou; Irene Dilari (Chemist), G. Koumandos, I. Pesmazoglu, and Demetrios Fatouros (Professor of the University of Technology, Saloniaka).

6. February 28, 1972, at Hotel Alpha; Subject: "Technology, Intellectualism and the State"; Speakers: N. Louros (Professor); N. Kyriazidis; D. Th. Tsatsos (Professor of the University of Bonn); Betty Vakalopoulou (Architect).

7. March 20, 1972, at Hotel Alpha; Subject: "words versus Habit"; Speaker: Gunther Grass (German Author).

8. May 8, 1972, at Hotel Alpha; Subject: "Human Rights: Freedom of Speech and Communication"; Speakers: J. Kambanellis (Playwright); G. Koumandos; K. Kyriazis (Editor and Author); A. I. Peponis; V. Raphaelidis (Producer); Stratis Tsirkas (Author).

CONFERENCE REPORT: H.R. 14989

Mr. ROONEY of New York submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14989) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1567)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14989) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 15, 23, 25, 26, 31, 35, 40, 41, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 13, 16, 34, 36, 38, 46, 56, 57, and 58, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$260,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$176,190,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,276,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$34,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,178,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,672,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$205,026,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$144,721,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$36,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$67,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$69,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,855,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,812,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$76,008,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That not to exceed \$1,000,000

of the funds contained in this title shall be available for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed by judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals or by judges of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$32,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities Control Board, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$15,000 for expenses of travel, \$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the name.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 9, 10, 17, 20, 22, 33, and 37.

JOHN J. ROONEY
(except as to amendment 52),

ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JOHN M. SLACK,
NEAL SMITH,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
GEORGE MAHON,
FRANK T. BOW,
E. A. CEDERBERG,
MARK ANDREWS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
HIRAM L. FONG,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

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 votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14989) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judi-

clary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, 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:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Administration of foreign affairs

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$260,800,000 instead of \$260,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$261,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International organizations and conferences

Contributions to International Organizations

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$176,190,750 instead of \$152,120,250 as proposed by the House and \$184,808,169 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that after December 31, 1973, no appropriation is authorized and no payment shall be made to the United Nations or any affiliated agency in excess of 25 per centum of the total annual assessment of such organization except that this proviso shall not apply to the International Atomic Energy Agency and to the joint financing program of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

International commissions

International Fisheries Commissions

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$3,276,000 instead of \$3,234,500 as proposed by the House and \$3,327,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional funds will provide \$29,500 for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and \$12,000 for membership in the International Council for the Exploration of the sea.

Educational exchange

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Activities

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$45,000,000 instead of \$40,816,000 as proposed by the House and \$52,860,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Provides that not less than \$4,000,000 shall be used for payments in excess foreign currencies as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$6,200,000 instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,320,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—Department of State

Amendment No. 8: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds dependent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The amendment is as follows:

The funds provided for Salaries and Expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be used hereafter, in addition to those uses authorized thereunder, for the exchange of identification records with officials of federally chartered or insured banking institutions to promote or maintain the security of those institutions, and, if authorized by State

statute and approved by the Attorney General, to officials of State and local governments for purposes of employment and licensing, any such exchange to be made only for the official use of any such official and subject to the same restriction with respect to dissemination as that provided for under the aforementioned appropriation.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing that \$15,000,000 of the funds available for planning grants to States under section 205 may be allocated without regard to the population formula set forth in that section.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Social and economic statistics administration

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$34,800,000 instead of \$34,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$35,872,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that of the additional amount allowed \$100,000 is for providing each State with local area economic estimates prepared on a county-by-county basis.

1972 Economic Censuses

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$11,178,500 instead of \$10,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,857,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Economic Development Administration

Development Facilities

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$190,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$160,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Regional Action Planning Commissions

Regional Development Programs

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$41,672,000 instead of \$39,072,000 as proposed by the House and \$62,672,000 as proposed by the Senate.

While the conferees have not allowed the additional \$21,000,000 proposed by the Senate, it is felt that the subject matter should be studied by the proper legislative committee to insure that the necessary airport safety projects are determined.

International activities

Export Control

Amendment No. 15: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds dependent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Foreign direct investment regulation

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$2,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing that \$300,000 be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Financial and technical assistance, Trade Adjustment Assistance", fiscal year 1972.

United States Travel Service

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$9,000,000 instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$205,026,000 instead of \$197,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$221,265,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing that \$6,000,000 be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Financial and technical assistance, Trade Adjustment Assistance", fiscal year 1972.

Research, Development and Facilities

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$144,721,000 instead of \$127,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$197,612,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing that \$13,000,000 be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Financial and technical assistance, Trade Adjustment Assistance", fiscal year 1972.

Amendment No. 23: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds for the fish protein concentrate program dependent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Satellite Operations

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$36,320,000 instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,036,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administration of Pribilof Islands

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$3,232,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,432,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Fishermen's Protective Fund

Amendment No. 26: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds dependent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Patent Office

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$67,500,000 instead of \$67,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$68,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Bureau of Standards

Research and Technical Services

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$69,100,000 instead of \$62,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$76,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Provides that not to exceed \$2,855,000 may be transferred to the "Working capital fund", National Bureau of Standards, instead of \$1,960,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Provides that not to exceed \$10,812,000 appropriated for experimental technology development and application shall remain available until expended instead of \$7,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,424,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that not less than \$450,000 of this amount shall be used to initiate an expanded fiber, textile and apparel flammability research program on a non-matching basis.

Amendment No. 31: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds for certain programs dependent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Office of Telecommunications

Research, Engineering, Analysis, and

Technical Services

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$6,500,000 instead of \$5,800,000 as proposed by the

House and \$7,705,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are agreed that the additional \$700,000 is for general telecommunications research at the Institute of Telecommunications Services at Boulder, Colorado.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing that \$700,000 be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Financial and technical assistance, Trade Adjustment Assistance", fiscal year 1972.

Maritime Administration

Ship Construction

Amendment No. 34: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate with reference to the purchase of vessels for lay-up in the National Defense Reserve Fleet instead of language as proposed by the House.

General Provisions—Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 35: Deletes Senate provision making the availability of funds for the Maritime Administration dependent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States

Salaries

Amendment No. 36: Appropriate \$3,784,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,770,000 as proposed by the House.

Care of the Building and Grounds

Amendment No. 37: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing that not to exceed \$95,000 of the unobligated balance is continued available until June 30, 1973.

Customs Court

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$2,341,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,241,000 as proposed by the House.

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other judicial services

Salaries of Supporting Personnel

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$76,008,000 instead of \$75,663,000 as proposed by the House and \$78,518,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed will provide for an increase of 272 positions over those provided for fiscal year 1972 in the Probation Service and will provide 30 additional secretarial positions for circuit judges.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Insert aggregate salary limitations as proposed by the House.

Representation by Court—Appointed Council and Operation of Defender Organizations

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$14,500,000 instead of \$13,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,083,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Restores language proposed by the House amended to provide that not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds contained in this title shall be available for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed by judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals or by judges of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$10,626,000 instead of \$10,506,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,959,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Salaries of Referees

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$6,991,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$6,656,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Commission on Bankruptcy Laws of the United States

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$426,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$350,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Arms Control and Disarmament Activities

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$10,253,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds dependent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Commission on Civil Rights

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 49: Deletes Senate provision making availability of \$820,000 dependent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Commission on International Radio Broadcasting

International Radio Broadcasting Activities

Amendment No. 50: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds dependent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 51: Provides not to exceed \$1,700,000 for payments to State and local agencies instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$32,000,000 instead of \$25,110,000 as proposed by the House and \$42,896,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Special representation for trade negotiations

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$1,000,000 instead of \$925,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Subversive Activities Control Board

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$350,000, instead of \$450,000 as proposed by the House.

Tariff Commission

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$6,000,000 instead of \$5,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,160,000 as proposed by the Senate.

United States Information Agency

Special International Exhibitions

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$4,946,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,394,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 57: Deletes House provision relating to purchase or lease of certain motor vehicles.

The conferees are agreed that all Departments and agencies covered by this Act are to follow the restrictions placed upon the Department of Defense relative to the payment of shipping charges on foreign-made automobiles purchased in foreign countries by U.S. personnel.

Amendment No. 58: Inserts Senate provision prohibiting use of funds to carry out provisions of Executive Order 11605 of July 2, 1971.

Amendment No. 59: Deletes Senate provision making availability of funds dependent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1973 recommended

by the Committee of Conference with comparisons to the fiscal year 1972 amount, the 1973 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills for 1973 follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	\$4,289,990,110
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	1 4,704,326,600
House bill, fiscal year 1973	4,587,104,350
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	4,820,717,769
Conference agreement	4,681,017,850
Conference agreement compared with—	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	+391,027,740
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	—23,308,750
House bill, fiscal year 1973	+\$93,913,500
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	—139,699,919

¹ Includes \$16,338,000 in budget amendments not considered by the House.

JOHN J. ROONEY
(except as to amendment 52),

ROBERT L. F. SIKES,

JOHN M. SLACK,

NEAL SMITH,

JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,

GEORGE MAHON,

FRANK T. BOW,

E. A. CEDERBERG,

MARK ANDREWS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

JOHN O. PASTORE,

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

HIRAM L. FONG,

MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT: H.R. 16593

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 16593) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1566)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16593) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 56, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, and 87.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 59, 60, 75, 78, and 88, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,528,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, including aircraft and vessels; modification of aircraft, missiles, missile systems, and other ordnance; design of vessels; training and education of members of the Navy; administration; procurement of military personal; hire of passenger motor vehicles; welfare and recreation; medals, awards, emblems, and other insignia; transportation of things (including transportation of household effects of civilian employees); industrial mobilization; medical and dental distress; maritime care; care of the dead; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in salvage services; military communications facilities on merchant vessels; annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian members of teaching services; tuition, allowances, and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; repair of facilities; departmental salaries; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional entertainment, and welfare expenses for the enlisted men; procurement of services, special clothing, supplies, and equipment; installation of equipment in public or private plants; exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$3,182,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 7202 of title 10, United States Code, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; \$5,145,754,000, and in addition \$50,000,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the Navy Stock Fund, of which not less than \$127,000,000 shall be available only for maintenance of real property facilities.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For expenses, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps including equipment and facilities; procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for the enlisted men; procurement and manufacture of military supplies, equipment, and clothing; hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation of things; medals, awards, emblems, and other insignia; operation of station hospitals, dispensaries, and dental clinics; and departmental salaries; \$373,729,000, of which not less than \$37,500,000 shall be available only for the maintenance of real property facilities."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for,

necessary for the operation, maintenance, and administration of the Air Force and the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; operation, maintenance, and modification of aircraft and missiles; transportation of things; repair and maintenance of facilities; field printing plants; hire of passenger motor vehicles; recruiting advertising expenses; training and instruction of military personnel of the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay, allowances, and travel expenses of contract surgeons; repair of private property and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers; care of the dead; chaplain and other welfare and morale supplies and equipment; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for enlisted men and patients not otherwise provided for; awards and decorations; industrial mobilization, including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and procurement planning; special services by contract or otherwise; and not to exceed \$2,249,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; \$6,200,372,000, and in addition, \$50,000,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the Defense Stock Fund, of which not less than \$216,700,000 shall be available only for the maintenance of real property facilities."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments and the Civil Defense Preparedness Agency), including administration; hire of passenger motor vehicles; welfare and recreation; awards and decorations; travel expenses, including expenses of temporary duty travel of military personnel; transportation of things; industrial mobilization; care of the dead; tuition and fees incident to the training of military personnel at civilian institutions; repair of facilities; departmental salaries; procurement of services, special clothing, supplies, and equipment; field printing plants; information and educational services for the Armed Forces; communication services; as follows: for the Secretary of Defense activities, \$43,369,000; for the organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, \$8,118,000; for the Office of Information of the Armed Forces, \$9,703,000; for the Armed Forces Institute, \$6,486,000; for intelligence and communication activities, \$450,187,000; for the Defense Nuclear Agency, \$10,970,000; for the Defense Supply Agency, \$683,758,000; for the Defense Contract Audit Agency, \$57,853,000; in all: \$1,270,444,000. Of the total amount of this appropriation not to exceed \$4,316,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payment may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government. Not less than \$14,430,000 of the total amount of this appropriation shall be available only for the maintenance of real property facilities."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$443,194,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$456,726,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$668,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,239,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,829,032,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,545,213,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,122,940,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$174,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 744. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be available for entering into any contract or agreement with any foreign corporation, organization, person, or other entity for the performance of research and development in connection with any weapon system or other military equipment for the Department of Defense when there is a United States corporation, organization, person, or other entity equally competent to carry out such research and development and willing to do so at a lower cost."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 745. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for any research involving uninformed or involuntary human beings as experimental subjects."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in

disagreement amendments numbered 3, 7, 19, 24, 30, 34, 55, 89, and 90.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
(Except as to amendments 40 and 87),
JOHN J. McFALL,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
STUART SYMINGTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

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 votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16593), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, 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:

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Military personnel, Army

Amendment No. 1—Appropriates \$7,528,000,000 instead of \$7,488,461,000 as proposed by the House, and \$7,533,063,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that the total reduction of \$180,063,000, instead of the House reduction of \$219,602,000 and the Senate reduction of \$175,000,000, should be allocated to specific items as contained in the House Report as follows: Military strength shortfall, \$157,913,000; Recruiting programs, \$4,350,000; Reduction in numbers of medical doctors, \$1,250,000; Movement of household goods by aircraft, \$600,000; Use of commercial aircraft instead of Military Airlift Command, \$200,000; Shipment of foreign automobiles, \$2,100,000; Increased allowance for shipment of household goods, \$1,500,000; Grade creep, \$12,000,000; and new lieutenant generals, \$150,000. The House receded from its specific reductions on all remaining items.

Military personnel, Navy

Amendment No. 2—Appropriates \$5,306,749,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,260,081,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are in agreement that the \$75,000,000 reduction is to be allocated to specific items as contained in the House Report as follows: Military strength shortfalls, \$15,700,000; Recruiting programs, \$3,887,000; Support to other nations, \$17,100,000; Headquarters operations, \$10,465,000; Responsibility pay, \$28,000; Southeast Asia amendment, \$13,800,000; Permanent change of station travel, \$3,900,000; Movement of household goods by aircraft, \$400,000; Increased allowance for shipment of household goods, \$600,000; Grade creep, \$10,000,000 and an addition of \$880,000 for the Inter American Training Center. The House receded from its specific reductions on all remaining items.

Amendment No. 3—Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to agree to the Senate amendment, with an amendment providing that none of the \$1,000,000 made available for the payment of transportation costs already incurred and chargeable to the fiscal year 1971 Military Personnel, Navy appropriation, which is in a deficit position, can be used until such time as a report of the deficiency as required by Revised Statutes 3679 (31 USC 665) has been submitted to the Congress.

Military personnel, Marine Corps

The conferees are in agreement that the reduction of \$1,356,000 should be allocated to specific items as contained in the House Report as follows: Recruiting programs, \$1,384,000; Parachute pay, \$426,000; Training travel for officers, \$143,000; Movement of household goods by aircraft, \$150,000; Shipment of foreign automobiles, \$300,000; Increased allowance for shipment of household goods, \$200,000; Grade creep, \$3,000,000; and the addition of \$4,247,000 for subsistence, clothing and quarters allowances. The House receded from its specific reductions on all remaining items.

Military personnel, Air Force

Amendment No. 4—Appropriates \$7,150,575,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,122,703,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are in agreement that the reduction of \$125,000,000 is to be allocated to specific items as contained in the House Report as follows: Military strength shortfall, \$59,756,000; Non-commissioned officer's academy, \$938,000; Support to other nations, \$21,861,000; Headquarters operations, \$4,789,000; Reduction in number of medical doctors, \$1,150,000; Parachute Pay, \$106,000; Southeast Asia/SALT amendments \$11,870,000; Movement of household goods by air, \$2,000,000; Shipment of foreign automobiles, \$2,530,000; Increased allowance for shipment of household goods, \$4,000,000; Grade creep, \$10,000,000; and officer severance pay, \$6,000,000. The House receded from its specific reductions on all remaining items.

Reserve Personnel, Army

Amendment No. 5—Appropriates \$453,734,000 proposed by the Senate instead of \$498,734,000 as proposed by the House.

Reserve Personnel, Navy

The conferees are in agreement that \$900,000 of the total reduction of \$1,680,000 is to be allocated to the program to convert certain units from pay group B to pay group A. The House direction with respect to this conversion is to remain in effect. The remainder of the reductions is to be allocated at the discretion of the Navy.

Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps

The conferees are in agreement that the reduction of \$1,349,000 is to be allocated at the discretion of the Marine Corps.

Reserve Personnel, Air Force

The conferees are in agreement that \$6,000,000 of the total reduction of \$7,900,000 is to be allocated to certain non-flying units of the Air Force Reserve. The House direction with respect to these non-flying units is to remain in effect. The remainder of the reductions is to be allocated at the discretion of the Air Force.

National Guard Personnel, Army

Amendment No. 6—Appropriates \$568,179,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$578,179,000 as proposed by the House.

National Guard Personnel, Air Force

The conferees are in agreement that \$400,000 of the total reduction of \$1,440,000 is to be allocated to recruiting programs of the Air National Guard. The remainder of the reduc-

tion is to be allocated at the discretion of the Air National Guard.

**TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY**

Amendment No. 7—Reported in technical disagreement. It is the intent of the Managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

For Operation and Maintenance, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Defense Agencies, the House established a series of specific limitations within each appropriation. The Senate reverted to large lump sum appropriations for each of these appropriations. The conferees agreed that for fiscal year 1973 the Congress should provide large lump sum appropriations for each service, but not for the Defense Agencies. However, the conferees further agreed that a provision would be included in the bill under "Operation and Maintenance, Army" requiring that the budget estimates for fiscal year 1974 for Operation and Maintenance Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force be submitted on a basis providing for the appropriation of specific sums for the various budget programs and activities, generally in accord with the structure included in the House version of the bill.

For Operation and Maintenance, Army, the bill appropriates \$6,636,570,000 instead of \$6,587,250,000 as proposed by the House, and \$6,866,619,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Senate agreed to the establishment of a separate appropriation for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", as proposed by the House.

The Senate also agreed to the House reduction of \$3,000,000 for Army Reserve technicians.

The House agreed to restore \$32,000,000 for the civilianization of kitchen police duties, as provided by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to restore only \$6,050,000 of the \$12,100,000 restored by the Senate in relation to the shortfall in military personnel.

The Senate added to the bill \$22,400,000 based on a revised estimate of the value of currency revaluation savings proposed by the Army. The conferees agreed to restore only \$6,700,000 rather than the amount proposed by the Senate.

The House agreed to the Senate increase of \$1,570,000 for the Safeguard Logistics Command.

The conferees agreed to allow only \$3,000,000 of the Senate increase of \$9,000,000 for the establishment of Army recruiting main stations.

The Senate report authorized the reprogramming and transfer of \$40,000,000 from depot maintenance operations to second destination transportation. The House had not reviewed this requirement. The conferees agreed that the Army should submit a prior approval reprogramming sometime after the convening of the 93rd Congress if this requirement exists at that time.

Operation and Maintenance, Navy

Amendment No. 8—Appropriates \$5,145,754,000 instead of \$5,134,779,000 as proposed by the House, and \$5,287,798,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Senate agreed to the establishment of a separate appropriation for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", as proposed by the House. The House agreed to restoring \$6,650,000 for the civilianization of kitchen police duties as proposed by the Senate.

The Senate restored \$1,000,000 of the House reduction of \$7,000,000 for intelligence operations of the Navy. The conferees agreed to restore \$500,000 in lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate.

The Senate restored a House reduction of

\$1,600,000 for the installation and repair of equipment, including the installation of the Army CHAPARRAL missile fire control units aboard Navy ships. The Senate agreed to recede on this item.

The House made a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the Navy's request for its Joint Uniform Military Pay System. The Senate restored these funds. The conferees agreed that only \$500,000 need be restored.

The Senate added \$6,650,000 to the Navy's request for second destination transportation. The House had not considered this matter. The conferees agreed that only \$3,325,000 would be added for this item.

The conferees agreed to the broader appropriation language as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps

Amendment No. 9—Appropriates \$373,729,000 instead of \$372,429,000 as proposed by the House, and \$381,823,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Senate agreed to the establishment of a separate appropriation for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", as proposed by the House.

The House agreed to restoring \$1,300,000 for the civilianization of kitchen police duties as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to the broader appropriation language as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force

Amendment No. 10—Appropriates \$6,200,372,000 instead of \$6,173,680,000 as proposed by the House, and \$6,424,705,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Senate agreed to the establishment of a separate appropriation for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Reserve", as proposed by the House.

The House made a reduction of \$3,300,000 because of an anticipated shortfall in Air Reserve paid drill strength. The Senate restored \$945,000 of this reduction. The Senate agreed to recede on this item.

The Senate restored \$20,000,000 for the Air Force civilianization of kitchen police duties. The conferees agreed that only \$15,000,000 need be restored.

The Senate restored \$3,804,000 of a House reduction of \$18,920,000 for operation of the Eastern test range. The House receded on this item.

The Senate restored \$1,200,000 of a House reduction of \$3,300,000 for 283 new civilian employees for contract administration operations in the Air Force. The Senate receded on this item.

The House receded to the Senate on the restoration of \$1,300,000 for contract support for Glasgow Air Force Base.

The House made a reduction of \$9,176,000 in the request for service support contracts in support of the South Vietnamese Air Force. The Senate restored these funds. The conferees agreed to restore only \$4,588,000 in lieu of the Senate figure.

The House had reduced by \$3,400,000 the Air Force request for additional funds for B-52 flight training of B-52 crews. The Senate restored all these funds. The conferees agreed that only \$2,000,000 should be restored, rather than the Senate amount.

The Senate added above the budget request \$21,950,000 for the pay of civilian personnel. The conferees agreed that the Senate should recede on this item and that if these funds are required they should be included in a supplemental request during the next session of the Congress.

The conferees agreed to the broader appropriation language as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, defense agencies

Amendment No. 11—Appropriates \$1,270,444,000 instead of \$1,267,644,000 as proposed by the House, and \$1,273,244,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to the establishment of specific limitations in the "Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies" appropriation as proposed by the House.

The Defense Intelligence Agency requested \$9,000,000 for additional employees and to expand existing contract studies. The House reduced this request by \$5,000,000 and the Senate restored \$2,600,000. The conferees agreed to restore only \$1,300,000 of the House reduction.

The National Security Agency requested an increase in the budget of \$16,600,000 for a variety of items. The House reduced this request by \$5,000,000. The Senate restored \$3,000,000 of this reduction. The conferees agreed to restore only \$1,500,000 of the House reduction.

The changes in the House amount required an increase in the allowance for intelligence and communications activities from \$447,387,000 to \$450,187,000.

Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve

Amendment No. 12—Appropriates \$199,299,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agreed to establish a separate appropriation for the Army Reserve.

Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve

Amendment No. 13—Appropriates \$136,119,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agreed to establish a separate appropriation for the Navy Reserve.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve

Amendment No. 14—Appropriates \$8,094,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agreed to establish a separate appropriation for the Marine Corps Reserve.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve

Amendment No. 15—Appropriates \$189,250,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agreed to establish a separate appropriation for the Air Force Reserves.

Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard

Amendment No. 16—Appropriates \$443,194,000 instead of \$433,120,000 as proposed by the House, and \$453,267,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The House reduced the request for headquarters operation and administration by \$2,850,000. The Senate restored \$700,000 of the House reduction. The conferees agreed to restore \$350,000.

The House reduced the Army Guard request for new technicians by \$12,700,000. The Senate restored these funds. The conferees agreed to restore only \$6,350,000.

The House reduced the request for operational supplies and equipment by \$10,000,000. The Senate restored \$6,747,000 of the House reduction. The conferees agreed that only \$3,374,000 should be restored.

Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard

Amendment No. 17—Appropriates \$456,723,000 instead of \$448,508,000 as proposed by the House, and \$460,143,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The House had made a reduction of \$4,800,000 based on an anticipated shortfall in drill strength. The Senate restored these funds and the House receded. The House also reduced the Air Guard request for new technicians by \$6,835,000. The Senate restored these funds. The conferees agreed to restore only \$3,418,000.

National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army

Amendment No. 18—Appropriates \$159,000 as proposed by the House instead of the \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—PROCUREMENT

Aircraft procurement, Army

Amendment No. 19—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers will offer a motion to appropriate \$33,500,000 instead of \$43,500,000 as proposed by the House, and \$38,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees agreed to delete \$5,300,000 from this appropriation for AH-IG Cobra helicopter gunship modifications, and to provide \$5,300,000 in the Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army appropriation for this effort.

The Conferees agreed to a general reduction of \$95,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances.

Amendments No. 20 and 21—Amendment No. 20 provides an additional \$95,000,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$85,000,000 as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 21 stipulates that, of the additional amount provided, \$10,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Aircraft Procurement, Army, 1972-1974" appropriation, as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided an additional \$85,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the "Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army, 1971-1973" appropriation.

Missile procurement, Army

Amendment No. 22—Appropriates \$668,200,000 instead of \$691,100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$663,900,000, as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$45,000,000 for the BGM/BTM-71A TOW Antitank missile, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees agreed to a general reduction of \$36,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$13,600,000 as proposed by the House, to be offset by transfer of prior year unobligated balances.

Amendment No. 23—Provides an additional \$36,500,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$13,600,000, as proposed by the House, the amount to be derived by transfer from the "Missile Procurement, Army, 1972/1974" appropriation. Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army

Amendment No. 24—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers will offer a motion to appropriate \$186,800,000 instead of \$279,200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$190,400,000, as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees agreed to delete \$3,600,000 from this appropriation for the XM-198 Towed 155mm howitzer, and to provide \$3,600,000 in the Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army appropriation for this weapon.

The House Conferees agreed to a reduction of \$36,400,000 for certain high-priority items, and to a general reduction of \$56,000,000 to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances, as proposed by the Senate.

With respect to the matter of providing battle tanks to the South Vietnamese Army, the Conferees direct that the Department of Defense immediately institute a program to refurbish available M48A1 tanks, and transfer these nonaccountable assets to South Vietnamese forces as soon as training and conversion of overhaul facilities can be completed. There are approximately 700 unserviceable M48A1 tanks in CONUS storage depots that can be used to establish a spare and repair parts float. During the intervening period, additional M48A3 tanks may be provided to the South Vietnamese forces, if necessary.

Amendment No. 25—Provides an additional \$56,000,000 for this appropriation. Of the additional amount provided, \$35,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army,

1971/1973" appropriation, and \$21,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, 1972/1974" appropriation, as proposed by the Senate. The House version of the bill contained no such provision.

Procurement of Ammunition, Army

Amendment No. 26—Appropriates \$1,262,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,318,800,000, as proposed by the House.

The Conferees agreed to a general reduction of \$56,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances. The Conferees further agreed that \$5,100,000 of the funds provided may be utilized to buy 76mm ammunition.

Amendment No. 27—Provides an additional \$56,000,000 for this appropriation. Of the additional amount provided, \$31,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 1972/1974" appropriation, and \$25,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Army Industrial Fund. The House had no such provision.

Other procurement, Army

Amendment No. 28—Appropriates \$592,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$597,500,000, as proposed by the House.

The Conferees agreed to a restoration of \$7,700,000 deleted by the House for float-ribbon bridges; and to a general reduction of \$37,500,000, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Provides an additional \$37,500,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000,000, as provided by the House, to be derived by transfer from the "Other Procurement, Army, 1972/1974" appropriation.

Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy

Amendment No. 30—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers will offer a motion to appropriate \$3,541,340,000 instead of \$3,682,140,000, as proposed by the House, and \$3,578,040,000, as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$472,400,000 for 35 S-3A Viking ASW aircraft, \$45,000,000 for initial spares, and \$61,200,000 in advance procurement funding for fiscal year 1974, for a total of \$578,600,000; instead of a total of \$622,400,000 for 42 such aircraft, as proposed by the Senate, and a total of \$485,400,000 for 23 aircraft, as proposed by the House.

With respect to the S-3A aircraft, the Conferees further agree that the funds provided are not to be obligated until this program has been thoroughly reevaluated from a cost-effectiveness and requirement standpoint in accordance with the observations and discussion of this matter in the House report, and the Secretary of Defense assures the Committees in writing that the continuation of this program is fully justified.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$25,000,000 for the procurement of the AIM-7F Sparrow III air-to-air missile, as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted the \$77,000,000 budgeted for this missile buy.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$110,700,000 for the procurement of 12 P-3C ASW patrol aircraft, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$214,700,000 for 24 such aircraft, as proposed by the House.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$7,100,000 in advance procurement funding for a fiscal year 1974 buy of the AV-8A Harrier V/STOL aircraft, as proposed by the House. The Senate had deleted these funds from the bill.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$299,200,000 for aircraft modifications, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$339,200,000 as proposed by the House.

The Conferees also agreed to a general reduction of \$155,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances.

Amendments No. 31 and 32—Amendment No. 31 provides an additional \$155,000,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$40,000,000, as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 32 stipulates that, of the additional funds provided, \$74,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Navy Stock Fund, \$20,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement of Aircraft and Missiles, Navy, 1972/1974" appropriation, and \$61,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement of Aircraft and Missiles, Navy, 1971/1973" appropriation, as provided by the Senate. The House had provided for a transfer of \$25,000,000 from the latter appropriation.

Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy

Amendment No. 33—Appropriates \$2,970,600,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,017,600,000, as proposed by the House.

The Conferees agreed to the deletion of \$47,000,000 for the conversion of a DLG guided missile frigate, as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided \$93,500,000 for the conversion of two such ships.

Other procurement, Navy

Amendment No. 34—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers will offer a motion to appropriate \$2,310,900,000 instead of \$2,328,400,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,316,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$13,800,000 for the SQR-14A Towed Array Surveillance System (TASS), and \$20,000,000 for NATO Sea-Sparrow launch and control units, as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided \$3,800,000 for the TASS and deleted the \$36,400,000 budgeted for the NATO Sea-Sparrow.

With respect to the NATO Sea-Sparrow, the Conferees agreed to hereby place the Department of Defense on notice that there shall be no further memorandums of agreement entered into with other nations for the procurement of military equipment until such procurement has been authorized and the funds appropriated therefor by the Congress.

The Conferees agreed to provide \$17,500,000 for the procurement of AN/SSQ-53 directional passive sonobuoys, but denied the \$2,500,000 budgeted for so-called product improvement of these sonobuoys. If this planned effort is required during fiscal year 1973, the Department of Defense may submit a reprogramming action utilizing Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy appropriations for this purpose.

The Conferees agreed to delete \$1,500,000 budgeted for the procurement of extended-range Walleye II glide bombs with a data link. A portion of these funds had been obligated by the Navy subsequent to the House report of September 11, 1972, denying the procurement, in violation of the Continuing Resolution understandings between the appropriate Committees of Congress and the Department of Defense. The Navy is directed to absorb the cost of the procurement through internal reprogramming of available funds. This does not constitute a commitment to production, and the direction on page 179 of the House report is to be adhered to by the Department of Defense.

The Conferees agreed to delete the \$2,100,000 budgeted for the installation of the Chaparral missile on Naval ships, as proposed by the House, for the reasons cited in the House report. The Senate had restored \$2,000,000 of the House reduction.

The Conferees also agreed to a general reduction of \$90,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances.

Amendments No. 35 and 36—Amendment No. 35 provides an additional \$90,000,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000,000, as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 36 stipulates that, of

the additional funds provided, \$40,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Other Procurement, Navy, 1972/1974" appropriation, and \$50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Other Procurement, Navy, 1971/1973" appropriation. The House had provided for a transfer of \$25,000,000 from the latter appropriation.

Procurement, Marine Corps

Amendment No. 37—Appropriates \$162,400,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$173,400,000, as proposed by the House.

The Conferees agreed to a general reduction of \$21,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000,000, as proposed by the House, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances.

Amendments No. 38 and 39—Amendment No. 38 provides an additional \$21,000,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000,000, as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 39 stipulates that of the additional amount provided, \$5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement, Marine Corps, 1972/1974" appropriation, and \$16,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement, Marine Corps, 1971/1973" appropriation. The House had provided for a transfer of \$10,000,000 from the latter appropriation.

Aircraft procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 40—Appropriates \$2,239,300,000 instead of \$2,368,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,152,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to provide \$421,600,000 for 30 F-15 fighter aircraft and \$536,400,000 for aircraft spares and repair parts, as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided \$320,600,000 for 15 F-15 aircraft and \$527,100,000 for aircraft spares and repair parts.

The conferees agreed to provide \$83,200,000 for 24 A-7D attack aircraft. The House had provided \$83,200,000 for 24 such aircraft and the Senate had deleted the funds included in the bill for these aircraft. Also agreed to was \$30,000,000 in advance procurement funding for a fiscal year 1974 buy option for the F-111F aircraft, as proposed by the House. The Senate had deleted the \$30,000,000.

The conferees agreed to provide \$32,000,000 for 60 A-37B attack aircraft, as provided by the House. The Senate had deleted the funds provided by the House for these aircraft.

The conferees also agreed to provide \$69,000,000 for two advanced airborne command post aircraft. The Senate had provided \$127,000,000 for four such aircraft. The House had deleted the funds for the procurement of operational aircraft, but had provided \$28,700,000 in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, appropriation for one test-bed aircraft.

The conferees further agreed to a general reduction of \$443,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$135,000,000 as proposed by the House, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances.

Amendments Nos. 41, 42, 43 and 44—Amendment No. 41 provides an additional \$443,000,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$135,000,000, as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 42 stipulates that, of the additional amount provided, \$135,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1971/1973" appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$110,000,000, as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 43 stipulates that, of the additional amount provided, \$115,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Air Force Stock Fund, \$35,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Defense Stock Fund, and \$118,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Army Stock Fund. Amendment No. 44 stipulates that, of the additional amount provided, \$40,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Air-

craft Procurement, Air Force, 1972/1974" appropriation. The House had provided an additional amount of \$135,000,000, of which \$110,000,000 was to be derived by transfer from the "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1971/1973" appropriation, and \$25,000,000 from the "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1972/1974" appropriation.

Missile procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 45—Appropriates \$1,670,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,637,500,000, as proposed by the House.

The Conference agreed to provide \$42,500,000 for the Command Data Buffer under the Minuteman Force Modernization budget activity, as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted these funds.

The Conference also agreed to a general reduction of \$35,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to be offset by the transfer of prior year unobligated balances. The House had proposed a general reduction of \$25,000,000 in this manner.

Amendments Nos. 46 and 47—Amendment No. 46 provides an additional \$35,000,000 for this appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 47 stipulates that, of the additional amount provided, \$4,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1972/1974" appropriation, and \$31,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1971/1973" appropriation, as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided for a transfer of \$25,000,000 from the latter appropriation.

Other procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 48—Appropriates \$2,099,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,139,300,000 as proposed by the House.

The Conference agreed to provide \$15,000,000 for the AN/TPN-19 Ground Approach Radar, as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted the \$31,800,000 budgeted for this radar.

The Conference also agreed to a general reduction of \$55,000,000 for munitions, as proposed by the Senate.

Procurement, Defense Agencies

Amendment No. 49—Stipulates that, of the \$7,700,000 general reduction proposed by the House, to be offset by transfers from prior year unobligated balances, \$2,700,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Defense Stock Fund, \$2,300,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement, Defense Agencies, 1971/1973" appropriation, and \$2,700,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Procurement, Defense Agencies, 1972/1974" appropriation. The House had provided that the \$7,700,000 be derived by transfer from the latter appropriation.

TITLE V—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army

Amendment No. 50—Appropriates \$1,829,032,000 instead of \$1,746,132,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,879,002,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$20,000,000 for initiation of development of an advanced attack helicopter for the Army. The Senate had provided \$29,500,000 and the House had deleted the funds entirely. The Managers are in agreement that the funds provided for the advanced attack helicopter shall not be obligated without Congressional approval as would be required for a prior approval reprogramming item of special interest.

The \$9,120,000 requested for the Aerial Scout helicopter is disallowed.

A total of \$18,000,000, the sum requested in the Budget, is provided for the Redeye II surface-to-air missile program, as proposed

by the Senate, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House. The House proposal that this program be conducted on a competitive prototype basis was not agreed to.

A general reduction of \$72,550,000 was agreed to instead of a reduction of \$112,800,000 as proposed by the House or a reduction of \$32,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Senate reductions of \$950,000 for Independent In-House Research and Development and \$300,000 for Electronic Warfare are agreed to.

The position of the House that the Heavy Lift Helicopter program proceed on a competitive component development basis was not agreed to.

The conferees are in agreement that \$5,300,000 for the AH-1G Cobra helicopter modification effort be provided in this appropriation rather than in the procurement appropriation as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted the item.

The conferees are in agreement that \$3,600,000 for the XM-198 Towed Howitzer program be provided in this appropriation rather than in the procurement appropriation as proposed by the Senate.

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy

Amendment No. 51—Appropriates \$2,545,213,000 instead of \$2,504,343,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,598,213,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$6,000,000 for the Submarine Launched Cruise Missile program instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

A total of \$32,100,000 is provided for the Surface Effects Ship program as proposed by the House, instead of \$41,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The \$9,000,000 proposed by the Senate for development of subsystems for the 2,000 ton ship was deleted.

A general reduction of \$99,600,000 was agreed to instead of the \$139,600,000 reduction proposed by the House and the \$59,600,000 reduction proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes reductions of \$430,000 for In-house Independent Research, \$1,000,000 for Airborne Electronic Warfare, \$1,000,000 for Surface Electronic Warfare, and \$7,000,000 for In-house Independent Laboratory exploratory development as proposed by the Senate.

The House directed in the Report that the Trident missile development effort be conducted competitively. The Senate Report stated that major components of the system be developed under competitive procedures. The conferees are in agreement that not less than 51 percent of the major components, by dollar value, must be obtained through competitive procedures.

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force

Amendment No. 52—Appropriates \$3,122,940,000 instead of \$3,080,440,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,161,040,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Committee of Conference recommends the appropriation of \$25,000,000 for airframe development related to the Medium STOL transport aircraft rather than \$16,000,000 for engine development as proposed by the House and \$16,000,000 for engine development plus \$35,800,000 for airframe development as proposed by the Senate. No funds are provided for engine development.

The conferees agree to the Senate increase of \$4,600,000 more than the House amount for the Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy (SCAD) program.

A total of \$112,000,000 is provided for the Advanced Ballistic Reentry system (ABRES) program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$122,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes \$53,-

200,000 for the Advanced Airborne Command Post in this appropriation as proposed by the House. The funding of the test-bed aircraft is thus retained in the RDT&E appropriation.

A general reduction of \$135,300,000 is imposed instead of a reduction of \$175,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$95,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to Senate reductions of \$800,000 in both Intelligence reconnaissance equipment and in Protective Systems. Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense Agencies

Amendment Nos. 53 and 54—Make technical corrections in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers will offer a motion to appropriate \$435,313,000 instead of \$435,513,000 as proposed by the House and \$467,313,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference is in agreement on unallocated reductions of \$9,200,000 for ARPA, \$5,200,000 for DNA, \$7,900,000 for NSA, \$450,000 for DSA, and \$1,750,000 for OSD/JCS support.

The Managers are in agreement on reductions of \$300,000 for the Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Hopkins; \$1,600,000 for the Institute of Defense Analyses; \$1,900,000 for Lincoln Laboratory; and \$1,400,000 for the Rand Corporation; as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement on the transfer of \$27,000,000 from this appropriation to a new appropriation for the Director of Test and Evaluation, as proposed by the House.

The conference action provides the following ceiling amounts, less the allocation of the reduction in Federal Contract Research Centers:

Advanced Research Projects

Agency	\$203,710,000
Defense Communications Agency	13,216,000
Defense Nuclear Agency	123,527,000
Defense Intelligence Agency	1,584,000
Defense Supply Agency	12,337,000
OSD/JCS Technical Support	15,562,000

Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense

Amendment No. 56—Appropriates \$27,000,000 for the new Test and Evaluation organization in a separate appropriation as proposed by the House instead of as a part of the "RDT&E, Defense Agencies" appropriation as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 57—Section 707(a). Places a limitation of \$174,450,000 on overseas dependents' education instead of \$172,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$176,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58—Section 707(1). Deletes provision proposed by the Senate which would authorize reimbursement to the General Services Administration for expenses of National Industrial Equipment Reserve.

Amendment No. 59—Section 708(1). Makes technical change proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60—Section 715. The Conference agreed to the inclusion of May 31, 1973, as proposed by the Senate, as the date for termination of flight pay for officers of the rank of colonel or equivalent or above in non-combat assignments.

Amendment No. 61—Section 720. The Conference agreed to the House language prohibiting the use of foreign currency for conversion of heating plants from coal to oil at defense facilities in Europe.

Amendments Nos. 62, 63, 64, and 65—Section 724. Include "specialty metals" in list of items to be procured only in the United States, as proposed by the House, and makes technical changes.

Amendment No. 66—Section 729. Conference agreed to House language making ammuni-

tion available for National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and travel funds available for Department of Defense personnel attending rifle matches.

Amendments Nos. 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 72. Change section numbers.

Amendment No. 73—Section 735. Provides general transfer authority of \$750,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$850,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74—Section 735. Inserts House language "or any subdivision thereof" to permit transfer under new appropriation language for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies".

Amendment No. 75—Section 735. Deletes House language with respect to Civilianization of Kitchen Police program. This language is no longer needed as funds have been provided in the bill for the Civilianization of Kitchen Police as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77. Change section numbers.

Amendment No. 78—Section 737. Imposes a limitation of \$2,735,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,500,000,000 as proposed by the House on funds available for support of Vietnamese and other Free World Forces.

Amendments Nos. 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83. Change section numbers.

Amendment No. 84—Section 743. Conferees agreed to the House language prohibiting the use of funds for the conversion of heating plants from coal to oil at defense facilities in Europe.

Conferees also agreed to the deletion of a provision proposed by the Senate prohibiting funds to be used for Exercise Reforger or Exercise Crested Cap or similar dual base exercises.

Amendment No. 85—Section 744. Changes section number and inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting research and development contracts or agreements with foreign companies when equally competent United States companies can perform at a lower cost.

Amendment No. 86—Section 745. Changes section number and inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for any research involving uninformed or nonvoluntary human beings as experimental subjects. There has been no indication or evidence that the Department of Defense has performed such research.

Amendment No. 87. Conferees agreed to delete provision proposed by the Senate with respect to termination of hostilities in Indochina at earliest practicable date, as set forth in last year's Procurement Authorization Act.

The Conferees agreed that since there is permanent legislation with respect to termination of hostilities in Indochina, there is no need for the inclusion of this provision in this bill.

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS

Amendment No. 88—Inserts new title making additional authorizations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 89—Reported in technical disagreement.

The Managers will offer a motion to agree to the Senate amendment making additional authorizations, with an amendment increasing the amount for aircraft for the Air Force by \$62,000,000, of which \$32,000,000 is for 60 A-37B aircraft and \$30,000,000 is for long lead time procurement items for the F-111 aircraft.

Amendment No. 90—Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to increase the limitations on funds for free world forces from \$2,500,000,000 to \$2,735,000,000.

Inclusion of additional authorizations in this appropriation bill is required because of the special situation brought about by the

submission of a Budget Amendment on June 30th. This procedure should not be construed as establishing a precedent.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
(except as to amendments 40 and 87),
JOHN J. MCFALL,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
STUART SYMINGTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for this week, on account of official business.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for this week, on account of official business.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD, today, for 30 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARLSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAILSBACK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ASPIN) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUNNELS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MELCHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 10 minutes, on October 11.

Mr. DOWNING, for 60 minutes, on October 12.

Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes, on October 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON, and to include tables and other extraneous material in his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 16810, the public debt limitation bill.

Mr. FRASER, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$425.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARLSON) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in 11 instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. McKEVITT.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. ESCH in four instances.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. HEINZ.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ASPIN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. BEGICH in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. ROE in three instances.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in five instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in five instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1524. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1928. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the St. Croix River, Minnesota and Wisconsin, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3627. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain mineral rights in certain lands located in Utah to the record owner thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3930. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and under lands in Onslow County, N.C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 4059. An act to provide that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District of Columbia shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of his blood, breath, or urine, for the purpose of determining the blood alcohol content; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. 56. An act to establish a national environmental data system and State and regional environmental centers pursuant to policies and goals established in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2118. An act for the relief of the estate of Amos E. Norby.

H.R. 9676. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of the University of Tennessee.

H.R. 10655. An act to designate certain lands in the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., as wilderness;

H.R. 13780. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property in Canadagua, N.Y., to Sonnenberg Gardens, a nonprofit, educational corporation;

H.R. 13825. An act to extend the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribe, band, or group; and

H.R. 14731. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to provide for the effective enforcement of the provisions therein prohibiting the shooting at birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 6, 1972, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3817. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to authorize the establishment of a National Guard for the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 5838. An act to designate certain lands in the Lava Beds National Monument in California, as wilderness;

H.R. 6318. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Burns Indian Colony, Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9198. An act to amend the Act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems;

H.R. 10243. An act to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes;

H.R. 11047. An act for the relief of Donald W. Wotring;

H.R. 11629. An act for the relief of Cpl. Bobby R. Mullins;

H.R. 11948. An act to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for participation by the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law;

H.R. 13533. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the reimbursement of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from urban renewal; to provide for reimbursement of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from Federal-aid system programs; and to amend section 5 of the Act approved June 11, 1878 (providing a permanent government of the District of Columbia), and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 1211. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission;

H.J. Res. 1257. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for the annual contributions by the United States for the support of the International Agency for Research on Cancer;

H.J. Res. 1263. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 30, 1972, as "National Sokol Day".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 11, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2410. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for criminal penalties for all who knowingly and willfully refuse or fail to file required reports, keep required data or falsify records; provide criminal penalties for unlawful carriage of persons for compensation or hire; to increase the civil penalty limits; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5932. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to review as to its suitability for preservation as wilderness, the area commonly known as the Indiana Peaks Area in the State of Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. Report on U.S. Bureau of Customs examination and screening procedures at ports of entry (Rept. No. 92-1554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 17034. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANLEY. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 14934. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make levels III and IV of the Executive Schedule applicable to certain positions within the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3310. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the authorized strength of the Naval Reserve in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2572. A bill for the relief of the city of New York; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 216. An act to permit suits to adjudicate certain real property quiet title actions; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 16593; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1566). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14989 (Rept. No. 92-1567). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3008. An act for the relief of August F. Walz. Rept. No. 92-1549. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 909. An act for the relief of John C. Rogers. (Rept. No. 92-1550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2714. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. William C. Harpold, U.S. Marine Corps (retired) (Rept. No. 92-1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3257. An act for the relief of Gary Wentworth, of Staples, Minn. (Rept. No. 92-1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3055. An act for the relief of Maurice Marchbanks (Rept. No. 92-1553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14923. A bill for the relief of Michael Joseph Wendt; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2270. An act for the relief of Magnus David Forrester (Rept. No. 92-1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2275. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Kutter (Rept. No. 92-1562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2518. An act for the relief of Anna Kolbizar-Sala (Rept. No. 92-1563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2822. A bill for the relief of Alberto Rodriguez (Rept. No. 92-1564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3583. An act for the relief of Gerald Vincent Bull (Rept. No. 92-1565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 17034. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 17035. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 17036. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide visas for parents of permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17037. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate U.S. citizenship requirements with respect to employment of personnel by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 17038. A bill designating the Oakley Reservoir on the Sangamon River at Decatur, Ill., as the William L. Springer Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 17039. A bill designating the Oakley Reservoir on the Sangamon River at Decatur, Ill., as the William L. Springer Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 17040. A bill authorizing the city of Clinton Bridge Commission to convey its bridge structures and other assets to the State of Iowa and to provide for the completion of a partially constructed bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, by the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 17041. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 17042. A bill providing for the establishment of a wild area system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 17043. A bill to establish the Federal Audiovisual Coordination Board, regulate production by Federal agencies of audiovisual materials, and provide certain labor standards in connection therewith; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 17044. A bill to amend the act providing an exemption from the antitrust laws with respect to agreements between persons engaging in certain professional sports for the purpose of certain television contracts in order to terminate such exemption when a home game is sold out; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 17045. A bill designating the Oakley Reservoir on the Sangamon River at Decatur, Ill., as the William L. Springer Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17046. A bill to provide emergency real estate tax relief to senior citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 17047. A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any nonmarket economy country which denies to its citizens the right to emigrate or which imposes more than nominal fees upon its citizens as a condition to emigration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 17048. A bill to discourage the use of leg-hold or steel jaw traps on animals in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 17049. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the rates of the excise tax on telephone and teletypewriter exchange service for 1973 through 1975 and to eliminate such tax for periods after December 31, 1975; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 17050. A bill to amend the act providing an exemption from the antitrust laws with respect to agreements between persons engaging in certain professional sports for the purpose of certain television contracts in order to terminate such exemption when a home game is sold out; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 17051. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to deem certain World War I veterans to be totally disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17052. A bill to amend section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 17053. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding and improving the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 17054. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 17055. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make loans to certain railroads in order to restore or replace essential facilities and equipment damaged or destroyed as a result of natural disasters during the month of June 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. STRATTON):

H.R. 17056. A bill to provide for the creation of the National Fire Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. STRATTON):

H.R. 17057. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 17058. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to accredited institutions of higher education to pay for up to one-half of the costs of fire science programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 17059. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 17060. A bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 17061. A bill to extend for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 17062. A bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 17063. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17064. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations providing for the placarding of certain vehicles transporting hazardous materials in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 17065. A bill to amend section 2503 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZION (for himself and Mr. DORN):

H.R. 17066. A bill designating the Oakley Reservoir on the Sangamon River at Decatur, Illinois, as the William L. Springer Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 1324. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the designation of the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 718. Concurrent resolution providing for the reprinting of additional copies of House Report No. 92-1519, entitled "Securities Industry Study"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. SISK, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. SMITH of California, and Mr. LATTA):

H. Res. 1153. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to House consideration of certain Senate amendments; to provide for the delegates from Guam and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H. Res. 1154. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 17067. A bill for the relief of Jackie Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 17068. A bill for the relief of Raffaele and Ida Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 1155. Resolution opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed

under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

REGISTRATIONS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1972:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration") : To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19-----

REPORT
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

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]

A. Patricia Abbott, 1625 A West Grance Street, Richmond, Va.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington D.C. 20006.

A. John J. Adams, Suite 550, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Vepco, Seventh and Franklin Streets, Richmond, Va.

A. Jerry Agoglia, Box 1310, Fairfield University, Fairfield, Conn. 06430.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Alderson, Catherwood, Ondov & Leonard, 105 East Oakland Avenue, Austin, Minn. 55912.

B. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.

A. Americans for Democratic Action, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. E. Lynne Arnold, Salisbury State, Salisbury, Md.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington D.C. 20006.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Michael A. Aymond, Room 315, Prentiss Hall, Winona, Minn.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Donald L. Badders, 910 South Michigan Avenue, Room 530, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

A. Lois Baer, 261 Lyndhurst Place, Lexington, Ky.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Ned Baker, D.W.J.C., University Drive, Nashua, N.H.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Bebchick, Sher & Kushnick, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. North Atlantic Mediterranean Freight Conference.

A. Richard Begay, Navajo Community College, Chinle, Ariz.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert Berk, Student Senate, Bryant College, Smithfield, R.I.

B. National Student Lobby, 1823 K Street NW., Washington D.C. 20006.

A. Ben Bloom, 137 Miller Hall, Big Rapids, Mich.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington D.C. 20006.

A. Karen Bock, 132 Sager, Michigan Center, Mich.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Becky Bogard, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Linda Bowen, 2050 East Evans, Denver, Colo.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Greg Bowman, Salisbury State, Salisbury, Md.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles G. Bragg, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

A. Michael E. Brown, M-32 Indiana Memorial Union, Bloomington, Ind.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Patrick Burch, 5206 Holden Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Gary Burkhardt, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. George Bursach, 12817 Meadowood Drive, Silver Spring, Md. 20904.

B. The Society of Tax Accounting and Returns Specialists, Inc., 501 13th Street, NW., Suite 1032, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Ray Burt, Box 2027 Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va. 24504.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Busby Rivkin Sherman Levy & Rehm, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Automobile Importers of America, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charles R. Carlisle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.

A. Jim Carter, 900 West Franklin, Richmond, Va. 23220.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Howard P. Chester, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Stone Glass and Clay Coordinating Committee, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Paul G. Chicos, 712 East John Street, Appleton, Wis.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Cabot Corp., et. al., 125 High Street, Boston Mass. 02110.

A. Coalition to Tax Pollution, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Donald Cooke, 806 Napoleon Road, Michigan Center, Mich.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Northwestern Refining Co., Drawer 9, St. Paul Park, Minn. 55071.

A. Karen Crocker, Salisbury State, Salisbury, Md.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Cumberland, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Ken Daly, Box 1310, Fairfield University, Fairfield, Conn. 06430.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Office Machine Dealers Association, 2510 Dempster Street, Des Plaines, Ill. 60016.

A. Nancy Day, 916 West Franklin Street, Richmond, Va. 23220.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Dimsdale, Washington College, Chestertown, Md. 21620.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Stephen P. Doehler, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James C. Donald, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Gary W. Donnelly, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Pauline B. Dunckel, 1901 North Fort Meyer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Meyer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Susan Dunkin, Box 3098, Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert E. Early, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Daniel J. Edelman, Inc., 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Safety Belt Council, 271 North Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y.

A. Neel Edward, Jr.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Russ Edwards, Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario, Oreg.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles Ehrhart, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 924, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188.

A. Ruth Bowdell Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.

A. Marc Elzweig, Bayside, N.Y.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert R. Fahs, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Cargill, Inc., 1200 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.

A. David H. Foster.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Pueblo of Cochiti, Post Office Box 70, Cochiti, N. Mex. 87041.

A. Patrick M. Gagliardi, Student Senate LSSC, Sault Ste Marie, Mich.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Thomas Garrett, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Leo J. Gehrig, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

A. George W. Gephart, 1412 Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

A. John A. C. Gibson, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mel B. Ginsburg, 139 Joralemon Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Antonio R. Gonzales, ASUC Office, U.C. San Francisco.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John Granger, Box 1529, S.U., Selinsgrove, Pa.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Sean D. Griffin, 4762 Cape May Avenue, San Diego, Calif. 92107.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Kenneth J. Guido, Jr., 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Martin, Ryan, Haley & Associates, Inc., 40 Central Park South, New York, N.Y. 10019.

B. Gulf & Western Food Products Co., 133 North Fourth Street, Fort Pierce, Fla. 33450.

A. Mr. Otto R. Harrison, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (A Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. William C. Hart, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 20 Montchanin Road, Wilmington, Del. 19807.

A. Steve Hartley, 612 Princeton Street, Cumberland, Md.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Jim Hathaway, Pembroke State University, Pembroke, N.C.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Chris Henchey, C/o Student Council, DWJC, Nashua, N.H.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Neil Hendershot, Box C-1016, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 17837.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Sue Hillan, ASU, Student Association, San Angelo, Tex.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William Taft Holland, Jr., 729 Sixth Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.

A. Denise Howard, 139 Joralemon Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Power Tool Institute, 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill.

A. Institute for Government Assisted Housing, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. International Union of Operating Engineers, 1125 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Phillip Jaret, Box 1353, Selinsgrove, Pa. 17870.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Jackie Johnson, Student Government Office, Frostburg State College, Frostburg, Md.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John G. Keller, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Frederick A. Kessinger, 416 Fourth Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert Klinefelter, Loyola University, 7101 West 80th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Steve Kovick, Somerville, N.J.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Lawrence E. Kreider, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Krooth & Altman, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. League of New Community Developers, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Anne Elizabeth Lacombe, Box 241, SMC, Notre Dame, Ind.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. League of New Community Developers, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. William J. Lehrfeld, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, 323 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Metropolitan Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Electronic Data Systems Corp., 1800 EDS Center, Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.

A. Adam Lewkowicz, 7900 Nagal Avenue, Morton Grove, Ill.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Bella L. Linden.

A. Charles B. Lipsen.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Roy E. Lott, Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Don Lynch, 2250 Pierce Road, University Center, Mich.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Michael J. McCabe, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Allstate Insurance Companies, Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Michael J. McCabe, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Allstate Insurance Companies, Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Kathleen A. McKeon, Box 379, Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., Suite 1100, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Montgomery Ward, Inc., 619 West, Chicago, Ill. 60607.

A. Jean A. McWilliams, Box 379, Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Tim Mabry, ASBMCC President, Pendleton, Oreg.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Michael W. MacDonald, Student Senate, LSSC, Sault Ste Marie, Mich.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Bill Markert, S.G.A., Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Larry Matson, ASU, San Angelo, Tex.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Brass and Bronze Ingot Institute, 300 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Dennis Mazurek, 454 Nordberg, NW., Grand Rapids, Mich.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Ronald Mead, 1105 West Maumee, Adrian, Mich. 49221.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Steven Mednick, Box 1310, Fairfield University, Fairfield, Conn. 06430.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William A. Meissner, Jr., 6200 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Rudolph Wolff & Co., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Robert J. Mellon, Box 719, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Carl J. Meyer, Jr., Box 719, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Bruce L. Mikesell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Independent Automobile Dealers Association, 1719 West End Avenue, Nashville, Tenn. 37203.

A. James Arthur Morgan, P.O. Box 545, Hollywood, Calif. 90028.

A. National Air Carrier Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. National Association of School Bus Contract Operators, 4616 Lawn Court, Fairfax, Va. 22030.

A. National Independent Automobile Dealers Assoc., 1719 West End Avenue, Nashville, Tenn. 37203.

A. Julia Norrell, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Clinical Laboratory Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael C. O'Hagan, Box 719, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Edward J. Panarelli, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.

A. Dennis Paul, 12201 Reithmiller, Grass Lake, Mich.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Local No. 8, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Retirement Plan & Trust, care of Marc Gertner, Suite 405, Spitzer Building, Toledo, Ohio 43604.

A. Stefan Peterson, University Center, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N.Dak.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Wayne Peterson, 313 Morey-Shepard, Winona, Minn. 55987.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Philmore P. Pleming, Post Office Box 870, Cumberland, Md.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Louis V. Priebe, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Ann Marie Rapp, Salisbury State College, Salisbury, Md.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. D. Michael Rapoport, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. William A. Ray, Jr., 2050 E. Evans, Denver, Colo.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Patty Redden, Salisbury State, Salisbury, Md.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William Reed, Post Office Box 7397, University, Miss.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 602 Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Ed Reeves, Box 8037 LC, Lynchburg, Va. 24504.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Austin T. Rhoads.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Thomas G. Roderick, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Reynolds D. Rodgers, 8425 Boone, Kansas City, Mo. 64114.
B. City of Kansas City, Mo., City Hall, 414 East 12th Street.

A. Tom Roff, 1425 Russ Boulevard, San Diego, Calif.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Bruce Rosen, Old Bridge, N.J.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Cristine Russell, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Coalition To Tax Pollution, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Arlie Schardt, 1424 16th Street, No. 501, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.

A. Quentin E. Scholtz, III, 1061 Cross Keys, Apt. No. 3, Lexington, Ky.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Mary R. Scifres, M-32 Indiana Memorial Union, Bloomington, Ind.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul J. Scotti, 328 DeGraw Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11231.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. A. R. Sharp, Jr., Box 817, University Station, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Susan L. Shaw, Box 44 Heathman, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. C. Kathryn Shelton, Box 817, University Station, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. 40506.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Alan Sheppard, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N.D.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Patricia Sickler, Saginaw Valley College, University Center, Mich.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Talmage E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.

A. Julian H. Singman, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, 17 Battery Place, Room 1530, New York, N.Y. 10004.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Richard F. Solomon, 13301 Point Pleasant Drive, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Edward Sosick, Box 780, S.U., Selinsgrove, Pa.
B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert C. Stacey, 4204 46th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
 B. Space Research Corp., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert Stevenson, Salisbury State, Salisbury, Md.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Stockholders of America, Inc., National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Howard Stovall, 2132 4 Mile Road, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Gary Strickland, Box 421, Pembroke State University, Pembroke, N.C.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Michael Strother, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Travelers Corp., One Tower Square, Hartford, Conn. 06115.

A. Glenn Sweetman, Box 525, S.U., Selinsgrove, Pa.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Bill Talty, 2084 East Ambler Johnston, V.P.T.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Richard M. Tempore, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Gerald Todd, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Consumer Federation of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. John Tucker, Box 958, Trinity, Deerfield, Ill. 60015.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Universal Development Consultants, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America.

A. Dan Viets, 200 Read Hall, Columbia, Mo.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. George B. Watts, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Teela Weiner, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Consumer Federation of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Bankers Association of Puerto Rico, c/o Wender, Murase, White & Briger, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Ward Industries, Inc., Post Office Box 849, Highway 65 South, Conway, Ark. 72032.

A. Wilkinson, Cragin & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Dakota Association of Canada, Post Office Box 1193, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Council for Health Care Services, 407 N Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Williams & King, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Nutritional Foods Association, 770 South Brea Boulevard, Suite 226, Brea, Calif. 92621.

A. Wilner, Scheiner & Greeley, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Metropolitan Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Karen Woerner, 1425 Russ Boulevard, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street San Diego, Calif. 92101.

A. Christine C. Woolston, Box 379, Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia, Pa.
 B. National Student Lobby, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Abe Pollin, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20011.

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 second calendar quarter 1972:

(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 <

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.*—(1) *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.*—(1) *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.
\$8,285.00	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. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$150.

A. John G. Adams, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Midland Enterprises, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$7,597.54. E. (9) \$7,597.54.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$6,435.80. E. (9) \$4,919.28.

A. Gibson T. Ahlgren, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Association General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suite 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$9,793.04. E. (9) \$9,793.04.

A. Alderson, Catherwood, Ondov & Leonard, 105 East Oakland Avenue, Austin, Minn. 55912.

B. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.

A. George Alderson, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street, Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Willis W. Alexander, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 No. Western Avenue Rm. 2, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.

D. (6) \$1,040. E. (9) \$1,572.63.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Assn. of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nicholas E. Allen, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$6.23.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

D. (6) \$3,040.59. E. (9) \$3,040.59.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.

D. (6) \$2,276.22. E. (9) \$2,176.22.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068, Washington Offices: 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

D. (6) \$44,347. E. (9) \$44,347.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$52,987.64.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$81,149.69. E. (9) \$2,042.54.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 689 Seventh Avenue, New York City 10019.

D. (6) \$2,831.75. E. (9) \$3,086.24.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.

D. (6) \$27,419.75. E. (9) \$27,419.75.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$4,450.86. E. (9) \$9,854.53.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md. 21054.

D. (6) \$60. E. (9) \$60.

A. American Land Title Association, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$2,686.08.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue.

E. (9) \$1,094.65.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004; 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$1,250.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

E. (9) \$28,676.36.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

E. (9) \$3,125.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1540 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo. 80218.

E. (9) \$1,345.02.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,851.26. E. (9) \$2,284.25.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$4,997. E. (9) \$10,078.

A. American Physical Therapy Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$5,146.16. E. (9) \$5,146.16.

A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$4,512.06.

A. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,310,353.78. E. (9) \$84,595.24.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 620, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$5,903.25. E. (9) \$2,089.86.

A. American Surveys, Embassy Square, Suite 901, 2000 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., One World Trade Center, Suite 1109, New York, N.Y. 10048.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$75.66.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$92.43.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.

D. (6) \$16,747.94. E. (9) \$16,747.94.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$10,290.06. E. (9) \$34,703.46.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Suite 828, Washington, D.C.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$202,940.46. E. (9) \$3,595.41.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,175. E. (9) \$46.25.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, Suite 718, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. CITC Industries, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$91.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence A. Arata, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$12,500.

A. John C. Archer, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$300.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$5.75.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 De Sales Street, Suite 302, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,580. E. (9) \$117.06.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp., 464 Ellis Street, Mountain View, Calif. 94040.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with the American Importers Association, 295 Fifth Avenue, N.Y. 10016.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Puerto Rican Government, Economic Development Administration, G.P.O. Box 2350, San Juan, P.R. 00936.

D. (6) \$50.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$2,350.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.

D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$91.25.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Suite 607, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.

A. Association for the Advancement of Invention & Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.

D. (6) \$2,875. E. (9) \$2,251.76.

A. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$8488.35. E. (9) \$8488.35.

A. Association for Broadcast, Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Atlantic Richfield Company, 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

E. (9) \$300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$5.

A. Gary D. Avery, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10015.

D. (6) \$168. E. (9) \$68.71.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Carl E. Bagge, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$378.75.

A. John C. Bagwell, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. George F. Bailey, Jr., Montgomery, Ala. 36104.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala. 36104.

D. (6) \$84. E. (9) \$227.69.

A. James F. Bailey, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,525. E. (9) \$1,052.29.

A. Emil F. Baker, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Soft Drink Association.

D. (6) \$80.65. E. (9) \$3.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

A. Thomas H. Barksdale, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,925. E. (9) \$267.

A. Robert C. Bernard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Baanard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$165.50.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, Suite 400, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London EC3A 8ET, England.

D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$5,710.55.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) \$3,600.

A. James C. Barr, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Association of Federal Credit Unions, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$117.50.

A. David S. Barrows, 215 Century Building, Portland, Oreg. 97205.

B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Court House, Roseburg, Oreg. 97470.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Weldon Barton.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$3,617.84. E. (9) \$120.96.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 400 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

B. Record Industry Association of America, 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$6,250.

A. Davis M. aBtson, 115 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Ethyl Corp., 115 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Lucius D. Battle, 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Batzell & Nunn, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Independent Terminal Operators Association, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. A. David Baumhart, Post Office Box 553, Lorain, Ohio 44052.

B. Green Olive Trade Association, 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) 9.83.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Room 800, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$1,104.17.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., 48214.

D. (6) \$2,256.71. E. (9) \$110.07.

A. Jack Beidler, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.

D. (6) \$3,013.60. E. (9) \$112.50.

A. Thomas S. Belford, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Winston Everett Bell, 417 East Carson Street, Las Vegas, Nev. 89101.

A. Thomas P. Bennett, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) 4,445.46.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass. 02178.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Austrian Trade Delegate, 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Max N. Berry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Meat Products Group, American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$78.46.

A. Robert L. Beven, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$168.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,891. E. (9) \$451.35.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Diana Washbon Bird, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$1,072.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Laurel Hill Cemetery Association, Mayton, Mo. 63105.

E. (9) \$112.04.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Occidental Life Insurance Co., 12th Street at Hill, Los Angeles, Calif. 90054.

E. (9) \$123.31.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Paul Revere Corp., Worcester, Mass. 01608.

E. (9) \$85.21.

A. Lydia Bitter, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$145.90. E. (9) \$145.90.

A. Brent Francis Blackwelder, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$316.50.

A. Jerald Blizin, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$27.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$6,875.01. E. (9) \$117.30.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.

D. (6) \$536.49. E. (9) \$68.85.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 609, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Albert D. Bourland, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 814, Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$2,121.80.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Edward L. Bowley, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO.

D. (6) \$6,816.16.

A. Joseph M. Bowman and Richard C. O'Hara, 1511 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Merger Committee, National Basketball Association, 2 Pennsylvania Plaza New York, N.Y., Merger Committee, American Basketball Association, 1700 Broadway, New York, N.Y. D. (6) \$17,500.

A. George E. Bradley, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of USDA, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$420. E. (9) \$25.

A. Wayne W. Bradley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

D. (6) \$2,443.18. E. (9) \$1,033.54.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Room 122, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. Edward J. Brenner, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.

B. Association for the Advancement of Invention and Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Agricultural Chemical Association.

D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$2.50.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

D. (6) \$350.

A. Joe B. Browder, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$665.

A. Michael D. Bromberg, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. William J. Brooks, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Cominco American Inc., West 818 Riverside, Spokane, Wash. 99201.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ebasco Industries, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morris town, N.J. 07960.

D. (6) \$850.

A. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

E. (9) \$3.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Council of Housing Producers, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Franchise Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. St. Paul Title Insurance Corp., 1650 W. Big Beaver Road, Troy, Mich. 48084.

D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$34.56.

A. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Union Commerce Corp., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$35. E. (9) \$16.85.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, c/o Mr. Chaco Chase, 109-20 71 Road, Forest Hills, N.Y. 11375.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$268.21.

A. George J. Burger, 125 Clove Road, New York, N.Y.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 125 Clove Road, New Rochelle, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 30 Clinton Place, New Rochelle, N.Y.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 30 Clinton Place, New Rochelle, N.Y.

D. (6) \$4,249.98. E. (9) \$2,155.40.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.

D. (6) \$37,615.25. E. (9) \$711.80.

A. George Burnham IV, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United States Steel Corp., 600 Grant Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.

D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$180.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$975. E. (9) \$301.45.

A. David Burpee, Fordham Farms, Doylestown, Pa. 18901.

E. (9) \$70.60.

A. Charles S. Caldwell, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$5,550. E. (9) \$424.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. Securities Industry Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$1,285.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112. D. (6) \$101.53.

A. Charles Argyll Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charles O. Campbell, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL-CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z. D. (6) \$917.68. E. (9) \$1,543.24.

A. Marvin Caplan. B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$2,811.25. E. (9) \$131.60.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Kirkin, Campbell & Keating, Room 505, The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England. E. (9) \$354.24.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Norval E. Carey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$375.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11232. B. Seafarers International Union. D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$1,821.29.

A. Charles R. Carlisle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. B. Lead-Zinc Producers Committee. D. (6) \$1,057.50. E. (9) \$742.45.

A. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 706 Raleigh Building, Post Office Box 2776, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.

A. Elizabeth S. Carpenter, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$6.20.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036. B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$3,125. E. (9) \$193.05.

A. John R. Carson, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015. B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015. D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson. B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank H. Case III, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$210. E. (9) \$350.

A. James B. Cash, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$75.55.

A. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$830.

A. Chapman, Duff, and Lenzini, 932 Pennsylvania Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. The Fouke Co., Route 1, Box 168, White Horse Road, Greenville, S.C. 29611.

D. (6) \$3,425. E. (9) \$259.47.

A. Chapman, Duff, and Lenzini, 932 Pennsylvania Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, 5727 Blake Road, Minneapolis, Minn. 55346.

D. (6) \$950. E. (9) \$477.56.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,411.

A. William C. Chapman, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

D. (6) \$8,000. E. (9) \$3,062.30.

A. Leslie Cheek, III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515 Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$250.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$57,201.85. E. (9) \$2,324.85.

A. Earl W. Clark.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$109.83.

A. Richard W. Clark, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$61.89.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

A. Jacob Clayman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$562.90. E. (9) \$562.90.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Interbank Card Association, Suite 3600, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$6.25.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 1075 Central Park Avenue, Suite 224, Scarsdale, N.Y. 10583.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$85.43.

A. William T. Cleary, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$20.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Brands, Inc., 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) \$62.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky., 40201.

E. (9) \$62.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Liggett & Myers Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020.

E. (9) \$62.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Lorillard, Division of Loews Theatres, Inc., 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) \$62.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Philip Morris Inc., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) \$62.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102.

E. (9) \$62.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$62.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$15.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Basketball Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York N.Y., 10023.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Owens-Illinois, Inc., Madison Avenue and St. Clair Street, Box 1035, Toledo, Ohio 43601.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$50.

A. Larry D. Cline, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$34.80.

A. Coalition for a National Population Policy, Suite 1010, Bender Building, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. E. (9) \$5,196.02.

A. Coalition to Tax Pollution, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$2,536.58. E. (9) \$2,522.93.

A. Grover C. Cobb, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Jeffery Cohelan.

B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$900.

A. David Cohen, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Jerry Cohen, 470 Totten Pond Road, Waltham, Mass. 02154.
 B. Ruetgerswerke Aktiengesellschaft.

A. Timothy A. Colcord, 1620 I Street NW, Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National BankAmericard, Inc., 555 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94126.
 D. (6) \$6,873.24. E. (9) \$7,384.92.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10005.
 E. (9) \$411.46.

A. William J. Colihan, Jr., 602 Ring Building, 1200 18th NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$600.

A. William J. Colley, 1776 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
 D. (6) \$2,355. E. (9) \$1,050.65.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Cylinder Manufacturers Committee, 1625 I Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$40.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (b) \$500. E. (9) \$475.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$100.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Boston Herald Traveler Corp., 300 Harrison Avenue, Boston, Mass. 02106.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Tool & Stainless Steel Industry Committee, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 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. 02903.
 B. The Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I. 02903.
 D. (6) \$68.75.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, Care of Langdon P. Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$18,000. E. (9) \$7,541.95.

A. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$696,758.82. E. (9) \$139,847.38.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. American Academy of Actuaries, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
 D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$152.70.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, 1285 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$200.

A. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW, Room 800, Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$10,939.30. E. (9) \$2,987.48.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$180. E. (9) \$112.15.

A. John A. Connor, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
 B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Consulting Engineers Council/US, 1155 15th Street NW, Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$5,840. E. (9) \$5,840.

A. Jack T. Conway, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$1,687.50.

A. Cook & Franke S. C., 660 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
 B. Marshall & Isteby Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Howard Lee Cook, Jr., 1776 K Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
 D. (6) \$2,248.13. E. (9) \$899.63.

A. Eileen D. Cooke, 110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20002.
 B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$99.36.

A. J. Milton Cooper, Suite 401, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
 B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$1,035.53.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Council of Forest Industries, 1025 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, Canada.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$34.95.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
 D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$14.50.

A. Cooperative League of the USA, 1828 L Street NW, Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$840.

A. Darrell Coover, 1625 I Street NW, Suite 812, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$281.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, Care of Langdon Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW, Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$200.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW, Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Lee, McCarthy & DeRosa, 102 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. James T. Corcoran, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 308, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$925. E. (9) \$87.50.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y. 14830.
 D. (6) \$100.

A. Robert M. Coulter, Suite 508, 1612 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$446.56. E. (9) \$446.56.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Adhesive & Sealant Council, 1410 Higgins Road, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Industrial Diamond Association of America, 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, 156 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis. 53044.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Road, Miami Beach, Fla. 33140.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Casualty & Surety Agents, 5225 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Glass Dealers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Optical Manufacturers Association, 30 E 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Raymond L. Courage, 1660 L Street NW., No. 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street, NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. MGIC Investment Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 53201.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Eugene S. Cowen, 9024 Willow Valley Drive, Potomac, Md. 20854.

B. American Broadcasting Co., 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$5. E. (9) \$5.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Glaverbel (USA) Inc., 75 Plandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y. 11030.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Midland Building, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.

A. Roger M. Craver, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$275.

A. Robert W. Crawford, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Association of General Merchandise Chains, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$9,999.99. E. (9) \$850.65.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Texas.

A. Hubert M. Crean, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$2,252. E. (9) \$314.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.

A. J. A. Crowder, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

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. 22209. E. (9) \$1,090.40.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$5,249.98.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL-CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$8,250. E. (9) \$2,240.71.

A. Pamela G. Curtis, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$4,474.98. E. (9) \$160.14.

A. William Kay Daines, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.

D. (6) \$320. E. (9) \$19.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$38.88.

A. Jean Daugherty, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Philip J. Daugherty.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$3,051.75. E. (9) \$77.50.

A. John B. Davenport, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$160.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$194.44.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill. 60521.

E. (9) \$184.37.

A. Charles D. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

D. (6) \$435. E. (9) \$85.24.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homman Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.

E. (9) \$175.06.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

E. (9) \$94.35.

A. Mr. Fred E. Davis, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$490.

A. R. Hilton Davis, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$9. E. (9) \$5.25.

A. Walter L. Davis, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Charles W. Day, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

D. (6) \$325. E. (9) \$280.

A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo., 8012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$100.81.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Kansas City Southern Industries, Inc., 114 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.

D. (6) \$360. E. (9) \$38.25.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$2.50.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Ray Denison, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,967. E. (9) \$361.88.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 1 Lincoln Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10023.
 D. (6) \$6,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
 D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. C. H. DeVaney, 425 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,175.

A. R. Daniel Devlin, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
 D. (6) \$2,460. E. (9) \$1,311.44.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif. 95802.
 D. (6) \$2,363.57. E. (9) \$203.57.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Marysville Dam Committee, Post Office Box 1550, Marysville, Calif.
 D. (6) \$2,113.47. E. (9) \$45.33.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Post Office Box 15830, Sacramento, Calif. 95813.
 D. (6) \$1,241.10. E. (9) \$41.20.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, Post Office Box 815, West Sacramento, Calif.
 D. (6) \$1,535.69. E. (9) \$95.69.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky. 41076.
 D. (6) \$42,546.28. E. (9) \$42,546.28.

A. Joseph DiStefano, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Union of District 50, Allied & Technical Workers of the United States & Canada, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 D. (6) \$5,376.07.

A. William H. Dodds, 1126 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
 D. (6) \$1,347.15. E. (9) \$246.55.

A. James F. Doherty.
 B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$8,937.50. E. (9) \$3,364.97.

A. Patrice M. Doherty, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
 D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$50.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$316.25. E. (9) \$259.21.

A. Gary W. Donnelly, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$14.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, Room 1128, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Room 1128, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
 D. (6) \$3,189.34. E. (9) \$419.50.

A. Mitchell Dorson, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$450.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Advance Schools, Inc., 5900 Northwest Highway, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, David R. Bradley Co., Ninth and Edmond Streets, St. Joseph, Mo.

A. F. Raymond Downs, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1104, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

A. Robert H. Doyle, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$3,693.05.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.
 B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Lawrence M. Dublin, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
 B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Madison Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
 E. (9) \$175.06.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York 19, N.Y.
 B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York 19, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$3,824. E. (9) \$2,426.46.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.
 D. (6) \$1,268.76. E. (9) \$100.

A. M. L. DuMars, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$60.

A. Louise C. Dunlap, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 D. (6) \$2,400.

A. Mr. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$405.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,075.

A. Robert E. Early, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$208.37.

A. Roy W. Easley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Arthur B. Edgeworth, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$437.50.

A. Hallett D. Edson, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
 B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
 D. (6) \$1,400.

A. E. Neel Edwards, Jr.
 B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$315.

A. Macon T. Edwards, Ring Building, Room 610, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 D. (6) \$405. E. (9) \$55.05.

A. Charles Ehrhart, 1800 K Street NW., No. 924, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B.Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188.
 D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$78.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., 1600 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.
 B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.
 D. (6) \$3,357.25. E. (9) \$2,791.98.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401. E. (9) \$717.35.

A. Richard W. Emory, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.

B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093. E. (9) \$1.46.

A. Gertrude Engel, 2450 Virginia Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Bob Hoffman, President, York Barbell Co., York, Pa. 17405. D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$205.58.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017. D. (6) \$392.40.

A. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20003. D. (6) \$9,937.50. E. (9) \$8,974.79.

A. Glenn R. Erickson, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$350.

A. Russell G. Ernest, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, No. 1014, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Standard Oil Co., 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street, No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005. E. (9) \$300.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE, Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. D. (6) \$2,575. E. (9) \$20.50.

A. Robert R. Fahs, 1030 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Cargill, Inc., 1200 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402. D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$61.24.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$5,785. E. (9) \$163.30.

A. Joseph A. Fanelli, 1511 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. E. (9) \$3.74.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo., 1012 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$85,037.75. E. (9) \$29,550.66.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW, Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036. E. (9) \$3,750.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1500 Guinness Tower, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, B.C., Canada. D. (6) \$8,499. E. (9) \$160.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Joint Committee of Printing & Publishing Industries of Canada, fourth floor, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto 12, Canada. D. (6) \$999.99. E. (9) \$36.

A. Francis S. Filbey, 817 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, 817 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$5,138.49.

A. Matthew P. Fink, 1775 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Thomas Fink, room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112. D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$55.86.

A. James W. Finley, 1015 18th Street NW, Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Crown Zellerbach Corp., One Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.

A. Mello G. Fish, 100 Indiana Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20001. E. (9) \$1,124.69.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky. D. (6) \$6,375. E. (9) \$317.23.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. D. (6) \$1,775. E. (9) \$25.34.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual P.O. Box 89, Lake-land, Fla. 33802. D. (6) \$1,125.99. E. (9) \$1,125.99.

A. Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, care of C. D. Kline, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33877. D. (6) \$375.33. E. (9) \$375.33.

A. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, P.O. Box 20155, Orlando, Fla. 32814. D. (6) \$375.34. E. (9) \$375.34.

A. John F. Fochtman, 1776 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. D. (6) \$2,062.50. E. (9) \$893.01.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.

B. Minnesota Railroads Association. D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$1,037.66.

A. James W. Forstel, 1776 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. D. (6) \$2,343.75. E. (9) \$447.10.

A. John S. Forsythe, 1701 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017. D. (6) \$728.88. E. (9) \$19.87.

A. William C. Foster, 1800 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., Post Office 576, Bellevue, Wash. 98009. D. (6) \$1,755. E. (9) \$392.70.

A. William C. Foster, 1800 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188. D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$83.25.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW, Suite 201, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John G. Fox, 2000 L Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007.

A. Robert B. Frederick, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$4,750.

A. James O. Freeman, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. D. (6) \$2,125. E. (9) \$21.25.

A. Verrick O. French, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037. D. (6) \$5,981.25.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, Fort Totten, N.Dak. D. (6) \$487.50. E. (9) \$14.12.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz. D. (6) \$235.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska. D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$2.50.

Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Mizrahi Women's Organization of America, 242 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10003.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Ariz. E. (9) \$25.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho. D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$8.25.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, S. Dak. E. (9) \$10.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Pueblo of Cochiti, Post Office Box 70, Cochiti, N. Mex. 87041. D. (6) \$300.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex. D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$9.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 120, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz. D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$7.20.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y. 14779.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Sisseton & Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Sisseton, S.Dak. D. (6) \$612.50. E. (9) \$19.22.

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. 20005. D. (6) \$80.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE, Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$52,423. E. (9) \$15,773.

A. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20003. D. (6) \$7,350. E. (9) \$7,350.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10015. D. (6) \$637.50. E. (9) \$2,280.59.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037. D. (6) \$200.

A. James E. Gaffigan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019. D. (6) \$161.55. E. (9) \$31.31.

A. Robert E. Gallimore, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037. D. (6) \$911.25.

A. Nicole Gara, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$1,000.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

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. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037. E. (9) \$1,364.26.

A. Edward V. Garlich, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209. D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$200.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$19.37.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209. E. (9) \$870.

A. James A. Gavin.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005. D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$325.

A. Donald A. Giampaoli, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$1,350.

A. William T. Gibb, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017. D. (6) \$93.75. E. (9) \$3.78.

A. Wayne Gibbons, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 620, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103. D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$157.63.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

A. Lawrence D. Gilson, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037. D. (6) \$300.

A. Dave Givens, 918 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37201.

B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005. D. (6) \$5. E. (9) \$2.51.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005. D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$17.33.

A. James M. Goldberg, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$550.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 614, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J. 07470. D. (6) \$330. E. (9) \$64.60.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48226.

A. Government Employee Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. D. (6) \$11,576.57. E. (9) \$6,305.72.

A. Donald E. Graham, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$4,514.98. E. (9) \$287.65.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. George W. Gray III, Suite 802, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homman Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607. E. (9) \$22.40.

A. James A. Gray, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Robert K. Gray, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017. D. (6) \$1,540. E. (9) \$170.93.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane, NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. D. (6) \$660. E. (9) \$141.74.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho 83702.

B. Union Pacific Railroad, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash. 98104.

B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. William G. Greif, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Bristol-Myers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022. D. (6) \$500.

A. Fred J. Greiner, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Milk Industry Foundation, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. E. (9) \$55.45.

A. John F. Griner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. D. (6) \$10,656.60. E. (9) \$3,668.62.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. E. (9) \$8,202.47.

A. James J. Gudinas, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Kenneth J. Guido, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037. D. (6) \$229.16.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$1,900. E. (9) \$725.

A. Robert J. Habenicht, 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va. 23220.

B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va. 23220. E. (9) \$250.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$78.35.

A. Matthew Hale, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$200.

A. J. G. Hall, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202. D. (6) \$4500. E. (9) \$1,817.72.

A. Keith Halliday, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$300.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Labor Law Study Committee, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 79 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603. D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$10.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022. D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$10.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$49.75. E. (9) \$30.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$1,050. E. (9) \$48.25.

A. Donald K. Hanes, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$204. E. (9) \$399.

A. Robert B. Harding, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Southern California Edison Co., P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, Calif. 91770. D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$68.74.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.

B. California Savings and Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, P.O. Box R, Pasadena, Calif. 91109. D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$647.19.

A. William E. Hardman, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

B. National Tool, Die and Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. National Association of Manufacturers. D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$709.42.

A. Andrew E. Hare, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. E. (9) \$12.35.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. D. (6) \$69. E. (9) \$69.

A. Thomas E. Harman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$250.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611. D. (6) \$440. E. (9) \$53.75.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$132. E. (9) \$111.94.

A. William C. Hart, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 20 Montchanina Road, Wilmington, Del. 19807. D. (6) \$1,753.28. E. (9) \$2,788.58.

A. Rita M. Hartz, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$5,913.60. E. (9) \$927.

A. Clifford J. Harvison, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$3,565.25. E. (9) \$818.44.

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) \$271.88. E. (9) \$180.16.

A. Robert T. Hayden, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222. D. (6) \$2,910.24. E. (9) \$1,126.40.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. D. (6) \$2,113. E. (9) \$76.18.

A. Hays and Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky. E. (9) \$1.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$2,516.55. E. (9) \$2,516.55.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$266.15.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Heilman, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky. D. (6) \$2,332. E. (9) \$2,332.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022. D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$150.

A. Leslie P. Henry, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$126.88. E. (9) \$2.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$496.75.

A. Andrew I. Hickey, Jr., 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005. D. (6) \$8,875. E. (9) \$528.18.

A. J. Thomas Higginbotham, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Consumer Bankers Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$1,122.84.

A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$2,000.

A. James J. Hill, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Harry R. Hinton, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. D. (6) \$1,987.50. E. (9) \$891.52.

A. James D. Hittle, Sr., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Pan American World Airways, Pan Am Building, New York, N.Y. 10017. E. (9) \$97.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037. D. (6) \$435.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222. D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$195.

A. Leo D. Hochstetter.
 B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$39.69.

A. Thomas W. Holland, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
 D. (6) \$923.12. E. (9) \$94.30.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$2,832. E. (9) \$5,306.

A. John W. Holton, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$18.50.

A. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.

A. C. T. Hoversten, 209 West 53d Street, Western Springs, Ill. 60558.
 B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Argo, Ill. 60501.
 D. (6) \$328.80.

A. Thomas Howarth, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$75.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Allstate Insurance Co., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
 D. (6) \$8,250. E. (9) \$2,807.37.

A. David J. Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
 D. (6) \$11,250. E. (9) \$94.50.

A. Richard M. Hunt, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. James L. Huntley, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$6,465.42. E. (9) \$923.80.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C. 20013.
 D. (6) \$5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C. 20013.

B. Daniel Smith, Retail Food et al. E. (9) \$202.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Ashland Oil, Inc., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Improvement Association, Inc., Ohio Valley.

A. Lester S. Hyman, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Openheimer.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$10,815. E. \$10,815.

A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$389.61.

A. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
 D. (6) \$8,490.10. E. (9) \$530.

A. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$9,200.46.

A. International Brotherhood of Painters & Allied Trades, 217-19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind. 47901.
 E. (9) \$4,545.88.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 E. (9) \$16,354.03.

A. International Union of District 50, Allied & Technical Workers of the United States & Canada, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 E. (9) \$5,376.07.

A. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$1,114.25.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn. 55101.
 D. (6) \$4,415.38. E. (9) \$13,182.77.

A. Ronald A. Jacks, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Reinsurance Association of America, 1025 Connecticut NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, Chas. E. Jackson & Associates, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1112, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
 D. (6) \$2,750. E. (9) \$255.61.

A. Raymond M. Jacobson, 1819 H Street NW. No. 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1750 Old Meadow Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
 D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Robert L. James, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 920, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Bank of America N.T. and S.A., Bank of American Plaza, San Francisco, Calif. 94137.
 D. (6) \$330. E. (9) \$264.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
 E. (9) \$300.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.
 E. (9) \$1,018.12.

A. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morristown, N.J. 07960.
 E. (9) \$850.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$975.

A. Jess Johnson, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Shell Oil Co., One Shell Plaza, P.O. Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
 B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,430.59. E. (9) \$266.45.

A. Charles N. Jolly, 1775 K Street NW., Suite 315, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Miles Laboratories, Inc., 1127 Myrtle Street, Elkhart, Ind. 46514.
 D. (6) \$455. E. (9) \$288.30.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$50.

A. H. Daniel Jones III, Suite 1001, 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
 D. (6) 90. E. (9) \$45.

A. L. Dan Jones, General Counsel, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$8.38.

A. Oliver H. Jones, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$719. E. (9) \$7,565.

A. Carl D. Jordan, 408 East Maple, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
 B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
 D. (6) \$351. E. (9) \$150.

A. Ardon B. Judd, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Dresser Industries, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
 B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 E. (9) \$12.25.

A. Gerald M. Katz, 1800 Merchantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
 B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
 E. (9) \$1.46.

A. Carleton R. Kear, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$170.

A. William J. Keating, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Grain & Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) 30.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
 B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
 E. (9) \$300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
 B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
 E. (9) \$275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.
 B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
 E. (9) \$12.09.

A. Mr. John G. Keller, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. George J. Kelley, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$700.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$1,000.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. George Kelm, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
 B. The Myron Stratton Home, P.O. Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.
 D. (6) \$275. E. (9) \$40.

A. R. G. Kendall, Jr., Montgomery, Ala. 36104.
 B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala. 36104.
 D. (6) \$90. E. (9) \$227.51.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$833.82.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio 45840.
 E. (9) \$422.35.

A. Jeremiah J. Kenney, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 E. (9) \$347.35.

A. Thomas P. Kester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
 D. (6) \$925. E. (9) \$200.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$545. E. (9) \$8.85.

A. Mrs. Walter G. Kimmel, 1715 25th Street, Rock Island, Ill. 61201.
 B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 E. (9) \$483.07.

A. Charles L. King, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$65.

A. Joseph T. King, 3600 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 B. Associated Equipment Distributors, 615 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill. 60521.
 E. (9) \$445.20.

A. Gibson Kingren, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.
 D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$408.75.

A. John M. Kinnaird, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2,344.88. E. (9) \$470.99.

A. Kirkland, Ellis & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
 B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$564.90.

A. James D. Kittleton, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$725.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
 B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$75.

A. Douglas E. Killever, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Clearay, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 409 LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill. 60172.
 D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$75.93.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$5,749.98. E. (9) \$416.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$575.

A. Philip M. Knox, Jr., 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$25.

A. Joseph L. Koach, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bradley R. Koch, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$125.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$42.50.

A. Horace R. Kornegay, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul A. Korody, Jr., 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$300.

A. Kenneth S. Kovack, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$4,368.75. E. (9) \$1,498.

A. Howard R. Koven and Abe Fortas, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Canal Square, 1054, 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. June Kysliko Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$146.

A. Lawrence B. Kreider, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Germaine Krettek, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20002.
 B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. James S. Krzyminski, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,562.48. E. (9) \$90.52.

A. William J. Kuhfuss, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
 D. (6) \$975.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$6,324. E. (9) \$1,296.94.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$5,673.70. E. (9) \$4,726.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL-CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$12,365.71.

A. John Lagomarcino, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$2,965.54. E. (9) \$21.65.

A. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.

E. (9) \$200.

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. 20006.

E. (9) \$537.38.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert B. Laurents, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va. 22150.

B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.

D. (6) \$1,950.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

D. (6) \$440. E. (9) \$125.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,404.77. E. (9) \$750.10.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

D. (6) \$12,124.98.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Shell Chemical Co., 2401 Crow-Canyon Road, San Ramon, Calif.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, Wilner, Scheiner & Greeley, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Metropolitan Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$310.76. E. (9) \$4.10.

A. Leva, Hawes Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Midland Enterprises, Inc., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. S. R. Levering, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,615.

A. Morris J. Levin, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

CXVIII—2187—Part 26

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Harry LeVine, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Stanly Lewis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (b) \$2,837.24.

A. Herbert Liebenson, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$1,200.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,716.34. E. (9) \$5,716.34.

A. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 SW. Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$272.77.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 SW. Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, 1331 SW. Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

A. John E. Linster, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.

B. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Electric Cos.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$170.57.

A. Sheldon I. London, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Mercandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.

D. (6) \$825.

A. Philip J. Loree, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10004.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10004.

D. (6) \$750.

A. James F. Lovett, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

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. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

B. Menswear Retailers of America, Room 390, National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

D. (6) \$600.

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) \$1,764.

A. James H. Lynch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 1st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$4,758.60. E. (9) \$311.53.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. Printing Industries of America, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

D. (6) \$950. E. (9) \$1,420.

A. Ian R. MacGowen, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$79.34.

A. Joseph V. Machugh, 225 A Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. Menswear Retailers of America, Room 390, National Press Building, 14th and F Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andre Maisondieu, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$690.

A. Elizabeth Mallory, Box 718, Union Station, Endicott, N.Y. 13760.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$115,434.58. E. (9) \$483.07.

A. Ben J. Man, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$1,741.12. E. (9) \$388.89.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va. 22101.

B. National Coal Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$6,876.01. E. (9) \$149.50.

A. Mike Manatos, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1104, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

D. (6) \$30. E. (9) \$30.

A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

A. Ralph J. Marlatt, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) \$1,325.

A. William J. Marschalk, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$35.

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.

A. J. Paull Marshall, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$349.87. E. (9) \$259.65.

A. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) \$1.46.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, P.O. Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Mike Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Mike Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Paul J. Mason, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$156.56. E. (9) \$22.24.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$5,499.91. E. (9) \$875.

A. P. H. Mathews, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$442.66. E. (9) \$394.20.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$459. E. (9) \$182.85.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$4,200. E. (9) \$188.57.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Mayer, Brown & Platt, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$5.

A. Mayer, Brown & Platt, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

B. Williams and Clayton Burch families, c/o Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Co., Trustee, 231 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$352.90.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2035. E. (9) \$227.50.

A. William J. McAuliffe, Jr., 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Land Title Association, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,275. E. (9) \$15.

A. Michael J. McCabe, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Allstate Insurance Cos., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Michael J. McCabe, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill., 60062.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$300.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$3,350.30.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Montgomery Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., North Perry and Jefferson Streets, Montgomery, Ala. 36103.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Magnavox Co., 1700 Magnavox Way, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Gulf and Western Industries, Inc., 1 Gulf and Western Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga. 30301.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., 3308 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La. 70119.

A. E. L. McCulloch, Room 814, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.
D. (6) \$284.60. E. (9) \$81.50.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) \$411.35. E. (9) \$80.17.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$575.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701.

B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont. 59701.
E. (9) \$198.44.

A. 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. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.
D. (6) \$7,080.

A. Myles F. McGrail, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich. 48640.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.

B. International Paper Company, Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$660. E. (9) \$217.83.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,885. E. (9) \$583.70.

A. Clifford G. McIntire, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$52.64.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$2,067.63.

A. Graham N. McKelvey, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$25.

A. John McKenna, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$1,359.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 933 North Kenmore Street, Suite 317, Arlington, Va. 22201.

B. National Headquarters, Marine Corps League, 933 North Kenmore Street, Suite 317, Arlington, Va. 22201.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 1200 North Court House Road (Box G4), Arlington, Va. 22201.

B. Non Commissioned Officers Association of U.S.A., P.O. Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex. 78298.
D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$408.73.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$25.

A. Teresa D. McLaughlin, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$2,366.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$175.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$315.

A. C. W. McMillan, National Press Bldg., 14th and F Streets, Suite 1015, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1540 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo. 80218.
 D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$470.89. E. (9) \$18.77.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C. 20036.
 B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2000. E. (9) \$1,391.81.

A. McNutt, Dudley, Easterwood & Losch, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Dredging Co., 12 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Dunbar & Sullivan Dredging Co., 22720 Michigan Avenue, Dearborn, Mich.
 D. (6) \$5,150. E. (9) \$1,121.11.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., Suite 1100, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Montgomery Ward, Inc., 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$225.

A. George G. Mead, 621 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md. 20910.
 B. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$1,359.05. E. (9) \$297.27.

A. George G. Mead, 621 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md. 20910.
 B. The National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, Suite 31, New York, N.Y. 10036.
 D. (6) \$708.75. E. (9) \$169.23.

A. William A. Meissner, Jr., 6200 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
 B. Rudolph Wolff & Co., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Mr. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,967.

A. R. Otto Meletzke, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$65. E. (9) \$3.89.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
 B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Committee on American Tanker Owners, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$9.50.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., New York, N.Y. 10017.
 E. (9) \$65.75.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Stewart Title Guaranty Co., P.O. Box 2029, Houston, Tex. 77001.
 D. (6) \$12,500. E. (9) \$49.53.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$912.24. E. (9) \$162.06.

A. John J. Motley.
 B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$380.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr.
 B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$392.

A. James G. Michaux, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. 45202.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Questor Corp., 1801 Spielbusch Avenue, Toledo, Ohio. 43601.
 D. (6) \$2,530. E. (9) \$25.

A. Anne Miller, Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$110. E. (9) \$51.41.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
 D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$41.69.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Houston, Tex.
 D. (6) \$262.50. E. (9) \$23.31.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Texas Gulf, Inc., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$259.53.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

B. Nebraska Railroad Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
 D. (6) \$5,749.98. E. (9) \$55.75.

A. Joe D. Miller, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
 D. (6) \$875.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
 B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

A. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
 D. (6) \$100.

A. Jack Mills, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Arnold C. Johnson.
 B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, Post Office Box 829, Boise, Idaho 83701.

A. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., Post Office Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$650.

A. G. Merrill Moody, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$176.74. E. (9) \$246.06.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Bituminous Coal Operators Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. O. William Moody, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$956.50.

A. Donald L. Morgan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Committee for Civil Airlift.
 D. (6) \$2,587.50. E. (9) \$486.84.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. James M. Morris, 1660 L Street NW., Room 804, Washington, D.C., 20036.
 B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
 D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$876.70.

A. James G. Morton, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$100.

A. Jack Moskowitz, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$26.73.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$80.

A. David J. Muchow, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 E. (9) \$65.75.

A. William G. Mullen, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 E. (9) \$176.50.

A. John J. Murphy, 517 Shoreham Building, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Customs Service Association.

A. Richard W. Murphy, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J. 07065.
 D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$36.50.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$402.50. E. (9) \$512.50.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$185.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,887.50. E. (9) \$120.32.

A. John J. Nangle, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 812, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$586.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
 B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
 D. (6) \$41.25. E. (9) \$50.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$27.50. E. (9) \$27.50.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
 D. (6) \$31,754.50. E. (9) \$6,981.48.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$9,070.96. E. (9) \$8,371.52.

A. National Association of Farmer, Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va. 22202.
 D. (6) \$1,112.59. E. (9) \$1,112.59.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$500.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$693,300. 03. E. (9) \$16,371.92.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$25.

A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2511 East 46th Street, Suite H, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$2,396.73. E. (9) \$2,396.73.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$8,516.35. E. (9) \$8,516.35.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill. E. (9) \$17,833.25.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
 D. (6) \$26,943.47. E. (9) \$3,839.07.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,703.89. E. (9) \$1,703.87.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$90,066.52. E. (9) \$3,183.63.

A. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
 D. (6) \$1,572.63. E. (9) \$1,572.63.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$115,434.58. E. (9) \$483.07.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 D. (6) \$11,951.77. E. (9) \$11,951.77.

A. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$473. E. (9) \$125.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$25,260.38. E. (9) \$25,919.72.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$7,625. E. (9) \$666.75.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
 B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$833.33. E. (9) \$80.48.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30326.
 E. (9) \$1,199.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$287,161.19. E. (9) \$21,539.50.

A. National Federation of Independent Business Inc., 920-922 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Federation of Independent Businesses Inc., 150 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, Calif. 94403.
 D. (6) \$20,394.99. E. (9) \$20,394.99.

A. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$92,744.96. E. (9) \$12,060.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
 E. (9) \$1,352.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 E. (9) \$200.

A. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
 E. (9) \$775.

A. National Institute of Locker & Freezer Provisioners, 224 East High Street, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022.
 D. (6) \$212.87. E. (9) \$568.71.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$3,496.65. E. (9) \$3,496.65.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68107.
 D. (6) \$7,462.74. E. (9) \$7,462.74.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 E. (9) \$7,636.77.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$5,254. E. (9) \$1,391.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y. 10001.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 E. (9) \$2,790.01.

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. 20006.
 D. (6) \$12,500. E. (9) \$13,444.87.

A. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$6,554. E. (9) \$2,312.63.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders, Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$180. E. (9) \$180.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Suite 711, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,026.77. E. (9) \$6,129.50.

A. Alexander W. Neale, Jr., 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,290. E. (9) \$20.40.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Southern California Edison Co., P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.
 D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$279.12.

A. Allen Neece, Jr., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$300.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$400.46.

A. Robert B. Neville, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$150.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$1,656.25. E. (9) \$208.22.

A. E. J. Newbould, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Clay Pipe Institute, 350 West Terra Cotta Avenue, Crystal Lake, Ill. 60014.
 D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$5.

A. Charles E. Nichols, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,025. E. (9) \$737.60.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO.
 D. (6) \$7,361.51. E. (9) \$553.06.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
 B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., 60606.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$100.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$554.13.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015.
 B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015.
 D. (6) \$650.

A. Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$347.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Transit Association, 465 L'Enfant Plaza, West, Suite 2900, Washington, D.C. 20024.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$192.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Room 110, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
 D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$208.20.

A. Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Standard Oil Co., Midland Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.
 E. (9) \$312.46.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
 B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
 D. (6) \$300.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Philippine Sugar Institute.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$250.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y. 10003.
 D. (6) \$4,109.98. E. (9) \$1,631.26.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Grain & Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$53.30.

A. Edward W. Oliver, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
 B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Roy E. Olson, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
 B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$23.75.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$1,843.75. E. (9) \$1,787.93.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$185.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,375.

A. Norman Paige, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Edward J. Panarello, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$3,945.40. E. (9) \$2,631.25.

A. Carol Ames Parker, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$193.27.

A. Kenton H. Pattie, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
 B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
 D. (6) \$1,245.34.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
 D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Boating Industry Association, 401 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
 D. (6) \$800.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Snowmobile Industry Association, 5100 Edina Industrial Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
 D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The Nestle Co., 100 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, New York 10605.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570.
 D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 707, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Tool, Die, and Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, Suite 707, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc., 2055 West 190th Street, Torrance, Calif. 90504.

A. John J. Pecoraro, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 217-19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind. 47901.
 D. (6) \$2,294.86.

A. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
 E. (9) \$2,679.50.

A. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$25.

A. J. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Shell Oil Co., 1 Shell Plaza, Houston, Tex. 77002.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Sr., Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.
 D. (6) \$1,450. E. (9) \$226.66.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,421. E. (9) \$330.94.

A. Richard W. Peterson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The American Bankers Association 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Michael Petresky, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.
 D. (6) \$2,850.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$350.

A. Roger J. Phaneuf, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
 D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$149.25.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$101.45.

A. Franklin A. Pickens, Post Office Box 1552, Odessa, Tex.
 B. Texas Railroads.
 D. (6) \$1,140. E. (9) \$471.64.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$3,333.33. E. (9) \$178.21.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2,501.13. E. (9) \$70.52.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$1,460.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex. 79401.
 D. (6) \$30,038.53. E. (9) \$1,350.

A. Political Action Committee for Engineers and Scientists, Suite 809, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$900.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge Ill.
 D. (6) \$458.

A. Dr. S. J. Poray-Tucholski, 15257 East Cedarsprings Drive, Whittier, Calif., 90603; 2626 41st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 B. Bermejo River Project Development Association.
 E. (9) \$204.80.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$45.25.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Power Tool Institute, Inc., 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 D. (6) \$630. E. (9) \$71.93.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. International Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. William C. Prather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
 B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
 D. (6) \$475.

A. William H. Press, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., 51 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$51.02.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Association of Registered Bank-Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$296.35.

A. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$1,007.55. E. (9) \$1,007.55.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 3025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
 B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Questor Corp., 1801 Spielbusch Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43694.
 E. (9) \$2,580.

A. Joseph E. Quinn, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$2,310.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 1, Box 199, Annapolis, Md. 21401.
 B. Associated Bakers of America, 735 West Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill. 60613.
 D. (6) \$676. E. (9) \$187.28.

A. Thomas H. Quinn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,666.50. E. (9) \$288.56.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$1,945.53.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$337.44.

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) \$8.95. E. (9) \$6.04.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$8,692. E. (9) \$8,692.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
 D. (6) \$2,575. E. (9) \$2,575.

A. Robert J. Rauch, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 D. (6) \$2,250.

A. G. J. Rauschenbach.
 B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
 D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$660.

A. Thomas D. Ray.
 B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$305.

A. William W. Rayner, 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
 B. Crowell Collier and Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
 E. (9) \$42.40.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.
 B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.
 D. (6) \$150.

A. Dwight C. Reed, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Soft Drink Association.
 D. (6) \$31.24. E. (9) \$2.50.

A. David J. Reedy, 1517 Virginia Street, Downers Grove, Ill. 60515.
 B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Argo, Ill. 60501.
 D. (6) \$900.

A. Robert S. Reese, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 A. Rosalie Reichman, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
 B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1 North 13th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.
 D. (6) \$1,537.50.

A. Barbara Reid, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 D. (6) \$1,137. E. (9) \$2.

A. John A. Reilly, 59 Malden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10038.
 B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, et. al., 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz. 85364.
 E. (9) \$25.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$3,946.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, Warner Building, Suite 1128, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
 D. (6) \$1,400. E. (9) \$8,233.37.

A. James J. Reynolds, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street, NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$466.

A. Austin T. Rhodes.
 B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919-18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$550. E. (9) \$80.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1130 17th Street NW., No. 430, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Continental Oil Co., High Ridge Park, Stamford, Conn. 06904.

A. Maxwell E. Rich, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$625.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.
 B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$25.

A. Stark Ritchie, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$3,750.50. E. (9) \$58.42.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Kenneth Roberson, 2 Dubonnet Road, Valley Stream, N.Y. 11581.

B. Meat Importers' Council of America, Inc., 708 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$18. E. (9) \$10.25.

A. William S. Roberts, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$110.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
 D. (6) \$185.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
 D. (6) \$203. E. (9) \$0.75.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$729.20.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 793, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. Walter E. Rogers, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Edward W. Rothe, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
 B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill. 60521.

A. Robert J. Routier, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$45.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., No. 1009, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Associated Press, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,220. E. (9) \$45.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., No. 1009, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Deltona Corp., 3250 S.W. Third Avenue, Miami, Fla. 33129.
 D. (6) \$6,340. E. (9) \$31.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio 44316.

A. Albert R. Russell, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 D. (6) \$2,058.46. (9) \$305.58.

A. Cristine Russell, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 B. Coalition to Tax Pollution, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
 D. (6) \$1,450.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., No. 514, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
 D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$1,240.59.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$897.30.

A. Ella Marice Ryan, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10010.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$12.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2,400. E. (9) \$480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 500 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.
 B. Standard Oil Company 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 & Tayler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson Street, Muncie, Ind.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum & Tayler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. York Bag Co., Ltd., 3577 Dundas Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

A. Carl K. Sadler, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$5,797.40. E. (9) \$7,738.62.

A. Jacques T. Schleifer, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
 B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium, Md. 21093.
 E. (9) \$1.46.

A. Allan D. Schlosser, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$100.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Liquor Stores Association, Inc., Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$60.

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) \$75.

A. Donald H. Schwab, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
 B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
 D. (6) \$1,691.25. E. (9) \$10.30.

A. John W. Scott, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1209, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Jefferson Pilot Corp., Post Office Box 21008, Greensboro, N.C. 27402.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1209, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Kay Sealy, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
 B. Pennzoll Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

A. Earl W. Sears, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 D. (6) \$163.75. E. (9) \$6.01.

A. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich. 48207.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Hamman Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$25.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 E. (9) \$180.53.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Pfizer, Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$850. E. (9) \$345.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius and Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
 D. (6) \$600.

A. Jane M. O. Sharp, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., No. 400, Washington, D.C. 20002.
 B. Council for a Livable World, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., No. 400, Washington, D.C. 20002.
 D. (6) \$4,000.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, Barr Building, 910 17th Street, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Doubleday & Co., Inc., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,175.

A. Dale Sherwin, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$75.04.

A. Edward L. Shields, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$1005.

A. Max Shine, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$992.50. E. (9) \$20.

A. Harvey A. Shipman, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Penn Central Transportation Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104.

A. A. Z. Shows, Suite 904 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$4,850. E. (9) \$3952.34.

A. Lucien J. Sichel, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Ill. 60064.

A. Sidney & Austin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$400.

A. John Silard, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Coalition on National Priorities, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
 D. (6) \$1,365.81.

A. David Silver, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$14.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Clearly, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Stephen Slipper, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$6.

A. Smathers and Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Horse Council, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$972.03.

A. Smathers and Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$15,000. E. (9) \$401.24.

A. Donald E. Smiley, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
 E. (9) \$549.14.

A. Arthur J. Smith, 1700 K Street NW., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Shell Oil Co., P.O. Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Everard H. Smith, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
 E. (9) \$54.80.

A. Robert Wm. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
 D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$290.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, 2511 East 46th Street, Suite H, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. Wayne H. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
 D. (6) \$2,840. E. (9) \$1,195.20.

A. Arthur V. Smyth, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash. 98401.
 D. (6) \$500. (9) \$100.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1100 17th Street NW., Suite 306, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.
 D. (6) \$550. E. (9) \$161.80.

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) \$2,102.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
 E. (9) \$250.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, P.O. Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C. 20007.
 D. (6) \$2,474.20. E. (9) \$3,239.43.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, One East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev. 89501.
 B. Nevada Railroad Association, One East First Street, Room 802, Reno, Nev. 89501.
 E. (9) \$552.75.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$200.

A. Jerome N. Sonosky, Gerald E. Gilbert & Alvin Ezrin, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Physical Therapy Association, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, Suite 400, 10400 West Higgins Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
 D. (6) \$1,125.40.

A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
 D. (6) \$1,399. E. (9) \$6.42.

A. Frank J. Specht, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William C. Spence, Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
 B. Columbia Gulf Transmission Co., Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
 D. (6) \$190. E. (9) \$250.65.

A. Nicholas J. Spiezzo, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$8,551.

A. Larry N. Spiller, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Consulting Engineers Council/US, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$50.

A. Squibb Corp., 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) \$172.

A. John M. Stackhouse, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Lynn Stalbaum, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$700.

A. J. Gilbert Stallings, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

A. The Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$312.46.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$350.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$100.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Steinhart, Goldberg, Feigenbaum & Ladar, Crocker Plaza, 34th floor, Montgomery at Post, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.
B. Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center, Calif. 92082.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$240.26.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Green Olive Trade Association, Inc., 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Robert College of Istanbul, Turkey, 305 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$113.75. E. (9) \$8.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wynne A. Stevens, Jr., 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) \$870.

A. Travis B. Stewart, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J. 07110.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$150.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Footwear Group, American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Japan Iron and Steel Exporters' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) \$6,039.35. E. (9) \$481.12.

A. William M. Stover, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$100.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$5,910. E. (9) \$803.60.

A. John Stringer, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$1,430.

A. Michael E. Strother, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$18.50.

A. Norman Strunk, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$385.09.

A. Walter B. Stults, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$600.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$575.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20068.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20066.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Travelers Corp., 1 Tower Square, Hartford, Conn. 06115.
E. (9) \$17.20.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Irving W. Swanson.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 128 C Street NE., Suite 61, Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) \$950.

A. David A. Sweeney, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$6,895.82.

A. John R. Sweeney, Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 701 East Third Street, Bethlehem, Pa. 18016.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$196.50.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Charles C. Tally, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va. 22901.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard M. Tempero, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) \$343.79.

A. Roy W. Terwilliger, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American National Insurance Co., Anico Building, Galveston, Tex. 77550.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. TENNECO, Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. William D. Thompson, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$2,537.05.

A. Paul J. Tierney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$143. E. (9) \$239.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$2,365.

A. Patrick F. Tobin, 1341 G Street NW., Room 304, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,645.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$2,800. E. (9) \$665.37.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$756.25. E. (9) \$360.03.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1107 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,525. E. (9) \$82.91.

A. Bernard H. Trimble, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$5,625. E. (9) \$26.30.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 B. National Association of Manufacturers.
 D. (6) \$792. E. (9) \$224.60.

A. James R. Turnbull, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Tyson.
 B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$12,300.04.

A. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 E. (9) \$32,368.44.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$241.92.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$364.45. E. (9) \$364.45.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$40,151.29.

A. Universal Development Consultants, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$45.98.

A. David E. Ushio, 2021 L Street NW., Suite 530, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
 D. (6) \$200.

A. Lois Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va. 22302.
 B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$62. E. (9) \$5.50.

A. John A. Vance, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
 D. (6) \$2,634. E. (9) \$2,254.39.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2,400. E. (9) \$480.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1720 I Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Hertz Corp., 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10021.
 E. (9) \$58.77.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1720 I Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
 E. (9) \$30.26.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
 B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
 E. (9) \$1.46.

A. Richard E. Vernon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$215. E. (9) \$75.90.

A. L. T. Vice, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$185.

A. Walter D. Vinyard, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$250.

A. Bruce E. Vogelsinger, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Consulting Engineers Council/US, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$50.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$317.71.

A. Donn L. Waage, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$127.75. E. (9) \$38.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$207.69. E. (9) \$24.68.

A. Paul A. Wagner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Bernard J. Welch, 1800 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$142.22.

A. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
 B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul S. Weller, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,400. E. (9) \$283.53.

A. Fred M. Wertheimer, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$6,425.

A. Terrell M. Wertz, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$151.67.

A. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, P.O. Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
 E. (9) \$500.

A. Wheeler, Van Sickle, Day & Anderson, 25 West Main Street, Madison, Wis. 53703.
 B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Clyde A. Wheeler, Jr., Suite 820, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Sun Oil Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103.
 D. (6) \$7,000. E. (9) \$1,725.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The Fertilizer Institute, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$25.

A. John C. White, Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. White, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio 45840.
 E. (9) \$476.39.

A. Robert L. White, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Zale Corp., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$150.

A. Robert E. Wick, 1800 K Street, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 1800 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 E. (9) \$133.27.

A. Joe O. Wiggs, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$250.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 E. (9) \$144.15.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Bonneville International Corp., 136 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
 E. (9) \$3.50.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Pierre Agency, Pierre, S.D.
 E. (9) \$31.71.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Dakota Association of Canada, Post Office Box 1193, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
 E. (9) \$95.10.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Hoopa Valley Tribe, Post Office Box 817, Hoopa, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Quinault Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, New Town, N. Dak.
 E. (9) \$3.55.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102.
 D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Council for Health Care Services, 407 N Street, SW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Francis G. Williams.
 B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$100.

A. Harding de C. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$50.

A. Harry D. Williams, 1660 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Ashland Oil, Inc., Post Office Box 391, Ashland, Ky. 41101.
 D. (6) \$250.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1825 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
 D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$646.99.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$8,000. E. (9) \$169.65.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Airlines, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 E. (9) \$85.82.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$38.74.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Oil Investment Institute, One Greenwich Plaza, Greenwich, Conn. 06830.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La. 71106.
 B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
 D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$98.72.

A. R. J. Winchester, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
 B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$380.78.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.
 B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Peter L. Wolff, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$9,245.60. E. (9) \$3,550.57.

A. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1 North 13th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.
 D. (6) \$7,830.08. E. (9) \$8,672.77.

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. 90017.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$140.

A. George M. Worden, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 D. (6) \$427.17. E. (9) \$25.85.

A. Gerald L. Wykoff, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., 1675 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association of Motion Picture & Television Producers, 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90048.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington,

B. Copyright Owners Negotiating Committee, c/o Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin, Krim & Ballon, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Embassy of the Government of the Republic of Korea, 2320 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Merger Committee, National Basketball Association, c/o Mr. Abe Pollin, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,850.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Abe Pollin, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20011.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$3.

A. Jack Yelverton, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$109.58.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,279. E. (9) \$447.67.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Charge Account Bankers Association, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,632. E. (9) \$425.

A. Albert H. Zinkand.

B. Getty Oil Co.

A. Charles O. Zuver, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$164.33.

*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 first calendar quarter of 1972 were received too late to be included or were not included in the published reports for the first quarter (**) or were not included in the published reports for the fourth quarter of 1971 (***):

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. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$2,500.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$9,680. E. (9) \$5,328.31.

A. Paul W. Airey, 4517 Sunset Drive, Panama City, Fla. 32401.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$7,407.04. E. (9) \$7,407.04.

A. George Alderson, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Frederick K. Alderson, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$740. E. (9) \$122.65.

A. M. B. Alderton, ARBA Building, Suite 405, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
E. (9) \$685.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.
D. (6) \$6,642.11. E. (9) \$6,642.11.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) \$3,814.17. E. (9) \$3,814.17.

A. American Conservative Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$19,478.73. E. (9) \$2,867.95.

A. American Federation of State, County, & Municipal Employees, 115 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) \$5,820.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$147,772.23. E. (9) \$2,595.93.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$1,390.07. E. (9) \$1,390.07.

A. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$100.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
E. (9) \$2,163.27.

A. The American Legion National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. 46206.
D. (6) \$71,754.31. E. (9) \$41,424.89.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,377.74. E. (9) \$1,377.74.

A. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 6201, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$2,220.88. E. (9) \$2,755.20.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Americans for Democratic Action, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$8,610. E. (9) \$7,342.78.

A. Erma Angevine, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Consumer Federation of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, Suite 718, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. CITC Industries, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$40.50.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
D. (6) \$145. E. (9) \$41.25.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) \$300.

A. Charles W. Bailey, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Emil F. Baker, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Peter M. Balitsaris, 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) \$2,156.25. E. (9) \$28.65.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, Suite 400, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Avenue, London EC3A 8ET, England.
D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$5,269.11.

A. Weldon Barton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$4,092.48. E. (9) \$134.27.

A. Ross Bass Association, Pulaski, Tenn.
B. Record Ind. Association of America, 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,250.

A. Jeffrey Bell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Conservative Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$1,050.

A. Thomas P. Bennett, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO-CLC, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$5,000.

A. George E. Bradley, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Professional Employees of USDA (OPEDA), 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$420. E. (9) \$25.

A. Cyril F. Brickfield, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$87.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) \$23,807.18. E. (9) \$23,807.18.

A. David Brower, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Philip N. Buckminster, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$165.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee c/o Mr. Chaco Chase, 109-20 71st Road, Forest Hills, N.Y. 11375.
D. (6) \$570. E. (9) \$192.34.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$975. E. (9) \$334.69.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Securities Industry Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$1,455.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles R. Carlisle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,057.50. E. (9) \$604.78.

A. Frank H. Case III, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$162. E. (9) \$250.

***A. Blue Allan Cartenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$20.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Dental Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$52.50. E. (9) \$2.42.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$7,715. E. (9) \$6,365.05.

A. Coalition for Rural America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$3,687.85. E. (9) \$5,987.88.

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. 20036.

D. (6) \$6,562.49. E. (9) \$505.87.

A. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc. 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023. D. (6) \$34,092.05. E. (9) \$26,032.96.

A. John A. Connor, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48231.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$290.

A. Harry N. Cook, Suite 200, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Cooperative League of the USA, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$830.

A. Council of AFL-CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional & Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005. D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$2,500.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Adhesive and Sealant Council, 1410 Higgins Road, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030, 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Industrial Diamond Association of America, 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, 156 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Kohler Co., Kohler, Wisc. 53044.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Road, Miami Beach, Fla. 33140.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Casualty and Surety Agents, 5225 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Glass Dealers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Optical Manufacturers Association, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. John A. Couture, 1625 L. Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,506.27. E. (9) \$486.88.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis. (D.) (6) \$3,979.18. E. (9) \$1,541.80.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, One Farragut Square South, Room 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Canned Meat Importers' Association, c/o North American Foods Division, Deltec International, Ltd., 2801 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,245. E. (9) \$326.52.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Guild of Prescription Opticians Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

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. 20005.

B. Association of Plaintiffs Trial Attorneys of Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United States Brewers Association, Inc., 1750 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$3,000.

***A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$3000. E. (9) \$255.28.

A. Vincent A. Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.

B. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.

D. (6) \$6,875. E. (9) \$1,040.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$850. E. (9) \$104.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street San Francisco, Calif. 94106.

D. (6) \$4,510. E. (9) \$2,672.98.

A. Joseph DiStefano, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of District 50, Allied & Technical Workers of the United States and Canada, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

D. (6) \$4,990.68.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,075.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

E. (9) \$53.17.

A. Hope Eastman, Esq., 1424 16th Street NW., No. 501, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.

D. (6) \$6,642.11. E. (9) \$6,642.11.

A. D. A. Ellsworth, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$5,514. E. (9) \$1,125.54.

A. Northcutt Ely, Watergate 600 Building, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Six Agency Committee, 302 State Building, 217 West First Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Alfred S. Ercolano, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$175.

A. Glenn R. Erickson, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$450.

A. Fensterwald & Ohlhausen, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023.

D. (6) \$4,280. E. (9) \$55.33.

A. Francis C. Fini, 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Air Force Sergeants Association Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Frank U. Fletcher, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of FM Broadcasters, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, Fort Totten, N. Dak.

E. (9) \$8.90.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

E. (9) \$2.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Mizrachi Women's Organization of America, 242 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10003.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

D. (6) \$525. E. (9) \$2.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

E. (9) \$5.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$5.68.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Salt River Pima Maricopa Community, Box 120, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

D. (6) \$62.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

D. (6) \$117.35. E. (9) \$6.82.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y. 14779.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Sisseton, S. Dak.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewiston, N.Y.

D. (6) \$142.25.

A. Nicole Gara, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$98,300. E. (9) \$5,969.52.

A. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. The Glenmede Trust Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James M. Goldberg, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$850.

A. Jack Golodner, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Council of AFL-CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Jack Golodner, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$310.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

E. (9) \$119.04.

***A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. 60602.

A. John F. Hall, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) 286.40.

A. Donald L. Harlow, 310 Riley Street, Falls Church, Va. 22046.

B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Warner & Harris, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$1,057.05.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$150.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Peter W. Hughes, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$39.75.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Ashland Oil, Inc., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Gregory A. Humphrey, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C. 20005.

E. (9) \$400.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., East Benning Road, Galesville, Md. 20765.

B. Committee on Federal Procurement of A/E Services, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$500.

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) \$1,093.08. E. (9) \$579.50.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$312.50. E. (9) \$26.15.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

A. International Union of District 50, Allied & Technical Workers of U.S. & Canada, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$4,990.68.

A. Ronald A. Jacks, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Reinsurance Association of America, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

E. (9) \$992.95.

A. Glen L. Jermstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Coalition for Rural America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$624.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$975.

***A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$4,781.50. E. (9) \$216.36.

A. Ardon B. Judd, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Dresser Industries, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Law Offices of Kennedy & Leighton, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$5,294.40. E. (9) \$1,403.

A. Francis A. Kelley, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$5,366.95.

A. George J. Kelley, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$650.

A. Herbert C. Kirstein, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. James D. Kittelton, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$725.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 409 LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill. 60172.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$71.06.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$575.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 4600 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20008.

B. American Trucking Association, 1616 P Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$525.

A. League for Economic Assistance and Development, Inc., 390 Plandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y. 11030.

D. (6) \$743.46. E. (9) \$743.46.

A. Charles W. Lee, Room 211, Congressional Hotel, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$25.

**A. Nils A. Lennartson, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$12,124.98.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

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., Long Grove, Ill., 60049.

D. (6) \$675.

A. Harry LeVine, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$19,656.28. E. (9) \$17,840.72.

A. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill., 60049.

E. (9) \$1,350.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

E. (9) \$1,213.86.

A. Ben J. Man, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$1,638.10. E. (9) \$450.29.

A. Albert E. May, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$88.50. E. (9) \$1.85.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1636 Champa Street, Denver, Colo. 80201.

D. (6) \$2,035. E. (9) \$227.50.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$575.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$3,054. E. (9) \$1,423.50.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

D. (6) \$585. E. (9) \$410.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

E. (9) \$400.

***A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Freeport Minerals Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE, Suite 5, Washington, D.C.

B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,550. E. (9) \$2,890.

A. Lester F. Miller, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$346. E. (9) \$12.

A. Paul J. Minarchenko, Jr., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$500.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Arnold C. Johnson.

B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. John G. Mohay, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$312.50.

A. John Morgan, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$544.16.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Central Gulf Steamship Corp., International Trade Mart, No. 2 Canal Street, New Orleans, La.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) \$756.62.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Sugar Distributors of Venezuela, Edificio de la Luz Electrica de Venezuela, Avenue Urquiza, Seventh Floor, Caracas, Venezuela.

A. Richard E. Murphy, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$100.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.

B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.

D. (6) \$41.25.

A. National Air Carrier Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. National Association of Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,182.16. E. (9) \$1,309.71.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$26,977.64. E. (9) \$29,789.26.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$609,358.39. E. (9) \$5,630.41.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$636.25. E. (9) \$568.66.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE, Atlanta, Ga. 30326.

E. (9) \$1,200.

A. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$38,573.88. E. (9) \$9,733.65.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 632, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$41,591.08. E. (9) \$27,259.39.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$6,367.56. E. (9) \$2,378.58.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$825.

A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,185.50. E. (9) \$750.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,821.43. E. (9) \$4,821.43.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

E. (9) \$2,940.77.

A. National Rural Housing Coalition, DuPont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,334. E. (9) \$712.38.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,225. E. (9) \$4,184.

A. National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) \$8,937. E. (9) \$17,142.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$12,500. E. (9) \$13,244.73.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,528.72. E. (9) \$2,736.47.

A. National Taxpayers Union, 319 Fifth Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$3,045.50. E. (9) \$3,514.95.

A. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) \$40,000. E. (9) \$19,031.

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) \$261.25.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Robert D. Nordstrom, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$100.

A. Daniel J. O'Callaghan, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$229.69.

A. Claude E. Olmstead, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$346. E. (9) \$21.

A. Roy W. Olson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Professional Employees of the USDA, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$25.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$148.05.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,843.75. E. (9) \$2,187.93.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,375.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Snowmobile Industry Association, 5100 Edina Industrial Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
D. (6) \$1,400.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Alaska Federation of Natives, 1689 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.
D. (6) \$1,800.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. The Glenmede Trust Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William C. Frather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) \$475. E. (9) \$114.

A. H. P. Pressler, Anderson, Brown, Orn, Pressler & Jones, 1122 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., The 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. Island Equipment Co., 3300 Northeast Yeon Avenue, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$27.

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) \$1,500. E. (9) \$54.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

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) \$346. E. (9) \$15.

A. Louis J. Rancourt, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Robert J. Rauch, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$800.

A. Sydner C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.

B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.
D. (6) \$150.

A. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., One East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) \$155,431.80. E. (9) \$38,555.23.

A. Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$3,000.

A. James J. Reynolds, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$143.

A. Austin T. Rhoads, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$261.45.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.

B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.
D. (6) \$2,000.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10013.

A. John Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$665.62. E. (9) \$68.86.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$134.70.

A. John F. Rolph III, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Eric P. Schellin, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$231.25. E. (9) \$24.22.

A. The Section 23 Leased Housing Association, Suite 707, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$450.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,239.50. E. (9) \$188.21.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., El Paso, Tex.

D. (6) \$3,175. E. (9) \$2,299.51.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

B. Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia, 2125 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,175.

A. William L. Slayton, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Kern Smith, Suite 405, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

D. (6) \$12,500. E. (9) \$5,324.

A. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va. 22207.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,845.10. E. (9) \$2,534.42.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.

D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$150.

A. J. Gilbert Stallings, Esq., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

A. Edward W. Stimpson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Japan Iron & Steel Exporters' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Richard H. Stock, 19 Fifth Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Richard H. Stock, 19 Fifth Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Richard H. Stock, 19 Fifth Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$575.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 128 C Street NE., Suite 61, Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. National Tuberculosis & Respiratory Disease Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.

D. (6) \$950. E. (9) \$19.31.

A. Ivan Swift, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$1,276.15.

A. Robert F. Sykes, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$182.83.

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) \$1,795.40. E. (9) \$514.30.

**A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$756.25. E. (9) \$360.03.

A. J. P. Trainor, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$2,808. E. (9) \$1,885.93.

A. W. M. Trevarrow, 1056 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich. 48232.

D. (6) \$4,750. E. (9) \$147.50.

**A. Galen Douglas Trussell.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$792.00. E. (9) \$442.85.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94108.

D. (6) \$261. E. (9) \$1,302.30.

A. James R. Turnbull.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$14.70.

A. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,747.80. E. (9) \$1,747.80.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$242.30. E. (9) \$19.98.

A. DeMelt E. Walker, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$790.70. E. (9) \$186.75.

A. Wald, Harkrader & Ross, 1320 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

A. Richard D. Warden, 1823 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1823 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$25,110. E. (9) \$8,503.43.

A. Warner & Harris, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$6,957.50. E. (9) \$6,431.96.

A. Leonard Warner, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Warner & Harris, Inc., 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 840, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Fred W. Wegner, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert E. Wick, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$142.69.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

D. (6) \$2,751.50. E. (9) \$4,476.03.

A. Francis G. Williams.

B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$100.

A. Harding de C. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$50.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$1,608.37. E. (9) \$364.21.

A. Augusta E. Wilson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Coalition for Rural America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,622.31.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,968.75. E. (9) \$535.07.

A. Jack Yelverton, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,415. E. (9) \$257.10.

A. John L. Zorack, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association.

D. (6) \$1,415. E. (9) \$257.10.