

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S. ROLE IN THE WESTERN
PACIFIC

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on February 11, the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) delivered a thoughtful and important address concerning the U.S. role in the Western Pacific.

Senator BUCKLEY had just returned from visiting many of the Asian countries with which the United States has mutual security agreements. Besides this, Senator BUCKLEY, before coming to the Senate, had a wide knowledge of Asia as a businessman with an interest in that area.

The New York Times on Tuesday, February 29, published excerpts from the Buckley speech on its editorial page with the caption "Must We Abandon Our Friends?"

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the excerpts from Senator BUCKLEY's speech as published in the Times.

Senator BUCKLEY has made a strong impression on the Senate. He is a man of ability, courage, and dedication. His election as a Senator from New York on the Conservative Party ticket is a tribute both to him and the people of his State.

I, as an Independent Democrat from Virginia, am pleased to have the opportunity to work closely with the Conservative-Republican from New York.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST WE ABANDON OUR FRIENDS?

(By JAMES L. BUCKLEY)

WASHINGTON.—While there may be arguments as to the extent and details of our involvement in the problems of Asia, no one in a position of responsibility suggests that we can turn our backs on them. We are a Pacific power just as we are an Atlantic power. The control of Asia and its vast manpower and mineral resources by a power hostile to the United States would be as intolerable a threat to our security as would be the control by a hostile power of the human and industrial resources of Western Europe. If the rimland of eastern Asia were to fall in hostile hands, the threat against the island republics extending from Indonesia around through Japan would be palpable, and our own continued access to vital waterways and resources would be placed in jeopardy. Moreover, the geographic and political isolation which would follow would dangerously reduce the alternatives which would be available to us in planning for our own defense. This is why very American President for over one hundred years has understood the need to maintain an American military presence in the Western Pacific.

At one time or another since V-J Day, each of the peoples of eastern Asia, with the exception of Japan, has felt the impact of that driving, disciplined, fanatic force which is Communism. It is a force which now controls the Chinese mainland and the northern halves of Korea and Vietnam. It is

a force which has launched direct attacks on South Korea and South Vietnam, and on Laos and Cambodia; a force which has organized and sustained guerrilla operations in Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. It is a force, I might add, which as yet has shown no signs of exhausting its incredible energy and determination.

Almost without exception, our friends in Asia are faced with clear and present threats to their security. The Thais must cope with increasingly active bands of Communist-trained insurgents; large areas of Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam are presently occupied by Communist invaders; and South Korea and Nationalist China must continue to live in the shadows of well-armed, hostile neighbors who have vowed to overwhelm them. Our friends are prepared to do what they can to defend themselves, but they require the military hardware with which to match the increasingly sophisticated weapons with which their enemies are being so freely supplied. In too many cases, however, we are failing to deliver the arms and the support implicit in the Nixon doctrine.

This failure on our part to follow through is giving rise to agonizing doubts as to the ability or willingness of the United States to sustain its role of leadership in the Western Pacific.

We can and must, in our own self-interest, restore the badly shaken morale of our friends in Asia. We can do this most effectively, in my judgment, by implementing the Nixon doctrine, and by making it clear in our actions abroad, and in our debates at home, that America will continue to give effective support to its Pacific alliances for as long as may be required to safeguard our mutual interests.

We must remember that if we are to maintain effective alliances, we must decide as a people that ours is a long-term commitment, and we must restore confidence in our capacity as a nation to sustain our role of leadership. If we should appear to falter, to grow weary of that role; if we appear unable to match the tenacity of the Communists, then the framework for regional security which we have constructed at so great a cost will surely fall apart.

And we must also be able to demonstrate that we will not fall victim to our own good nature. Because we have no aggressive designs on others, we find it hard to understand that others have a driving compulsion to dominate. Because we seek peace, we assume that others seek it with an equal intensity. Because we negotiate in good faith, we are too often tempted to place a dangerous reliance on the good faith of others. It is this streak of innocence embedded in the American nature which may raise the greatest question as to our ultimate capacity to meet the responsibilities which have been thrust upon us. I believe that we may now be entering a point in history, both in Asia and elsewhere, which will test whether or not Leo Durocher stated a rule of universal application when he said, "Nice guys finish last."

VOLUNTEERS CAN TEACH READING

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, voluntarism has long been a great tradition of the American people. It is now time for

volunteers to step forward to meet a current and pervasive problem in American society.

A recent survey conducted for the National Reading Center by Louis Harris & Associates confirmed that 21 million Americans, a full 15 percent of the adult public 16 years of age and over, lack some or all of the basic functional reading skills to deal successfully with even the most simple everyday experiences of modern life.

In trying to find solutions to this problem, the National Reading Center has devised a plan to train volunteer tutors who will help improve reading skills. The director of the Center, Dr. Donald G. Emery, has outlined the proposal in the guest editorial appearing in the March 1972 issue of the School Administrator, published by the American Association of School Administrators.

I insert this editorial at this point in my remarks:

NATIONAL READING CENTER—AT YOUR SERVICE

One of seven American adults cannot read well enough to understand newspaper want ads or questions on standard application forms. Up to 40 percent of the pupils in some big-city school districts are well below expected reading performance levels. Up to one quarter of the school enrollment needs more help in reading. We do, in fact, have a substantial reading problem in this nation, and it is time we got together to solve it. Yet we still do not have a usable performance definition of reading proficiency. This is no time to berate the schools for failing to solve the problem. Nor do we need lengthy explanations of how things got this way. This is the time to get on with some fairly obvious and some more difficult corrective measures.

First, let us teach all teachers how to teach reading skills, preferably before they begin teaching, but on the job if necessary. Let us see that classrooms and libraries, public places and homes have generous supplies of reading materials so children and adults can enlarge their reading skills. If parents by intuitive motivation teach very young children our oral language code by leaning heavily on attention, repetition and personal instruction, we should be able to achieve universal success with the printed code, too.

Learning to read proceeds best with direct personal instruction. But we don't have the teacher time or salary dollars to provide the amount of contact time that every child needs and deserves. A really trained volunteer reading tutor working under the supervision of the teacher can create the needed additional time for each child. The same principle holds for adults learning to read.

But volunteerism, while a great American tradition, has a bad name in some schools. The disenchantment often results from gratification of the volunteer's ego, lack of teacher orientation in how to use volunteers, and especially lack of volunteer training, which leaves the teacher with another problem rather than more help. At this moment, the preparation and use of trained volunteers is one of the few areas in which rapid improvement is possible.

The National Reading Council (NRC) has charged the Center to aid states in generating pools of trained volunteer reading tutors to help in schools where they are wanted. The National Reading Center is now involved in developing tutor training programs to produce 10,000 trained tutors in each of 20 states. Next year a similar program will be

conducted in the remaining states. The volunteers are trained to provide supplementary services to the school's reading program. A handbook has been prepared to guide teachers in the effective use of volunteers trained by the Reading Center. The Center's program and materials have been developed by professionals and have been tested on the state level in Iowa, Ohio and Washington, D.C. A cooperative effort among voluntary organizations, the Center, local communities and school districts can produce a new human resource to help change the current reading scene. All responsible volunteer tutor programs should be encouraged. Partly through the trained tutor technique the Right To Read can become a reality in this decade.

The reading needs of adults require a massive effort, too. The Center is overseeing the development of new tutor programs directed to helping the adult worker, the dropout, the migrant worker, the Spanish-speaking American, the prison inmate and others.

Superintendents will be asked to assist in local recruitment of volunteers and in planning for their productive utilization. The Center recommends that local planning committees include school administrators, the PTA and local voluntary service organizations. For further information about how a single district can become part of a state's program working with NRC, write to Volunteers, National Reading Center, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

The school administrator is the key person to stimulate his community to recognize and fulfill the right of every adult and child to learn to read. The measure of his leadership will be whether he imaginatively marshals community cooperation and resources—including trained volunteer reading tutors—to confront both the in-school and out-of-school facets of the problem.

JUDICIAL RESTRAINT NEEDED ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are entitled to the deterrent of capital punishment in the discretion of their several separate State legislatures. They are also entitled to judicial decisions that do not rewrite either State or Federal constitutions to indulge individual judicial prejudices against the concept of capital punishment.

It is categorically impossible to establish that the prospect of death for certain deliberate killing is not a deterrent. It is, perhaps, equally difficult to establish that it is a deterrent either.

However, the Federal and most State constitutions expressly recognize capital punishment by use of the phrase "in capital cases," and it is a palpable abuse of the power of judicial decision to extend to a constitutional prohibition of capital punishment in general, the additional constitutional enjoiner that a punishment may not be cruel or unusual.

In this connection the following column by Smith Hempstone of the Washington Star is significant:

CALIFORNIA'S CRUEL AND UNUSUAL DECISION

(By Smith Hempstone)

By a 6-1 vote, the Supreme Court of California has declared the death penalty to be unconstitutional in that state. The immediate effect of the decision is to give (literally) a new lease on life to 107 death row inmates, including such luminaries as Sirhan B. Sirhan, the assassin of Robert F. Kennedy, and mass murderer Charles Manson.

A side effect has been the release on bail of Angela Davis, who is charged with murder, kidnaping and conspiracy in connection with the Marin County Civic Center shoot-out in which four people lost their lives. It is earnestly to be hoped that the authorities lay eyes on Miss Davis again.

The death penalty is still permissible in 40 states, although the U.S. Supreme Court is expected to rule soon whether executions violate the Constitution's 8th Amendment prohibition against "cruel and unusual punishment." There have been no executions in the United States since June 1967 and 588 men and 2 women convicted of capital offenses await the decision of the high court.

However, the U.S. Supreme Court may rule, the California verdict will stand in that state barring an amendment to the California Constitution. The state court's ruling was in contravention of the frequently expressed will of the elected representatives of the people of California, who on several occasions in recent years have defeated in the state legislature bills which would have abolished capital punishment.

The California court's ruling was based on a clause in the State Constitution virtually identical to the federal charter's 8th Amendment. Chief Justice Donald R. Wright, speaking for the majority, partially based his finding that execution is "cruel" on the long time-lag between conviction and implementation. The obvious reply to that is that the appeal process ought to be speeded up.

Judge Wright held that the death penalty is "unusual" largely because of the declining number of executions in the United States (down from a high of 199 in 1935 to 2 in 1967) and the fact that there is a trend toward abolition throughout the world. To which one might reply that the imposition of the death penalty in this country has remained relatively stable (averaging about 100 annually for the past decade) and that the problems of Britain (for example) are not those of the United States.

Stanford University law professor Anthony G. Amsterdam argued the case for abolition before both the U.S. Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court. One of his arguments was that the only people who suffer the death penalty are "the poor, black, personally ugly and socially unacceptable."

All right. Forget Sirhan and Manson; their cases may be so emotive that it is impossible for any of us to render a balanced judgment. Take instead the case of Ernest J. Aikens Jr. whom Amsterdam represented before the national and state high courts.

Does anybody really believe that Aikens was sentenced to death because he was "poor, black, personally ugly and socially unacceptable?" I do not know (or care) whether he was black or white, but I rather imagine that the severity of his sentence had something to do with the fact that he beat, raped and stabbed to death two women, one of them five months pregnant, and shot to death the driver of a car who gave him a lift.

In his opinion, Wright stated that the California court's decision was "not grounded in sympathy for those who would commit crimes of violence but in concern for the society that diminishes itself whenever it

takes the life of one of its members." A noble sentiment. But would the society of San Quentin, let alone that of the United States as a whole, truly be diminished by the execution of Ernest J. Aikens Jr.? More importantly, can society afford to turn men like Aikens free after they have served 8 to 10 years, which is what a life sentence frequently amounts to.

There's the rub. What is the alternative? To keep them caged for the remainder of their natural lives? In Wright's eyes would that not, perhaps, correctly, constitute "cruel and unusual punishment?"

Abolitionists like to claim that those who favor the retention of the death penalty do so largely out of an atavistic thirst for vengeance. There may be something in that but not much. What law-abiding people want—and have a right to expect from their government—is that men like Sirhan and Manson and Aikens should never walk the street again.

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision may not echo that of the California court. But if it does, Congress and the state legislature are going to have to frame legislation which provides decent folk with the protection to which they are entitled in an imperfect society which has its share of depraved psychopaths.

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR WIVES

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, recently I read a lucid dissertation from Mrs. Lucy Albright's letter to the Glasgow Republican. Although it was written by a woman and for women, the "Ten Commandments for Wives" is intriguing. I trust that all wives will enshrine all these commandments in the innermost chambers of their hearts and will obey them in word and in spirit. I submit this article for the RECORD:

ADAM'S RIB

Written by a woman and for women—"Ten Commandments For Wives."

Defile not thy body neither with excessive foods, tobacco, nor alcohol, that thy days may be long in the house which thy husband provideth for thee.

Put thy husband before thy mother, thy father, thy daughter and thy son for he is thy lifelong companion.

Thou shalt not nag.

Permit no one to tell thee that thou art having a hard time of it; neither thy mother, thy sister, nor thy neighbor, for the judge will not hold her guiltless who letteth another disparage her husband.

Thou shalt not withhold affection from thy husband for every man loveth to be loved. Forget not the virtue of cleanliness and modest attire.

Forgive with grace for who among us does not need forgiveness?

Remember that the frank approval of thy husband is worth more to thee than the admiring glances of a hundred strangers.

Keep thy home in good order, for out of it cometh the joys of old age.

Honor the Lord thy God all the days of thy life, and thy children will rise up and call thee blessed.

MORE FARMERS GET BIG PAYMENTS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, since I first offered my amendment on June 6, 1963, to limit direct Government payments to farmers, support for this idea has been growing steadily.

On August 5, 1970, the House approved the Agricultural Act of 1970 which was the first general farm program to contain a limit on direct government payments. The limit was set at \$55,000 per commodity per person. I would have preferred a much lower limit, but recognized that even with the higher figure, considerable progress had been made in the 8 years since my first effort in this direction.

Farmers have completed their first year under the \$55,000 limit and are now enrolling for the 1972 crop year. Because of farm reconstitution and a little known clause in the cotton section of the 1970 Agricultural Act, there will be virtually no savings to the U.S. Treasury because of the payment limit last year.

In July of 1970, the U.S. Department of Agriculture responded to an inquiry of mine by forecasting that "the amount of payment reduction" under the \$55,000 limit plan, then being considered by the House Agriculture Committee, would be \$58.2 million. During debate on the farm program in August of that year, I expressed fear that the limitation as written by the committee would permit wholesale evasion and save little. The \$2.1 million saved represents less than 4 percent of what the saving should have been.

History of direct payments shows that more farmers are getting big payments each year.

In 1968, a total of 5,914 farmers in the Nation received payments in excess of \$20,000. These farmers were paid a total of \$273,333,643.

The number of farmers receiving payments in excess of \$20,000 increased in 1969 to 7,795. These farmers collected a total of \$366,779,995.

Both these figures grew again in 1970 when 10,371 farmers received payments in excess of \$20,000, collecting a total of \$414,500,000.

Now the 1971 payments have been completed and the totals have once again grown. Last year the number of farmers receiving \$20,000 or more from the Federal Treasury was 13,751. These farmers were paid a total of \$486,339,509. That is an average of \$35,367.57 per farmer in this select listing of agricultural giants.

Farmers in my home State of Illinois clearly understand the problems connected with Government payments. For several years, farmers in my district have indicated overwhelming support for a limit on payments at \$20,000 per farmer each year. A recent poll taken by *Prairie Farmer* magazine, one of the most respected farm publications in the Nation, indicates most Illinois farmers agree on the question of program payments.

In the *Prairie Farmer* poll, nearly 79 percent of the farmers interviewed said they favor reducing or eliminating commodity payments. Of this group, 40 percent favor a limit on payments at the \$20,000 level. An additional 23.5 percent favor setting the limit at \$10,000 or less and 14.6 percent want the payments eliminated completely.

The \$55,000 payment limit provided in the Agricultural Act of 1970 has not been effective. It was drafted by people who do not believe in a payment limit, and who accepted one only as a way out of a deadlocked situation.

Our current farm program is in effect for this year and next. A year from now the House Committee on Agriculture will seek the best program to succeed the 1970 act. That will be an opportune time to change the payment limit provision. Two changes are needed: a lower level—I propose \$20,000—an elimination of loopholes.

In order that we may have an ongoing record of farm program payments made in excess of \$20,000 in each of the recent years, I am placing in the *RECORD* today the names of the Nation's farmers who received payments in that category in 1971. The listing is by State and counties within those States so each Member of the House can easily determine the number of farmers in his district receiving these large payments.

This information has special importance because of the changing character of these payments. With each passing year, they represent proportionately less resource adjustment—the retirement of productive cropland—and more direct support of farm family income.

Cotton, wheat, and feed grains farmers can plant eight different crops on their set-aside land. This year, in addition to these crops, feed grains farmers can plant any crop, including soybeans, on one-half of their set-aside acreage. The practice of permitting livestock grazing on such acres for 7 months during the year also continues.

The use of acres set aside under the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the production of food and feed—grazing, soybeans, and so forth—tends to weaken the resource adjustment goal of the programs. It amounts to an ever growing leak in cropland adjustment. I am not criticizing these exceptions. Rather, I say they should be recognized for their crop production effect.

In signing up under the act, to a great degree farmers are simply agreeing to shift land use, rather than idle land. Taxpayers can no longer justify big payments on the theory that they get value received in the idling of cropland.

Therefore, it makes more sense than ever for the Congress to establish a reasonable and effective limit on the total amount of direct payments a farmer may get under the various programs.

The following table prepared from information supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture shows the extent to which payments for set-aside vary from one State to another. In several States taxpayers are making payments for set-aside which each year are larger than the market value of the land itself. In effect, the taxpayers buy the land over and over without ever getting title to it.

The table follows:

SET-ASIDE COSTS IN 1971

	Per acre set-aside payments	Acres set aside per 1,000 (acres)	Value of cropland per acre		Payments as percent of cropland value	
			Irrigated	Dry	Irrigated	Dry
Arizona	\$501.76	1.99	\$890		56.4	271.2
California	361.65	2.77	1,000	540	36.2	67.0
Louisiana	312.83	3.20	375		83.4	
Arkansas	303.69	3.29	310		98.0	
Mississippi	297.38	3.36	280		106.2	
Nevada	151.88	6.58	515	130	29.5	116.8
South Carolina	136.82	7.31	250		54.7	
Alabama	129.56	7.72	235		55.1	
Tennessee	125.24	7.98	305		41.1	
Texas	98.93	10.11	358	223	27.6	144.4
Georgia	93.33	10.71	280		33.3	
New Mexico	86.92	11.50	625	85	13.9	102.3
North Carolina	80.79	12.38	395		20.5	
Idaho	78.48	12.74	485	240	16.2	32.7
Iowa	76.20	13.12	475		16.0	
Illinois	74.96	13.34	555		13.5	
Indiana	71.64	13.96	450		15.9	
Missouri	70.39	14.21	295		23.9	
Wisconsin	68.71	14.55	280		24.5	
Washington	68.09	14.69	1,205	280	5.7	24.3
New York	62.36	16.04	190		32.8	
Maryland	62.35	16.04	595		10.5	
Ohio	62.21	16.07	445		14.0	
Minnesota	59.84	16.71	280		21.4	
Michigan	58.66	17.05	290		20.2	
Virginia	58.31	17.15	310		18.8	
Kentucky	57.40	17.42	330		17.4	
Nebraska	56.50	17.70	(*)		---	
Pennsylvania	56.49	17.70	390		14.5	
New Jersey	55.67	17.96	920		6.1	
Oregon	54.95	18.20	690	445	8.0	12.3
Delaware	54.76	18.26	490		11.2	
Massachusetts	52.75	18.96	380		13.9	
Utah	49.61	20.16	580	180	8.6	27.6
Oklahoma	49.06	20.38	265		18.5	
Montana	47.06	21.25	280	100	16.8	47.1
Florida	46.62	21.45	(*)		---	
Connecticut	44.72	22.36	840		5.3	
New Hampshire	44.39	22.53	275		16.1	
North Dakota	44.32	22.56	120		36.9	
West Virginia	41.74	23.96	170		24.6	
Wyoming	41.37	24.17	275	70	15.0	59.1
Kansas	38.97	25.66	210		18.6	
Vermont	38.88	25.72	235		16.5	

Footnotes at end of table.

SET-ASIDE COSTS IN 1971—Continued

	Per acre set-aside payments	Acres set- aside per 1,000 (acres)	Value of cropland per acre		Payments as percent of cropland value	
			Irrigated	Dry	Irrigated	Dry
Maine.....	\$38.23	26.16	\$150		25.5	
South Dakota.....	36.01	27.77	130		27.7	
Colorado.....	31.72	31.53	390	\$90	8.1	35.2
Rhode Island.....	31.25	32.00	(2)			
Average.....	72.30	13.83	(2)			

¹ Based on prices in 10 of 11 crop reporting districts.

² Not available.

The tabulation by States of the big payment recipients follows:

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Alabama

[Amounts in dollars]

AUTAUGA COUNTY

Carroll H. Rhyne.....	67,878
O. H. Jones.....	58,895
Malcolm D. Smith.....	58,233
Percy D. Roy.....	57,155
James T. Murfee.....	55,189
Wilson Johnson.....	52,943
M. S. Murfee.....	52,517
Dismukes Farms.....	49,733
Autauga Farming Co.....	44,001
J. A. Rainwater.....	42,284
C. W. Johnson and Son.....	33,303
O. C. Bruner.....	31,297
Bob Condra.....	31,249
Wadsworth Brothers.....	29,508
W. P. Jones.....	25,810
B. R. Wood.....	24,456
D. L. Yarbrough Estate.....	24,154
James A. Adams.....	23,283
D. D. Whetstone.....	21,800

Total payees in county (19)..... 783,688

BARBOUR COUNTY

W. L. Corcoran.....	58,522
---------------------	--------

Total payees in county (1)..... 58,522

BIBB COUNTY

Young Brothers.....	49,445
James Brothers.....	46,935
J. C. Goodson.....	35,606
McArthur Tidwell.....	31,339
M. C. Murphy.....	24,391

Total payees in county (5)..... 187,716

BLOUNT COUNTY

Dean Pruett.....	53,807
Dixie Farms Inc.....	52,938
Durwood Gilliland.....	35,259
Boyd Murphree.....	21,107

Total payees in county (4)..... 163,111

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Alabama

BULLOCK COUNTY

Rutland Bro.....	39,996
J. P. Tompkins, Jr.....	22,339

Total payees in county (2)..... 62,335

BUTLER COUNTY

Harry Poole.....	57,377
William Poole.....	28,189
J. N. Poole, Jr.....	25,965
Thomas C. Simmons.....	25,531

Total payees in county (4)..... 137,062

CALHOUN COUNTY

Sorrell Bruce Wesson.....	28,337
Earl Truitt.....	24,251
Louis Hammonds.....	21,440

Total payees in county (3)..... 74,028

CHEROKEE COUNTY

Jeff D. Jordan & Co.....	53,135
W. A. Ellis, Jr.....	47,174
James E. Ellis.....	46,974
Jess Willard Lecroy.....	40,388
Sewell Brothers.....	38,189
Millard Lecroy & Son.....	33,720
Lowe Brothers c/o B. Lowe.....	33,303
W. T. Williams & Sons.....	29,995
Howell C. Tucker.....	29,903
Robert Emory Chesnut.....	28,431
Ray Allen Lindsey.....	28,240
Sanford L. Flynt.....	27,200
Woodrow W. Rains.....	26,732
Robert E. Black.....	25,973
Orval Ray Singleton.....	24,525
Thomas Marrion Sewell.....	23,446
Ray Brothers.....	20,707

Total payees in county (17)..... 558,035

CHILTON COUNTY

J. Robert Cox.....	57,401
C. R. Childress.....	46,532
Charles F. Culp.....	38,872
J. T. Franklin.....	36,152
Louise Kelley.....	25,447

Total payees in county (5)..... 204,404

CHOCTAW COUNTY

W. H. Sparrow.....	25,041
--------------------	--------

Total payees in county (1)..... 25,041

COLBERT COUNTY

R. Gordon Preuit.....	51,559
Daniel Counts.....	50,628
William Elbert Reid.....	49,448
Billy Pullen.....	49,210
Price Counts, Jr.....	47,783
Willie Posey.....	47,455
W. Carter Reid.....	45,539
Eugene V. Blythe.....	45,428
Ben Fennel, Jr.....	43,337
Hubert R. Stanley.....	40,631
J. J. Johnson.....	39,880
Gordon Ray Price.....	39,450
J. W. Jeffreys.....	37,042
Howard Keeton.....	36,625
Herbert C. Harris, Jr.....	35,331
Hollis Isbell.....	32,841
James M. Underwood.....	29,115
Donnie T. Brumley.....	28,521
Paul Reid.....	28,469
Bobbie O. Wright.....	28,167
Aaron Patterson.....	26,896
David N. Reid.....	26,022
Kenneth Uhlman.....	25,830
Paul Minor.....	25,061
Charles Keeton.....	24,968

John Louis Croom.....	23,627
James Franklin Minor.....	21,070

Total payees in county (27)..... 979,933

CONECUH COUNTY

J. T. Ward.....	27,736
-----------------	--------

Total payees in county (1)..... 27,736

COVINGTON COUNTY

W. G. Foshee, Jr.....	52,341
-----------------------	--------

Total payees in county (1)..... 52,341

CULLMAN COUNTY

T. J. Pate.....	53,849
W. F. Blackwood.....	47,242
Billy Fletcher.....	32,866
Forrest Ingram.....	23,423
Noble Vest.....	21,759

Total payees in county (5)..... 179,139

DALE COUNTY

Borland Bros.....	31,570
-------------------	--------

Total payee in county (1)..... 31,570

DALLAS COUNTY

Carl Henderson.....	72,682
J. W. Suttle.....	59,575
B. F. Jr. and G. R. Beers, III.....	58,238
Thomas J. Pope.....	55,000
James A. Minter, Jr.....	53,026
J. C. Sheehan.....	51,993
W. H. Watts & Son.....	50,873
James A. Minter, III.....	45,956
Thomas E. McHugh.....	42,555
R. Furniss Ellis.....	38,274
Nelson Norris.....	36,173
Jewell Farms.....	35,517
Sommers and Rountree.....	34,542
Robert Lee Sanford, Jr.....	34,328
James Hopson Sanford.....	34,327
Tyler G. Moore.....	33,713
Beers Brothers.....	33,262
Robert Culpepper.....	31,648
Otto E. Godwin.....	30,243
Cedar Creek Farms.....	28,916
George Wood.....	28,343
Robert Smith.....	27,907
W. J. Neighbors.....	26,878
R. W. Zimmerman.....	25,284
Edwin R. Moore.....	24,334
J. C. Gresham.....	23,493
Billy Hardy.....	22,783
Givhan Land CNA Cattle Co.....	20,347

Total payees in county (28)..... 1,060,210

DEKALE COUNTY

Hoyt Rains.....	22,782
Stiles Norman Waldrop.....	20,015

Total payees in county (2)..... 42,797

ELMORE COUNTY

Sherrill J. Woodfin.....	49,013
Henry Owen Harper.....	48,966
George Douglas McCartha, Jr.....	44,138
Lewis O. Rich.....	39,384
Garnand and Thornton.....	38,487
James Melvin Taylor, Jr.....	37,517
J. Melvin Taylor.....	37,428
John T. Taylor.....	36,227
Wood T. Dozier.....	36,006
State of Ala. Bd. Corr.....	31,888
James T. Brown.....	31,421
Robert W. Terry.....	28,787
James T. Brown, Jr.....	28,442
Riley Mask, Jr.....	25,297
Fred L. Oliver.....	24,423
J. C. Collum.....	22,532

Total payees in county (16)..... 559,956

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Alabama—Continued

ESCAMBIA COUNTY	
George Prestwood.....	50,010
Board of Corrections.....	38,641
Total payees in county (2).....	88,651
ETOWAH COUNTY	
Emory Johnson.....	57,393
FAYETTE COUNTY	
J. C. Randolph.....	49,573
FRANKLIN COUNTY	
Vernia Ganes Masterson.....	22,300
GREENE COUNTY	
N. G. Garth.....	35,386
Elam Smith.....	32,443
Bigbee Farm.....	29,066
William M. Steele, Jr.....	26,449
H. E. Carpenter.....	25,753
Curtis I. Eatman.....	23,584
Bayne Ethridge.....	23,581
Velma Farm.....	23,096
Charles S. King.....	22,745
J. F. Cameron, Jr.....	22,633
Curtis R. Taylor.....	22,295
Total payees in county (11).....	287,031
HALE COUNTY	
Marvin D. Johnson.....	33,539
Waller E. Wedgworth III.....	29,145
Johnnie Bedsole.....	29,043
Turpin Vise.....	26,956
Thomas C. Lewis.....	26,506
Henry A. Bailey.....	23,094
Francis O. Clary.....	21,858
John D. Bolling, Jr.....	21,834
Spencer C. Langford, Jr.....	21,206
Total payees in county (9).....	233,181
JACKSON COUNTY	
C. E. Cornelson.....	43,171
Winston T. Smith, Jr.....	36,258
Dewayne Medlock.....	26,279
Bob Mantooth.....	25,100
Lloyd Meeks.....	23,270
John H. Neal.....	21,300
Total payees in county (6).....	175,378
JEFFERSON COUNTY	
Jacob V. Pate.....	26,813
LAMAR COUNTY	
W. A. Austin.....	28,333
Total payees in county (1).....	28,333
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	
Andrew C. Walker.....	52,290
Roe B. Woodis.....	35,052
Theo Scott.....	31,258
Robert L. Winters.....	29,959
Ray McIntyre.....	29,327
Alfred J. Buffler.....	28,165
Hugh L. Rice, Jr.....	27,214
Harvell J. Walker.....	26,799
Jeff Winters.....	26,004
Buster L. Thornton.....	25,878
James E. Hale.....	25,725
Howard T. Walker.....	25,460
Bonnie Burgess, Jr.....	23,313
Rufus W. Bratcher.....	23,281
Ray Smith.....	23,007
James W. Iker.....	22,718
Billy D. Rhodes.....	22,003
Homar E. Liles.....	21,615
G. E. Barringer.....	20,185
Total payees in county (19).....	519,253

LAWRENCE COUNTY	
Albemarle Corporation.....	58,871
James Blythe, Jr.....	58,239
Dan Claborn.....	55,301
Samuel R. Letson.....	55,152
G. T. Hamilton.....	55,051
Benjamin A. Rose.....	54,919
E. F. Mauldin.....	54,502
W. J. Lee and Son.....	52,961
D. L. Martin, Jr.....	49,353
W. W. Hamilton.....	47,710
Wheeler Farms, Inc.....	46,520
Armstrong Farms.....	46,362
Hugh J. Posey.....	44,263
J. C. Claborn.....	44,166
Jack C. Davis.....	42,240
Waylon Cross.....	41,771
George Collins.....	36,585
Grady B. Rose.....	35,341
Guy Parker.....	33,604
Wayne Hamilton.....	33,419
Daniel Gilchrist IV.....	33,081
Hood Harris, Jr.....	31,938
Harold Green.....	29,532
Hubert Coffey.....	29,380
O. D. Brackin.....	27,408
Richard Brackin.....	27,408
E. H. Dewberry.....	27,258
V. Dewees Crockett.....	23,390
Lynn Cross.....	25,664
J. R. Knouff.....	25,227
Grady Windle Parker.....	25,049
W. C. Aday.....	24,351
Daniel Gilchrist.....	24,238
James Blythe.....	23,315
O. C. Lansford.....	23,170
J. O. Weeks.....	22,816
Oneal Rose.....	22,791
Thomas A. Bowles.....	22,725
Jack Wells Kidd.....	22,370
Neal Williams.....	22,173
Anthony Dewberry.....	22,134
Jerry Dewberry.....	22,134
Willis Manley.....	21,473
Roland Cross.....	21,051
Larry Parker.....	20,185
Claude Dyar.....	20,096
Paul Henry Kirby.....	20,011
Total payees in county (47).....	1,609,698
LEE COUNTY	
Robert E. Gullatte.....	29,899
T. W. Collier.....	26,757
Leary Whatley.....	25,804
W. O. Baker.....	24,785
Nelson Hillyer.....	24,537
Auburn University.....	23,876
Collier & Littrell.....	23,726
Total payees in county (7).....	179,384
LIMESTONE COUNTY	
Thomas H. Vann.....	58,628
Walter B. Shaw.....	58,175
Joe R. Murphy.....	56,646
R. W. Anderson & Sons.....	55,842
Fred William Hays.....	53,735
John D. Anderson.....	52,968
Rowe B. Sanderson.....	50,080
Henry Charles Baucom.....	49,333
Ned Johnson.....	48,472
Luke Pryor.....	48,037
Eugene Grant Lowery.....	45,170
Glenn V. Moore.....	45,056
Gene Thomas Burgreen.....	44,949
Pettus Menefee.....	44,284
Dan Atkinson.....	43,992
Fred Atkinson.....	43,965
L. V. Moore.....	42,260
Robert Horace Marks.....	41,693
Greenbrier Farms.....	40,133
Grover C. Lawson, Jr.....	39,029
Darden Bridgeforth.....	38,941
William Henry Stewart, Jr.....	37,525
Ernest P. Hargrave.....	36,868
Robert Hargrave.....	36,867
James P. Grooms.....	36,406
Thomas C. Downs.....	36,345

J. Howard Hobbs, Jr.....	36,024
H. E. Hargrave.....	35,368
Withers G. Peebles.....	34,972
Kenneth Carter.....	34,849
Anderson Farms, Inc.....	34,677
Winfred Barron.....	34,619
Glenn Black.....	34,329
C. D. Downs.....	33,778
James T. Sanderson.....	33,004
Lucille F. Bowles.....	32,774
Stanley H. Menefee.....	31,236
John David Lecroix.....	30,901
James Edward Power.....	29,560
Horace L. Devaney.....	29,318
James Morris Black.....	27,242
Edmond P. Garrett, Jr.....	26,466
James H. Garrett.....	26,466
Jackie W. Leonard.....	26,305
Vester M. Leonard.....	25,958
Leo Hargrave.....	25,161
Chesley H. Moore.....	24,568
Paul Black.....	24,379
Wesley Marks.....	24,261
Gilbert Johnson.....	24,007
Cecil Devaney.....	23,331
Joe D. Anderson.....	22,867
Donal L. Peek.....	22,493
James U. Devaney.....	22,376
M. W. Haney & Sons.....	22,360
Charles R. McCormack.....	20,222
Total payees in county (56).....	2,039,260
LOWNDES COUNTY	
George Marlow Reese, Jr.....	57,552
O. P. Woodruff.....	55,630
G. T. Meadows, Jr.....	55,232
Elizabeth C. Meadows.....	55,232
B. C. Rhyne.....	45,937
Harrell Hammonds.....	39,828
E. R. Meadows.....	31,087
Howard Payne Meadows.....	28,811
Fred W. Holladay.....	27,494
Charles Schreiner, Jr.....	26,024
Caswell G. McCurdy.....	24,659
David M. Lyon.....	20,855
Total payees in county (12).....	468,341
MACON COUNTY	
A. L. Lazenby, Jr.....	54,258
Mrs. H. A. Torbert & Sons.....	47,655
Bobby Mooring.....	43,134
Segrest Bros.....	36,919
Robert F. Walters, Jr.....	36,718
F. C. Thompson.....	32,198
Ben W. Walker.....	26,681
Ray Magee.....	24,649
S. T. Sego, Jr.....	23,495
James L. Kirby.....	23,230
John C. Carter, Jr.....	21,145
George P. Holt.....	20,924
E. E. Story.....	20,672
J. M. Walker.....	20,080
Total payees in county (14).....	431,758
MADISON COUNTY	
John W. McCrary.....	56,431
Ray Vandiver.....	55,406
James E. Patterson, Jr.....	55,000
Wilburn B. Douglass.....	54,885
W. Homer Tate.....	54,308
Carl A. Williams.....	53,120
John W. Vandiver.....	52,296
Erle P. Douglass.....	52,293
John W. League.....	46,936
Robert L. Pickens.....	45,994
Tyler Denton.....	45,913
Tom E. Lowery.....	44,314
Dock Murphy.....	42,611
Homer Hunter.....	42,349
Everett Jones.....	42,295
George B. St. Clair.....	41,119
Albert Hunter.....	40,952
Willard Hunter.....	40,952
Carlton Ikard.....	37,088
Samuel J. Darwin III.....	36,499
Hubert Yell.....	35,989

Don Martin	35,587
W. R. Spears	34,117
William A. Brockway	33,722
M. E. Moore	32,331
Donald Spencer	32,191
Grady Abernathy	30,868
William H. Gray	30,772
Monte V. Davis	30,650
Glancye Gray	30,297
Wesley Thomas	30,163
Donald Sublett	30,082
Claude N. Buchanan	29,885
Robert L. Taylor	29,816
C. Q. Lowery	29,677
Glenn Murphy	28,636
Lila S. Moore	27,922
Jack T. Clift	27,808
Orville H. Esslinger	27,549
Glenn Campbell	27,460
Wayne M. Thorson	27,011
Allen Bragg	26,905
N. L. Reynolds	26,260
Ronald Vaughn	25,564
Millard L. Sanderson	25,342
Wade A. Hubert	24,863
Kenneth Pike	24,842
Robert M. Davis	24,729
Edmund Payne	23,992
J. A. Pettus	23,905
Edward Alexander	23,598
Buford Parvin	23,232
John Hays	23,133
Milton Carter	22,731
Arthur Medley	22,656
Dennis O. Bragg	22,612
William R. Rodman	22,532
A. D. Whitworth	21,937
Wallwood Farm	21,736
Sam Harris, Jr.	21,489
Elon Balch	21,463
Lonnie Miller	21,027
O. C. Moon	20,549
Austin Smith	20,452
W. L. Sanderson, Jr.	20,363
Sandra G. Valley	20,198
E. H. Martin	20,006

Total payees in county
(67) 2,179,410

MARENGO COUNTY

James W. Glass	51,350
Allan Ramsey	38,329
Ed Bobbitt	35,787
Hunter N. Brown	29,985
William G. Rentz	25,906
Jean. Agri Inc. c/o L. E. Gilmore	24,217
Abner Dunn, Jr.	23,849
Steward D. McKnight	20,619

Total payees in county (8) 249,042

MARION COUNTY

B. W. Rollins	28,245
---------------	--------

Total payees in county (1) 28,245

MARSHALL COUNTY

Jimmy B. Miller	32,551
Robert L. Haynes	29,643
Harold Burnett	27,755

Total payees in county (3) 89,949

MONROE COUNTY

Maston & Bibb Mims	31,262
Carson House, Jr.	25,045

Total payees in county (2) 56,307

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

W. H. McLemore	58,671
T. D. McLemore	40,178
A. J. McLemore, Jr.	29,616
G. N. Handey, Jr.	23,056
T. W. Oliver	21,369

Total payees in county (5) 172,920

MORGAN COUNTY

Gorman M. Braswell	43,645
Curtis Stroup	39,267
Milton Jean	36,552
Percy Sharp	26,610
W. C. Brady	25,872
Howard Millsap	24,066
John B. Sewell	21,946

Total payees in county (7) 217,958

PERRY COUNTY

J. C. Moore Mercantile Co.	55,064
T. J. Jones	38,311

Total payees in county (2) 93,375

PICKENS COUNTY

J. A. Hanson	47,788
Jimmie C. Hood	43,294
Abrams & Garriss	36,065
W. B. Peebles Jr.	29,097
Roy Goodwin	24,610
Jamie M. Summerville	24,449
Thomas Parker	23,251
Glenn Brothers	20,215

Total payees in county (8) 248,769

RUSSELL COUNTY

Ben F. Bowden	58,675
George M. Adams	26,677
J. Wayne Mott	25,144
John T. Ingram	21,275

Total payees in county (4) 131,771

SHELBY COUNTY

D. E. Morris	37,930
John M. Thompson	37,349
L. B. L. Ranch	35,093
John D. Kidd	27,566

Total payees in county (4) 137,938

ST. CLAIR COUNTY

Norris K. Waites	26,409
------------------	--------

Total payees in county (1) 26,409

SUMTER COUNTY

General Agriculture, Inc.	30,395
George N. Aust	29,642
Lloyd Glen	22,075

Total payees in county (3) 82,112

TALLADEGA COUNTY

Robert M. Gambrell	40,101
French Junior Pruitt	37,917
Clyde A. Walker	32,405
Henry T. Jinks	29,880
James D. Robinson	27,291
Glenn M. Hawkins	25,512
S. F. Tanner	20,661

Total payees in county (7) 213,767

TALLAPOOSA COUNTY

William M. Wisener	46,509
James E. Davis	31,336
L. A. Wisener	23,251
O. W. Bradshaw	20,321

Total payees in county (4) 121,417

TUSCALOOSA COUNTY

J. L. Harper	52,669
Joe Rice, Jr.	48,580
W. B. Chandler	43,999
W. J. Chandler	40,885
W. O. Chandler	40,847
Darden D. Barton	39,300
Spiller Farms	24,829
Ala. Dept. of Mental Health	21,960
Fletcher Barnes	21,473

Floyd Hughes, Jr.	20,547
J. D. Jobson	20,517

Total payees in county (11) 375,606

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Nelson Bedsole Moseley	46,280
Edward Garriss	31,919

Total payees in county (2) 78,199

WILCOX COUNTY

Raymond Pharr	30,618
H. H. Wilkinson & Son	27,774
Charles R. Reeves	24,018

Total payees in county (3) 82,410

(472) Total payees in State 15,989,575

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—excluding loans—Alaska

[Amounts in dollars]

HOMER COUNTY

Aleutian Livestk Corp.	34,891
------------------------	--------

Total payees in county (1) 34,891

Total payees in State (1) 34,891

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—excluding loans—Arizona

[Amounts in dollars]

COCHISE COUNTY

Wicks Ranches	78,482
Alf B. Claridge	75,296
Bill Hilburn	68,337
Ernest L. White, Jr.	68,032
Floyd Robbs	62,149
Edward Barnes	61,855
Charles Wade	60,858
Frank C. Hale	56,592
Montierth Farms	56,360
W. R. Shumaker	56,114
H. J. Campbell, Jr.	55,261
Alvin E. Ratliff	52,270
Roy Lee Young	49,104
Delbert Motes	48,879
M. K. Sellers	47,688
Kinard Bros.	46,215
Miller G. Aker	45,688
J. C. Dunagan	45,453
Roger A. Hale	38,335
C. E. Hilburn	38,231
Marvin Lamar Barnes	37,040
E. V. Hart	36,826
Leroy Pierce	36,725
V. C. Smith	36,692
Thomas W. Cooke, Jr.	36,678
Edward E. Rivers	35,924
M. D. Morgan	34,157
Gus Arzberger	33,657
William Kambitch	32,689
Buckner & Kidd	30,685
W. R. Grimes	30,326
ACPC Invest Co.	29,132
Jack Robinson & Sons	27,745
Roy E. Mathews	25,549
J. F. Schmelzla	24,569
Western Harvestors Inc.	23,507
Louis Cooper	22,113
B. B. Rumlfield	21,479
Lewis Grizzle	20,976
Ray Yamasaki	20,698
Gerald P. Schoenfelder	20,221
Darrell Lee	20,084

Total payees in county
(42) 1,748,671

COCONINO COUNTY

Red Hill Sheep Co.	39,368
Sitgreaves Sheep Co.	20,404

Total payees in county (2) 59,772

1971 ASGS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Arizona—Continued

GRAHAM COUNTY

Angel Escobedo	41,860
Melvin R. Bryce	38,867
Daley Brothers	29,504
Arden J. Palmer	27,314
Alder Bros.	26,088
Allred Brothers	24,133
Zenos Howard	23,839
Glen Layton	22,848
Verdell Howard	20,739
Verie Palmer	20,390

Total payees in county (10) 275,582

GREENLEE COUNTY

Adrian Richins	30,706
----------------	--------

MARICOPA COUNTY

Spreckels Sugar Co.	86,812
The NW Mut Ins. Co.	85,023
Goodyear Farms	81,522
F. C. Layton	81,044
Chatham Farms, Inc.	78,970
Earl S. Dobson	72,144
J. L. Golithly, Jr.	68,296
Alan B. Melton	67,373
Carl Weiler	67,371
Baskett Farms, Inc.	66,060
Joe A. Sheely	65,239
Chas. F. Youngker	65,058
Southmountain Farms, Inc.	64,497
F. M. Gorrell	64,211
Ben F. Youngker, Jr.	63,780
Donald Wiechens	62,803
Davis Ranch Co.	61,777
Abel Bros.	61,046
Ray Schnepf	60,904
Hugh Bennett	60,890
Dougherty Ranch	60,172
Kenna V. Jordan	58,497
John M. Williams, Jr.	58,189
Paul E. Perry	58,144
J. L. Hodges Farming Co.	57,752
Leyton Woolf	57,728
B. F. Youngker, Sr.	57,595
William Hardison	57,348
Joe Bickman	57,243
William K. Richey	57,228
L. T. Malone Co.	57,223
Harris Cattle Co.	57,101
Holly Ranch	56,987
A. F. Walden	56,960
Allen F. Belluzzi	56,786
Marcia L. Wheat	56,656
James P. Trimble	56,653
John J. Graham	56,285
W. Bruce Heiden	56,112
J. L. Golithly, Sr.	56,071
S & P Farms, Inc.	55,930
John Huges	55,831
Travis H. Jones	55,756
Paul R. Smith	55,694
L. M. Pace	55,511
A. Ann Arena Liefgreen	55,484
John R. Arena	55,484
Waddell Ranch Co.	55,483
Jack Barnes	55,367
J. V. Pace	55,350
David Parker	55,159
Keith Jorde	55,159
Growers Exchange, Inc.	55,105
J. R. Lanford	55,000
Jack Rayner, Jr.	54,969
Marvin R. Morrison	54,842
Kenneth C. Morrison	54,842
CCG Farms, Inc.	54,817
Gladden Farms	54,571
Tom Waddell	54,511
H. W. Porterfield	54,275
Laveen Cotton Co.	54,246
Frank Garcia, Sr.	54,200
Frank Garcia, Jr.	54,200
Jacob Stephens III	54,062
Stuart L. Anderson	54,049
Michael J. Moore	53,968
Richard S. Walden	53,714

E. Garth Lamb	53,681
A Tumbling T Ranch	53,556
Woodrow Lewis	53,450
Jacob S. Stephens	53,199
Ted R. Pierce	53,097
Ted A. Pierce	53,097
G.B.L. Farms, Inc.	53,061
Delmar John	53,058
Erwin John	53,058
Layton Farms	52,374
Jewell Turner Farms	52,298
J. R. Tucker	52,268
D. L. Hadley	52,026
R. G. Eastman	51,642
Jeffrey T. Jones	51,579
Ed Ambrose	51,519
Ben Riggs	50,632
Gertrude Conway	50,569
Phil Ladra	50,559
C. L. Whitehill	50,197
F. D. Layton	50,069
Deon Layton	50,069
Thomas E. Walden	50,027
West Farms, Inc.	49,731
Reed J. Kerby	49,717
Sossaman Farms	49,673
Jack Rayner, Sr.	49,669
Reed Riggs	49,142
Jerome Thompson	48,948
Wayne King	48,708
Lyle King	48,708
Carl G. Stevenson	48,283
Sam Camborn	48,050
Robert L. Cook	47,823
W. H. Jarnagin	47,689
Jon A. Tucker	47,395
Bob L. Phillips	47,340
George Knapple	47,294
E. & L. Walden	46,968
D. Roscoe Est.	46,925
J. E. Roscoe	46,812
Johnson Enos	46,812
Merlin Schurz	46,812
Jimmy Love	46,812
Billman Hayes, Jr.	46,812
Martin Garcia	46,608
Candelario Garcia	46,608
Keith Walden	46,504
J. G. Boswell Co.	46,450
Tommy Wheelis	46,241
Mack Hastings	46,155
David E. Pinkham	45,892
Wm. G. Brandon	45,753
Robert L. Layton	45,304
R. & J. Hayden	45,170
W. Thelander & J. Eidal	45,145
Wallace Bales	45,104
Wayne Vandsdell	44,716
Ray Vandsdell	44,716
Turner Ranches	44,703
Luther J. McLain	44,687
H. C. Douglas	44,687
Lonnle A. Page	44,364
Willie C. Page	44,364
Myrtle N. Riggs	44,327
Hudson Farms, Inc.	44,319
Duane D. Schnepf	44,308
Daniel E. Jarrell	43,900
Amos A. Jarrell	43,887
Arnold D. Jarrell	43,887
Maricopa Stake Lds	43,876
Jamcs R. Davis	43,493
Barbra C. Walden	43,190
Eugene Schwertner	43,173
Gerald W. Mecham	43,048
Newell A. Barney	43,048
M. & P. Getzwiller	42,682
Kenly Farms	42,411
Henry F. Backer	42,178
Robert M. Rayner	41,055
Earle E. Rayner, Jr.	41,043
Ronald Rayner	41,043
Earl C. Recker, Co.	40,902
Ellsworth Farms	40,734
Joe Bob Neely	40,416
Allen Ranches	40,368
Kempton Snedigar	40,232
Ted Hazen	40,226
Chet John & Sons	40,086
Buckeye Farms, Ltd.	40,022

John T. Bales	39,992
Steve Bales	39,992
W. A. Heiden	39,618
Germain H. Ball	39,498
The Taylor Co.	39,458
William W. Sutton	39,457
Cal A. Sutton	39,457
S. J. Jennings	39,287
Kathleen Scholtz	39,287
S. C. Jennings	39,287
Moore & Taylor	39,145
C. W. Neely	39,046
L. M. Conner	38,848
Lehi Palmer	38,543
Richard Evans	38,426
Hayden Farms, Inc.	38,250
Bill R. Moore	38,063
M. & L. Farms, Inc.	38,029
Espil Sheep Co.	37,891
W. P. Haggard & Son	37,663
Jack Palmer	37,479
H. L. Anderson	37,440
Mil For Farms, Inc.	37,368
Aja Sheep Co.	37,015
G. Keith Sasser	36,779
Rudolph Johnson	36,720
Cheatham Dairy, Inc.	36,147
Sheep Spring Sheep Co.	35,486
Leo C. Smith Farms	35,234
Ohaco Sheep Co.	35,223
D. K. Sasser	35,147
R. B. Coplen	35,098
J. S. Hoopes	35,049
Bill Luke Ranches, Inc.	34,884
Gorden Cameron Estate	34,375
R. M. Hume	34,140
John Tolmachoff	33,730
Sanders Farms	33,699
L. D. Hardesty	33,652
L. L. Hardesty	33,652
Bruce Hardesty	33,652
Charles W. Burns	33,652
George W. Hardesty	33,652
Basilio Aja	33,428
Howard Lydic	33,351
Robert D. Ryan	33,038
James Marioneaux	32,872
Robert W. Edwards	32,506
Norman Knox	32,332
Laveen Farming Co.	31,861
R. L. Saylor	31,818
C. E. Sanders	31,381
J. H. Evans, Jr.	30,907
Ocotillo Fms	30,588
Carl Mumme	30,473
Robert E. Robertson	30,225
Reed W. King	30,102
Rainbow Ranches	30,059
Youngker Farms	29,919
C. Dale Willis	29,917
Wayne Weller	29,771
R. R. Wood	29,682
Byron Patterson	29,526
G. Turner & Son	29,203
Hugh L. Gieszl	28,816
Verl Peterson	28,719
H. & R. Henry Farms	28,693
Rala Singh	28,664
William Wade	28,487
John D. Vance	28,485
Eldon W. Cooley	28,485
R. W. Cheatham	28,065
John Fornes	27,910
Fisher Miller Hay & Dev. Co.	27,902
Philco Carter	27,464
Rich & Rich	27,455
Versluis Ranches	27,109
Jean Arriaga	26,783
John D. Hamilton	26,756
Lloyd Martin	26,632
Phillip Echeverria Estate	26,092
Otto B. Neely	25,968
Ivan Rex	25,936
D. M. Brown	25,892
Dwayne E. Dobson	25,891
Nichols Farms	25,654
James M. Accomazzo	25,575
J. B. Hill	25,563
O. E. McGinty	25,348

Chris Peterson	25,113
Bruce B. Hardesty	25,102
Bruce Brooks	25,042
Delbert Beyer	25,041
Jesus Lapaglia	24,957
Edward Martori	24,908
Anthony Martori	24,908
Frank V. Condello	24,903
Joseph F. Martori	24,903
Vidal L. Gomez	24,879
Vidal Gomez, Jr.	24,871
Henry Duran	24,871
Paradise Sheep Co.	24,743
Emory J. Hurley est.	24,262
Russell Badley	24,103
Long Tome Sheep Co.	23,983
J. L. Woolf	23,954
G. R. Rogers	23,851
Raymond Cook	23,836
Geo. & Myrtle Velt	23,801
Bob Stump	23,534
R. D. Beebe & Sons	23,452
W. T. Jarnagin, Sr.	23,380
J. A. Wood Co.	23,242
E. G. Rhodes	23,236
E. W. Hudson, Jr.	22,758
Kubelsky Est.	22,735
H. C. McGarity	22,714
G. Ray Mayhugh	22,677
Circle One Livestock	22,655
Alex & John Conovaloff	22,614
Arthur E. Price	22,531
Fremon Coker, Jr.	22,060
J. C. Wilson	21,874
James M. Shahan	21,776
Gene E. Narramore	21,697
Bartlett Heard Co.	21,469
Auza Sheep Co.	21,451
Rhodell Farms, Inc.	21,236
W. H. Miller	21,130
L. D. Henry	20,875
Wayne A. Enloe	20,740
Roach & Baker	20,643
Donald L. Bissinger	20,640
V. H. Haggard, Jr.	20,603
Kenneth Burnett	20,526
Jerry Lewis	20,521
F. A. Wilden	20,217
Tamara S. Anderson	20,054

Total payees in county
(296) 12,326,246

MOHAVE COUNTY

Eldon K. Parish	54,355
Hanc Enterprise	53,596
John Vanderslice	22,480

Total payees in county (3) 130,431

PIMA COUNTY

Farmers Investment Co.	115,018
Growers Finance Gin.	68,128
Herbert Kai	59,090
Ralph Wong	56,934
Bing K. Wong, Sr.	56,870
Bing K. Wong, Jr.	55,534
Jimmy Bowden	55,324
Warren E. Culbertson	55,324
David Wong	55,097
Pat Tucker, Jr.	52,645
Frances Chan	51,920
R. G. Buckelew	48,024
John Kai, Jr.	46,899
Wallis Farms, Inc.	46,642
Buck Sam Chu	44,469
J. Boyd White	41,991
Woodrow Jarvis	41,124
James B. White, Jr.	40,280
Evco Farms, Inc., Synd.	32,771
Henry A. Worthey	31,524
John H. Payne	31,044
David Anway	29,907
James Kuen Wong	28,738
Gladden Farms A Part	28,485
John E. Payne	27,739
Mamie Kai	27,581
John Kai	27,581
Imogene Brittan Gladden	26,182

E. C. Barnett	25,901
H. W. Brittain	24,340
Bench S. Cattle Co.	23,583
Edward Anway	22,829
Gary L. Watson	22,223
C. E. Watson	22,223
Glenn Harbour	22,194
R. F. Hopkins	22,188
B. Harbour	22,188
Flying E Bar Cattle Co.	22,138
Iola Cady	21,609
Total payees in county (39) 1,534,281	

PINAL COUNTY

Gila River Farms	367,096
Ak Chin Farms	313,974
Bogle Farms, Inc.	87,979
C. & V. Growers, Inc.	70,260
Elleen M. Nutt	69,512
Kirby Hughes	67,097
Norman C. Nupen	67,012
Frances D. Nutt	67,012
Reinaldo Q. Montijo	66,683
Arizona Farming Co.	64,319
Shumway Enterprises	61,878
Fred Enke	61,269
Peter J. Robertson	61,116
Marathon Farms	61,088
Rodney Kleck	60,161
Robert D. Bechtel	60,129
Tolby & Boulaids	59,679
Rex Neely Trst.	59,375
Milton P. Smith, Jr.	59,328
Margie L. Hanna	59,164
C. Ray Robinson	59,126
Robert Allen Taylor	58,884
C. J. & L. Farms	58,726
Marcus Vanderslice	58,704
C. P. Honeycutt	58,489
Roger Goff	58,178
Greater Ariz. Rch., Inc.	58,030
Olise Self	58,024
Guy H. McMurry Rec.	57,820
Desert Growers, Inc.	57,820
Charles A. Peircey	57,820
Wm. A. Stanfield	57,820
R. E. Schlittenhart	57,819
Thos. A. McCarville	57,819
Robt. E. Hamilton	57,780
Jack Nichols Est.	57,650
Noel Martin	57,561
R. W. Neely	57,555
Bob A. Anderson	57,555
George Anderson	57,538
K. E. Shollenbarger	57,493
John Smith	57,375
W. & J. Farms	57,359
Producers Cotton Oil	57,267
T. & C. Cattle Co.	56,973
El Dorado Rch., Inc.	56,901
Picacho Land & Cattle Co.	56,857
Martin Talla	56,670
Patrick Talla	56,567
D. & W. Farms, Inc.	56,497
John W. Quid	56,469
John Dermer	56,460
John W. Dale	56,459
Daley & Bogle	56,417
Phillip C. Hanson	56,369
Dan C. Palmer	56,109
W. F. Dunn	56,109
W. A. Dunn	55,053
Santa Cruz, Ent., Inc.	55,896
L. 4 Ranches, Inc.	55,759
C. B. Clark Rec.	55,690
Joe Ingram	55,690
John D. Singh	55,480
P. S. Thompson	55,413
Leonard Anderson	55,377
J. D. Hughes	55,377
Lucid Franco	55,377
Ronnie Hughes	55,377
Juan Valdez	55,377
Rudy Espinoza	55,377
Roy Rice	55,377
F. Baldenegro	55,377
W. Baldenegro	55,377
Donald Wainscott	55,377

Dennis Nowlin	55,362
Frank Herrera	55,294
Bill Lewis	55,294
Albert Clayton	55,294
David Campos	55,294
Raymondo Montiel	55,294
Walter Isom	55,265
William Isom	55,265
James F. Brady	55,177
Paul Ollerton	55,124
Carlos Elias	54,993
Tom Clayton	54,912
Raymond Clayton	54,912
Ernest F. Brady	54,817
Bill McSwain	54,807
Tom Gaddis	54,800
Paul Duran	54,588
Rod Zigoures	54,567
Leon Zigoures	54,567
J. O. Burns	54,306
Clyde Lane	54,274
Independent Gin Co.	53,332
Jack L. Finley	53,125
Wm. E. Foster	52,573
J. H. Farms	52,388
Dick Turnbull	52,178
V. M. Glenn	52,178
Howard Arp	52,178
Gary Turnbull	52,136
Richard W. Arp	52,136
W. M. Glenn	52,136
Joseph A. Turner	52,024
Snsn. Vly. Rnh	52,023
Reed D. Shute, Jr.	52,008
R. J. Dillard	52,008
P. W. Vensel	51,972
Frank W. Shedd, Jr.	51,832
Mills Pace	51,811
Ernest McFarland	51,592
Cross Mtn. Sheep Co.	51,390
Eleana R. Smith	51,012
Robert W. Brooks	50,878
Wilbur Wuertz	50,872
C. S. C. Farms, Inc.	50,544
Sunset Rnchs., Inc.	50,458
Harold L. Early, Sr.	50,456
Harvey Davison	50,269
Empire Farms	49,527
Koenig Aviation, Inc.	49,502
S. C. McFarland	49,101
Buford Gladden	49,031
Charles Hill	48,960
Manterola Trust	48,912
J. M. Self, Jr.	48,886
Howard Holland	48,755
H. D. Conner	48,665
Paul Pearce	48,509
James Dean Brady	48,499
Clifford Hess	48,392
David Pretzer	47,920
Richard Cruz	47,877
J. A. Roberts	47,689
Diwan Ranches, Inc.	47,600
John S. Elliott	47,542
Warren E. Cox	47,481
T. M. Coury, Sr.	47,171
T. M. Coury, Jr.	47,157
Albert M. Coury	47,157
Tom J. Finley	47,053
Margaret Finley	47,046
J. R. & Velma Urton	46,862
T. O. Gardner	46,047
Leo Ellsworth	46,047
Jerry Skousen	46,028
Era Mae Barnes	46,017
Harold F. Self	45,919
Picacho Buttes Farms	45,739
Mickey A. Clark	45,592
R. P. Anderson	45,567
W. D. Storie	45,459
Glenn Lane	45,377
R. B. Elsberry	45,266
Norval C. McNatt	44,773
Jack Ralston	44,535
Dr. P. F. Hartman	44,467
Jim Pate	44,383
Avra Plantations, Inc.	44,024
Jackson Bogle	43,742
Max Nichols Farms	43,683
Marty Zwilling	43,220

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Arizona—Continued

Floyd Pearson	43,220	Debb Stephens	28,191	M and V Farms	55,000
Talla Farms, Inc.	43,156	Carl Tomkinson	28,093	Edward H. Taylor	55,000
Duane Ellsworth	43,104	Wales Ranches Inc.	28,063	Arizona Western Ranches Inc.	55,000
Isabel Singh	42,992	Wales Farms Inc.	28,063	Bankhead Enterprises	55,000
Howell Wadsworth	42,698	Wayne Wuertz	27,903	Woods Co.	54,991
Lonnie R. Schnepf	42,679	Franklin Pratt	27,602	Fred Nussbaumer	54,724
Florence Farms, Inc.	42,369	Dwayne B. Self	27,481	W. J. Scott	54,692
Jack Kortsen	42,175	M. R. Nafziger	27,464	M. E. Lee	54,562
Ben N. Kortsen	42,175	Charles E. Wright	27,921	Geraldine Scott	54,532
James K. Henness	42,112	Ronald Miller	27,105	Diamond S. Farms	54,147
Emory Shahan	41,950	M. C. Montgomery	26,960	A. C. Cockrill	54,108
G. Robt. Ralston	41,872	Frank Graham	26,836	L. P. Barkley	53,671
B. M. Cabanillas	41,728	M & W Farms Inc.	26,721	Ben Matthews	53,363
Carlos Cabanillos	41,728	G. Gilbert Farms, Inc.	26,662	Kelly Hughes	51,935
J. A. Kellison	41,643	Dalton H. Cole, Jr.	26,649	Keller Farms	50,888
Riftin Curtis	41,643	R. C. Goree	26,229	Clyde Curry	49,690
Fred R. North	41,493	James F. Shedd	25,912	Hoffman Enterprises	49,328
Gary L. Ralston	41,441	Thomas M. Carlton	25,565	J. W. Ferguson	47,780
Ralcot Ranches Inc.	41,175	Wesley D. Hood	25,565	F. M. Ferguson, Jr.	47,780
Carlton Farms Inc.	41,143	Chester Ethington	25,487	Tom Howell	47,639
H. L. Holland	41,043	Herman Diwan	25,163	Wm. M. Harrison	47,189
Frank Abate	40,913	Christopher Lane	25,158	Henry Lelvas	46,860
Eldon Smith	40,856	Harlan Russell	25,025	Earl Hughes	46,777
W. R. Skousen	40,780	Dalton H. Cole	24,796	Charles D. Phillips	45,838
Bartlett Farms Inc.	40,604	Louis L. Johnson	24,698	Mcelhaneys Farms	44,789
Woodman Moore	40,519	Vnb Linda & L. Jr. Johnson	24,698	C. L. Stephens	42,646
Norman Pretzer	40,225	C. G. Cotton Flin Co.	24,604	Double Bar Ranch, Inc.	42,606
Alex Pretzer	40,225	Emmett Jobe	24,419	Jon Nickerson	41,822
Howard Arthur Wuertz	40,084	Eddie J. Farrell	24,304	W. L. Moore	41,768
C. W. England	39,854	Duane Daley	23,952	Oscar Walls	41,687
Leon M. Nowell	39,831	Richard M. Daley	23,882	Archle Mellon	41,317
W. A. Ladd	39,479	Claude H. Evans	23,677	W. Y. Murphey	41,204
Grant E. Peterson	39,461	W. C. Pate	23,644	J. D. McCain	41,204
W. L. Crouch	39,111	Walter Gantzel	23,524	W. M. Wootton	40,732
Cecil Crouch	39,111	Don Stephens	23,339	Marcus Moore	40,587
Tracy Hutchins	39,021	Carl Myers	23,207	John and Jud Ott	40,186
Delbert Lewis	38,949	Earl E. Chandler	23,180	Cuming Farms, Inc.	38,940
Arnold Hill	38,420	Storey Rnchs. Inc.	23,075	Edward C. Cuming	38,892
James K. Pew Farms	38,356	Alvin T. Ethington	22,816	James W. Cuming	38,892
H. L. Kendrick	38,060	Joel England	22,656	Mary Cumings	38,892
Barbara Erwin	37,670	J. H. England	22,656	T. W. Williams	38,702
A. C. T. Ranches Inc.	37,602	J. E. Robinette	22,635	Wide River Farms	38,552
Pat Abate	37,374	Ellas M. Romley	22,348	Weeks and Son	38,510
Edward Y. Hooper	37,288	R. & R. Lvstsk	22,152	Curtis Woodman Roach	38,230
Nellie Rogers	37,042	Edward Nevitt	22,011	Dunn Farms	38,084
Darvin Rogers	37,042	Paul J. Prechel	21,955	Riverbottom Farms	37,910
E. M. Layton	36,593	Savage Frms., Inc.	21,740	Lee Consaul Co.	37,200
Stanley Ellis	36,204	Willis Combs	21,727	Allen Marlatt	35,096
Inland Farms	35,493	Jim Wheelis	21,621	Glen Holt	34,360
Robert M. Davis	35,445	Herman Myers	21,420	Louie Kehl	34,345
Sheba I. Macey	35,388	M. V. Orme Jesup	21,404	Wenden Farming Co.	33,997
Agnes K. Beggs	35,135	E. I. Jones	21,391	Charles Urrea and Sons	33,483
Fred Diwan	34,923	J. E. Jones	21,391	Joe Holt	33,156
Echeverria Feeding Co.	34,910	M. Dillon	20,848	William Holt	33,156
Thomas Stephens	34,746	James F. Duke	20,848	Danny Earl Holt	33,156
Bill Warren	34,334	Oliver C. Anderson	20,848	Ralph Clayton	32,995
Duncan Butler	34,171	O. V. Anderson Trst	20,848	Lorraine Claypool	32,995
Norman Hagen	34,166	C. B. Shiflet	20,780	Cibola Land & Cattle	32,405
Merlin Hamilton	34,165	Arthur J. Faul	20,492	D. S. Phillips	32,388
Elaine Farms Company	34,083	Paul Deconinck	20,424	George Silva	31,503
R. W. Tripp	33,635	Virgil Chandler	20,226	Wm. Floyd Dunn	30,855
Luis Flores	33,613	H. H. Hanna	20,167	Robert Lee Dunn	30,855
Wayne Ray	33,529			Wm. Thacker	30,368
Edward C. Pratt	33,448			David R. Gipe	29,696
Libb Mosby	32,888			Star Ranch, Inc.	28,955
G. Buster Brown	32,861			Gunther & Shirley	28,253
F. D. Barnes	32,179			Circle Bar Farms, Inc.	28,128
K. K. Skousen	32,016			Moenk Fletcher	28,078
Vera C. McChesney	31,928			Larry Wisby	28,073
Larry R. Scott	31,928			Phil and H. D. Sibley	28,006
Clarence Skousen	31,639			Manuel Romo	27,805
Thomas N. Caywood	31,431			Clarence Phillips	27,118
Robert Ellsworth	31,405			Jim Naquin	27,103
Thayer A. White	31,370			Royce R. Richardson	26,862
Charles W. Rhodes	30,922			Robert Mountjoy	26,862
Donald Ellsworth	30,919			John Peach	26,193
Irene McCown Vaughn	30,538			Floyd Embree	26,033
West Coast Land & Cattle Co.	30,189			Joe Hernandez	25,768
Cameron Sides	30,023			Robert Woodhouse	25,563
Clifton C. Sides	30,023			Marion Griffin	25,502
Lloyd White	29,943			Pete Pasquinelli	24,556
Janie Poonian	29,604			Glen Sturges	24,258
Phil C. Hogue	29,512			L. W. Simmons	24,157
Raymond Ford	29,452			Burnis Williams	24,010
Chanan Singh Est.	29,158			Gila Ranch, Inc.	23,785
Marie White	29,018			Mike Martinez, Jr.	23,717
M. H. Montgomery TST	28,992			Dillard Engler	23,286
				S. E. Musgrove	22,309
				Rail X Ranch, Inc.	22,130
				Bill Alcalda	21,983

Total payees in county
(313) 14,118,471

YUMA COUNTY

Freshpict Foods Inc.	106,752
Barkley Co. of Ariz.	74,507
William La Pollette	73,054
Charles B. Sherrill	73,054
Oral Hunter	72,496
Don Andersen	70,243
Don B Co.	65,716
Kemper Brown	65,067
Benny Simmons	65,016
Ben Simmons	65,016
Chrismer Farms	61,654
Robert Cockrill	58,764
David Carroll	58,502
Arthur Blohm	57,546
L. E. Mauldin	56,872
F. E. Mauldin	56,872
J. F. Barkley	56,308
Thom Blohm	56,267
Maricopa Dust Spray	56,135
Winston Farms	56,011
C. R. Kriminger	55,673
Thomas H. McNamara	55,000
F. C. Braden	55,000

Clyde Gaines.....	21,723
David M. Williams.....	21,211
Damel Farms.....	21,011
Anne S. Babcock.....	20,413
E. W. Grover.....	20,095

Total payees in county
(118) 4,963,115

Total payees in State
(824) 35,187,275

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program pay-
ments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding
loans—Arkansas

[Amounts in dollars]

ARKANSAS COUNTY

Robbie G. Dabbs.....	21,753
----------------------	--------

ASHLEY COUNTY

William B. Deyampert.....	56,511
Gus Pugh Sons, Inc.....	54,489
Billy E. Scroggins.....	53,445
CRC Lynn, Inc.....	52,794
Fisher Farms, Inc.....	52,500
Kenneth Rice Farms, Inc.....	51,590
Earl Pamplin Farms, Inc.....	50,028
Victor Edwards.....	46,995
Bobby Foster.....	46,870
Jack Edwards, Inc.....	45,634
W. W. Cochran.....	45,097
Earl Cochran.....	45,097
R. E. Lee.....	44,940
James Baugh.....	41,690
Edith Robinson & Martha Rye.....	40,943
Jim Young Farms, Inc.....	39,371
Gay Farms, Inc.....	38,606
William L. Johnson.....	37,549
Guy Botsford, Inc.....	37,357
E. D. Gregory Co.....	36,620
Ray Maglothlin.....	35,774
John B. Currie.....	34,460
William P. Holland.....	33,284
R. D. Selby.....	32,364
C. E. Bridewell Farms, Inc.....	32,356
William G. Norsworthy.....	31,470
Austin Bordeaux.....	31,298
Jerry Tumlinson.....	29,590
John H. Ralph.....	28,406
Henry W. Burns.....	28,404
Bill Gibbs.....	28,384
Frances D. Wilson.....	27,039
Henry S. Morschheimer.....	25,806
John B. Currie, Jr.....	24,725
B. & I. Co.....	24,138
Frances Shackelford.....	24,026
Robert D. & Joel W. Pugh, Inc.....	24,005
Felix Pugh Interests.....	22,309
Pugh Brothers & Co.....	21,949
McCombs Farm.....	21,361
Louis C. Morschheimer Jr. ex.....	20,703
Annette M. Gregory.....	20,697
W. T. Files.....	20,598
M. M. Oneal Farm.....	20,254

Total payees in county (44) 1,561,526

CHICOT COUNTY

Multiponics Inc.....	58,553
Jimmy R. Pylate.....	54,828
James W. Winters.....	53,630
Don Pylate.....	50,056
T. P. Borgognoni.....	49,808
Oscar L. Crowe.....	49,224
Robert E. Dunavant.....	47,578
Nettie Handley.....	47,578
J and V Pieroni.....	45,925
Burchfield Farms Inc.....	42,793
W. R. Smith.....	42,481
Carpenter Brothers.....	41,904
Tom Rayder.....	38,217
Yellow Bayou Pitt., Inc.....	35,539
W. T. Dixon.....	34,584
William G. Rayder.....	33,106
Alvin Ford, Sr.....	30,696
Woodson B. Hays.....	30,244
A. G. Rocconi.....	30,185
A. S. Rocconi.....	29,115
Billy Hunter.....	28,763

W. J. Allums.....	28,573
Ray Black.....	28,365
Harvey T. Hunter.....	28,312
Charles W. Strecker.....	27,848
Fred Woodall.....	25,834
Sam Epstein est.....	24,347
Jerry Ford.....	23,962
A. C. Mazzanti.....	23,304
Dawson Brothers.....	23,237
J. H. Hall Farms, Inc.....	22,136
Harper Bros.....	21,809
Donald H. Major.....	21,676
Charles D. Crawford.....	21,519
T. V. Tucker.....	21,450
Olan Mencer.....	20,750
Ed. Lawler.....	20,293
L. M. Breedlove and Sons.....	20,086

Total payees in county (38) 1,278,308

CLARK COUNTY

Vernie D. Langley, Jr.....	22,561
Sewel Daniell.....	22,325

Total payees in county (2) 44,886

CRAIGHEAD COUNTY

Gary Gipson.....	36,026
Wayne Baker.....	35,229
Paul Owens.....	32,521
Herbert Wood.....	29,810
T. W. Norwood.....	25,867
Geo. C. Robertson, Jr.....	24,601
Bill Stone.....	23,638
Ray Dooley.....	22,556
C. & C. Farms, Inc.....	22,249
Virgil Booth.....	21,721
William A. Starnes.....	21,383
Robert Box.....	20,915
H. H. Blalock.....	20,377
Larry Burns.....	20,266

Total payees in county (14) 357,159

CRITTENDEN COUNTY

Bruins Ping, Co.....	63,224
John M. Swepton.....	56,819
Allen B. Helms.....	56,733
Julian L. Hardin.....	56,647
James W. Young, Jr.....	56,131
Sulcer Planting Company, Inc.....	55,915
Charles S. Riggan.....	55,791
Jack W. Ray.....	55,684
Middle Place, Inc.....	55,173
Paco, Inc.....	54,970
Nugenco, Inc.....	54,905
Allen B. Helms, Jr.....	54,612
Wapanocca Planting Co.....	53,145
F. H. Griffin.....	51,612
William B. Rhodes Co.....	51,257
James L. Garrott.....	50,176
N. S. Garrott, Jr.....	50,176
O'Neal & Son, Inc.....	49,995
Paul Pirani.....	47,997
Dino Pirani.....	47,997
Adolph Pirani.....	47,665
Milton Lubin.....	46,634
Baylus B. Quackenboss.....	46,339
Cy Bond, Jr.....	46,338
Rowena B. Stuckey.....	46,338
D. W. Rogers.....	46,175
Joe Rogers.....	45,154
Sammy Hatley.....	43,157
Billy Jack Looney.....	43,127
Joe E. Looney.....	43,124
Dan Springfield, Jr.....	43,069
Roy A. Bloodworth.....	42,521
Joe Dale Bloodworth.....	42,521
Robert Eugene English.....	42,521
Johnny Shelton.....	41,625
Alpe Farms, Inc.....	40,740
H. P. Sisk.....	40,213
Walter J. Carlson.....	38,920
Ralph C. Carlson.....	38,908
William A. Carlson.....	38,908
Earl White.....	38,635
Beuford J. Wallace.....	36,141
David S. Wallace.....	36,131
James R. Stockley.....	35,597
S. & W. Farms, Inc.....	35,428
Don Bell.....	35,246

Charles L. Williams.....	34,150
Hester Parker.....	33,263
W. Neely Mallory.....	33,251
C. T. Rodgers.....	33,184
E. J. Barham, Jr.....	33,094
Lowell W. Taylor, Jr.....	32,620
Sadie Beck Taylor.....	32,620
Alton Grant Farms.....	31,587
H. M. Brinkley Est.....	30,845
Vernon Felker.....	30,843
Armond Angelletti.....	29,750
John Angelletti.....	29,747
Ragland Plant, Inc.....	29,130
W. H. Greene.....	28,995
B. P. Kelley.....	28,958
W. T. Oliver.....	28,593
A. Cecil Oliver, Jr.....	28,593
L. C. Smith.....	28,424
Johnnie Marottil.....	28,366
Daniel Marottil.....	28,366
C. B. Britton.....	28,155
Thomas M. Holmes.....	27,974
L. G. Byford.....	27,901
J. F. Rieves, Jr.....	27,539
Frank Handley.....	27,525
Marybeth K. Rieves.....	27,461
Carl E. Morrison, Jr.....	27,002
William P. Morrison.....	26,449
S. M. Nickey, Jr.....	26,106
J. L. Currie.....	25,566
E. J. Baker, Jr.....	25,046
Katherine W. Clarke.....	24,904
E. H. Clarke, Jr.....	24,897
William W. Clarke.....	24,897
E. M. Ott.....	24,844
Helen T. Thomas Trust.....	24,403
Julia T. Kirkpatrick Trust.....	24,403
Marilee T. Stratford Trust.....	24,403
John F. Twist Trust.....	24,403
Reginald B. Twist Trust.....	24,403
Joe Baratti.....	24,381
Olga S. McNeely.....	24,353
Howard Atkins.....	24,347
Aldo Marconi.....	24,147
Joe Currie.....	23,354
Lonnie Webster.....	22,239
Herbert Allen.....	21,803
Frank G. Fogleman.....	20,957
J. F. Fogleman.....	20,957
Freddie N. Bollinger.....	20,601
R. K. Bollinger.....	20,601
Julia B. Goodwin.....	20,351

Total payees in county (98) 3,560,885

CROSS COUNTY

John H. Johnston.....	54,976
W. M. Smith and Sons.....	49,052
Ruston Farms.....	41,333
L. T. Beene.....	39,031
Gene Thompson.....	38,545
Abner Clements.....	38,281
Leslie Nix.....	37,876
Richard Twis.....	36,467
Cherry Farms.....	34,534
Paul McCutchen.....	29,852
Ed Bond.....	29,470
Ira F. Twist.....	29,291
R. W. Byrd.....	28,273
Dennis McKnight.....	28,203
Donald McKnight.....	28,203
S. A. Atkison.....	27,283
Gordon Morris.....	27,256
Hugh B. Proctor, Jr.....	25,935
Wallace Martin, Inc.....	25,212
Twist Parkin Co.....	22,444
E. D. McKnight Est.....	22,385
Robert Twist.....	22,380
John A. Brenner.....	20,997
John G. Twist.....	20,864
Bill Rucker.....	20,391

Total payees in county (25) 778,534

DESHA COUNTY

R. B. Stimson & Co.....	56,724
Reedville Farms.....	42,175
Frank Trotter.....	40,332
P. W. Teeter & Sons Co.....	39,765
R. A. Pickens.....	37,319
Baxter Land Co.....	32,973

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Arkansas—Continued

Bickham Bros.	32,737
Johnson Bros Gin, Inc.	29,621
Mallard Flats, Inc.	28,103
Gary Michael Roberts	27,443
Clay Cross	27,039
Jimmie Miles	26,955
C. B. Stevens Farms, Inc.	26,317
Holt Holt & Roddy	25,257
New & Lick	25,253
L. L. Boyette	23,523
H. G. Leek, Jr.	23,506
Clifton L. Meador	23,256
Charles Raymond Day	22,555
David Brooks Griffin Tr.	22,318
Grover Jones	22,007
Howard Newton	20,878
Martin Wood	20,793
M. L. Walt	20,606
Carmack Don McCurry	20,438
J. L. Britt	20,307
Cecil Tucker	20,014

Total payees in county (27) 758,217

DREW COUNTY

Carl Pamp'in	55,452
William Bulloch	45,175
Bilgischer and Sponer	43,389
R. C. Greenway & V. Greenway	39,149
John Mack Arnn	36,493
John W. Arnn	35,481
C. R. Russell & Son	33,560
E. R. Lambert, Jr.	31,038
Chester Tate	29,152
Donald M. Bulloch	28,546
Charles S. Holloway	26,478
Rogers Trust No. 2	25,387
Tillar Livestock Co.	24,548
Curtis Lagrone	22,456
Miles Whitaker Lowe	21,375

Total payees in county (15) 498,729

GREENE COUNTY

Heulon Barron	20,713
---------------	--------

JACKSON COUNTY

R. D. Wilmons, Jr.	55,946
Andy Doyle	45,361
Burton Merc. & Gin Co.	35,110
Ira Wheeler	26,718
Bell & Carson	24,724
Mack Bros., Inc.	23,969
J. D. Nicholson	23,805
Rock Island Planting Co.	23,629
Tony Walton Farm, Inc.	23,033
Jim Bailey	21,848
Village Creek Planting Co.	21,317

Total payees in county (11) 325,460

JEFFERSON COUNTY

AR State Penal Farm	107,846
E. Hudgens Jeter Est.	55,319
B. J. Alzheimer Foundation	55,000
B. J. Alzheimer Tstmtry Trustee	55,000
Lake Dick Plantation, Inc.	54,947
Pipkin Farm	51,795
D. Stratton, Inc.	49,999
Allen Jacobs	48,674
Peek Planting Co.	48,625
S. R. Baugh	47,887
W. W. West Co.	47,712
Jimmy Blair	47,026
Delton Edward Stratton	46,582
Leon Callahan	44,649
Earle T. Phillips	44,330
Lyons Planting Co., Inc.	43,426
James Terkeurst	41,351
R. L. Bruton	38,546
R. S. Barnett, Jr.	36,652
Frank H. Lyons, Jr.	35,828
R. E. Watkins, Jr.	34,994
R. E. Watkins	34,994

Swan Lake Plantation, Inc.	34,758
A. C. Hunter	34,500
John N. Stern Trust	34,250
Clarence Dutton & Son	33,897
Ben J. Alzheimer, Jr.	33,632
John Briggs, Jr.	33,573
Earl Chadick & Sons	33,480
William C. Maloney, Jr.	32,440
Lester Carter	31,914
Stone Planting Co., Inc.	31,868
L. L. Dutton & Son	30,235
Brewer and Bryant	30,227
Sam Luckie	29,282
Adams Enterprise, Inc.	29,025
E. E. Henderson	28,937
Fish Lake Farms Inc.	28,840
Collins A. Andrews, Jr.	27,687
L. J. Rogers, Inc.	27,619
West & Orton	27,427
A. C. Freeman, Jr.	27,008
J. L. Burgess, III	26,569
Flat Bayou Farms, Inc.	26,487
James Adams	26,481
Thomas O. Murchison, Jr.	25,874
Chambliss Farms	25,018
Noble Lk. Pltg. Co. Inc.	24,803
Coy Earnest Scott	24,605
Jesse Page Walt	24,090
William Shelby Jeter	23,905
Larone Lowe, Jr.	23,150
W. B. Albright	23,065
Henderson Bros. Inc.	22,832
Thomas D. Dial	22,690
Benny J. Fratesi	22,648
Marshall Benjamin Garrett	22,545
Georgetown Farms	22,411
Rita B. Freeman	22,087
Walter Will Bryant	22,064
Larry Ross Hills	22,050
William M. Redfield Trust	21,946
Morris Allred	21,692
L. W. Francis	21,650
Joe Newton, Jr.	21,294
Rob Roy Plantation, Inc.	21,099
Paul Blackwell	21,025
Gray Farms, Inc.	20,905
M. A. Rose and Sons, Inc.	20,499
Marvin Edgerton Burgess	20,030
Paul Stone	20,023

Total payees in county (71) 2,355,318

LAFAYETTE COUNTY

Lawrence E. Taylor	54,055
Troyce E. Endsley	48,243
Carl Adams, Jr.	47,768
Andrew Whisenhunt	47,617
William L. Goza	38,383
Moore Properties, Inc.	33,248
J. G. Allen, Jr.	30,811
Horace M. Burks	28,471
James R. Murphy	27,697
Tom Brackman	22,702
Willie H. Harrit	22,150
Henry T. Williams	20,966

Total payees in county (12) 422,111

LEE COUNTY

Dick Ed Thomas	51,888
W. E. Stiles	51,512
G. R. Brent	49,255
Dan Felton & Co.	47,857
Barker Farms, Inc.	47,571
Robert May	44,290
Miller Farms, Inc.	43,408
McGinnis Bros. Farms, Inc.	42,984
H. T. Dillahunty	41,692
Stiles & Manley	39,086
Elmwood Plantation, Inc.	38,701
C. M. Cooke	37,879
Vance & Bentley	37,514
Eldon Reed	36,352
Lindsey Farms, Inc.	34,825
Mann Farms, Inc.	34,825
Ellis Evans	34,791
C. E. Yancey & Sons	34,432
Willie E. Jones	32,735
George L. Ballard	30,746
Whitehead Farms, Inc.	30,566
Jerry P. Hicky	30,423

Sisk Farms, Inc.	29,947
Parten Farms, Inc.	29,479
Lawson Hughes	28,649
Thomas Gist, Jr.	27,221
Flowers Brothers	25,514
E. W. Reynolds	24,609
J. E. Ivy	23,576
Raymond W. Stanfield	22,110
W. H. Gerrard	21,202
Webb Sweet	20,374
Lockhart Sweet	20,374
Jones Farms, Inc.	20,245

Total payees in county (34) 1,166,632

LINCOLN COUNTY

H. R. Wood & Son, Inc.	52,837
C. H. Clowers & Co.	46,098
Marion F. Baugh	46,014
N. M. Ryall & Sons, Inc.	41,947
Bruce Norton	31,851
Knight Brothers	30,976
Richard Jones	29,046
Frizzell Farms, Inc.	28,118
Wood Brothers	26,978
A. O. French, Jr.	26,532
Robert Edward Dreher, Jr.	25,537
Roy Baugh	25,267
Boscoe Blagg	24,894
W. H. Venable	23,177
J. L. McEntire & Sons, Inc.	22,658
Morris H. Dreher	22,498
Knox W. Bitley	22,423
Robert Edward Dreher	22,172
B. F. McGraw	21,923
Robert Venable	20,614

Total payees in county (20) 591,560

LITTLE RIVER COUNTY

E. C. Lavoie & Sons	29,462
McGraw Brothers	25,836
W. L. Matteson III	23,771
S. D. Matteson	21,145

Total payees in county (4) 100,214

LONOKE COUNTY

Herman Jeans	54,992
Floyd H. Turner	54,860
Sam McNeil	53,091
Jimmie H. Boggess	51,850
Charles Capps	51,264
Basel Henderson	48,351
Bobby Jones	43,138
Triangle Farms	40,663
James W. Phillips	40,554
James C. Rollins	40,315
Bobby Gene Wright	37,122
H O J H D N Nipps	35,787
Odes Perry	35,757
Robert L. Dortch, Jr.	32,282
R. W. Morris	30,031
Elmer E. Willman	29,852
Waylon B. Sims	29,778
Turner C. Johnson	29,117
Wm. J. Bevis	28,788
Connie Glenn Jordan	28,783
Anthony W. Dickinson	28,738
Thomas H. Jordan	27,563
Joy Leon Hill	26,192
Albert E. Yarbrough	25,898
James Workman	25,145
Johnnie Wallace	24,918
Morris F. Hallum	24,064
Hervy L. Patterson	23,741
Sam Stewart	22,985
Luchen Walls	22,908
Cobb Brothers & Co.	22,714
Luid Jones	22,285
Richard Bransford	21,449
Loranz George Crouthers	21,090
Paul Junior Capps	20,705
Arnold Oneal	20,203

Total payees in county (36) 1,176,953

MILLER COUNTY

Price Plantation Inc.	46,778
R. E. Ransdell	45,630
Doyle Stevens	35,166
Rufus F. Eaton	20,711

Total payees in county (4) 148,285

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY

Wesson Farms Inc.	98,328
Armstrong Planting Co.	62,846
Lee Wilson & Co.	62,262
Clide Barnett	61,661
John A. Edrington	61,547
Langston Gin Co.	59,017
Bobby Senter	58,177
W. T. Metzger Jr.	56,640
Larry J. Woodard	56,602
Midway Farms Inc.	55,588
Lowrance Bros & Co.	55,346
Crosthwait Gin & Merc Inc.	55,000
Magnolia Farms	55,000
W. J. Denton Est.	54,942
Charles W. Bowles	53,561
R. D. Hughes Gin Co.	52,559
C. B. Robinson	51,896
Rel Wilson Trust Luxora	51,865
R. J. Gillespie	50,905
Harold Senter	50,786
Ira G. Ashley	50,717
Charles Nick & Richard Rose	50,509
M. J. Koehler	49,739
C. S. Standifer, Jr.	48,209
Thomas Tate	47,560
Reven Creecy	47,560
B. C. Land Co.	47,499
Larry Woodard Farms, Inc.	45,956
Keiser Planting Co.	45,071
Clifford Gillespie	44,908
Marie Planting Co.	43,702
McDaniel Farms	42,652
John E. Crain, Jr.	42,443
Virgil Stewart	42,118
Clarence Crosskno	42,096
A. E. Teaford	42,069
John M. Stevens, Jr.	41,699
Rel Wilson Trust Wilson	41,519
Bob Jackson	39,733
Amon Eugene Holt	39,615
Dan & Chester Caldwell	39,579
John M. Speck	39,388
Wayne Taylor	37,291
Bill Taylor	37,291
C. J. Lowrance III	37,163
Speck Bros	36,713
C. L. Denton, Jr.	36,612
Nancy M. Trimue	36,334
Chiles Planting Co.	36,037
Joe Dilldine	35,123
Leon Brothers & Son	35,098
Collie D. Lowrance	34,706
Wilbur F. Johns Farms	34,105
Glenn A. Cook	33,948
Earl H. Wildy	33,846
John W. West	33,532
Leonard Ellison	33,450
W. S. Cockerham, Jr.	33,373
Arthur Tusing	33,291
Charles R. Moore	32,991
Jack Hale	32,967
Gold Lake Farms	32,663
Ray Harrison	32,638
Wilbur Wildy	32,563
W. M. Taylor, Jr.	32,527
K. D. Main	32,332
Kenneth Shannon	32,301
L. T. Dillard	31,632
James Terry	31,463
Doug G. Bennett	31,461
E. H. Riley	31,222
E. T. Gurley	30,943
Henry Battle	30,817
Trice Battle	30,817
Charles J. Ryals	30,715
A. A. Banks	30,490
H. T. Bonds, Sons, Inc.	30,394
Mary Ann Gill	30,373
Alvin S. Bennett	30,146
McGuire & Son, Inc.	29,970

Ralph Bros.	29,616
Alex Goble, Jr.	29,407
Clyde Whistle	29,071
Charles E. Crigger III	29,004
J. L. Gurley	28,946
Charles Wildy	28,812
Elliott Farms	28,651
Moreland B. White	28,283
Allen Metheny	28,279
Paul Long	27,976
J. E. Crain, est.	27,680
Willis Stutts	27,654
Vaughn L. Shownes	27,642
Albert Williams	27,397
F. N. Craig	26,773
John B. Wilson	26,759
Hays T. Sullivan	26,755
James P. Sullivan	26,755
P. D. Johnson	26,572
Oliver Coppedge, Jr.	26,552
W. J. Smith	26,478
Robert Gammill & Son	26,385
Buford Jarrett	26,342
Bryce Grant	26,265
E. A. Stacy	26,043
M. G. Smith	25,343
Lyman Henson	25,282
E. E. Wallace	25,220
R. C. Branch, Sr. Estate	24,877
Billy Gann	24,864
John E. Gann	24,332
Gerald Costner	24,247
V. S. Johnson	24,225
Ted Parnell	24,212
William H. Wyatt	23,958
Otto S. Gordon	23,894
Jimmy Baugher	23,547
Edra S. Girdley	23,477
Jimmie Davis	23,414
James H. Woodard	23,230
Morris & Hart	23,125
Charles D. & Donald L. Baker	23,082
Murray Richardson, Jr.	22,956
C. C. Councille	22,920
Gus Morris	22,892
Blythe Clark	22,672
Florenden Plantation	22,419
D. B. Brannon, Jr.	22,264
Eric Waddell	22,243
Herbert H. Ellis	22,175
Donald Felts	22,137
Joe W. Felts	22,137
D. R. McDaniel	22,121
Eddie Thomas	22,019
Lester B. Gill Trust	21,649
J. H. Smart	21,644
W. A. Jones Farm	21,568
Evadale Planting Co.	21,381
J. R. Whistle	21,243
Nancy O. Fairley Trust	21,165
J. Lynn Tranum	21,085
Joe Gurley	21,074
Wrenacres, Inc.	20,999
Russell Simpson	20,706
Langston Enterprises, Inc.	20,702
Dunkin Farms	20,586
Nick Patterson, Jr.	20,564
Larry Joe Bell	20,540
Ed. Hardin	20,509
R. B. Holthouse	20,337
Thomas H. Callis	20,300
John Ellis	20,027

Total payees in county (152) 5,143,650

MONROE COUNTY

Amos Everett	44,169
Ray Fuller	43,580
Donald R. Dearing	38,463
Lily Peter	33,590
Parker E. Johnson, Jr.	30,023
Carter Clifton Company	29,363
Hyett E. Harrod, Jr.	28,284
Jay Calloway and Son	26,564
Bruce Crow	26,517
Rudolph Calloway	26,427
Homer Lawless	25,898
Hurley McKoy	24,833

Robert H. Mayo	20,639
A. B. Walls	20,008
Total payees in county (14)	418,358
OUACHITA COUNTY	
Benton Taylor	41,677
W. K. Henry	28,094
Total payees in county (2)	69,771
PHILLIPS COUNTY	
Highland Lake Farm	55,267
Hill Farms, Inc.	55,000
G. & P. Land Co.	54,948
J. A. Hill	53,592
R. J. & W. D. Suddath	52,708
B. D. Alexander	52,127
Frances Jo Blackburn	51,951
Brooks Griffin	51,686
E. T. Wells, Inc.	49,697
James H. Wood	48,961
Hiram Alexander	48,153
Elizabeth A. May	48,142
Milton Alexander	48,142
Curtis Clark	47,976
Elizabeth H. Strang	47,614
O. D. Howe Est.	47,445
Riverside Farm	46,280
David Hill	45,957
Thomas E. Young	44,451
Dave Inebnit	43,625
Solomon Bros., Inc.	43,034
King Wells Farm	42,358
Ray Dawson	41,478
Harry Stephens	40,974
Delta Plantation, Inc.	40,350
Roy Sanderlin	38,437
G. J. Short	37,668
James E. Yancey	37,477
Winston Foster	37,378
Wooten Bros.	37,244
Otis W. Howe Est.	36,162
J. E. Storey	35,225
Joe Pillow	35,039
J. O. Wheeler	34,485
Buron Griffin	34,444
A. F. Gregory, Jr.	31,865
Deputy Place	31,753
W. C. Brandon	31,737
J. D. Rohrschels	31,689
T. W. Keesee	31,470
Catron Plantation	31,059
R. J. Young	31,037
Buford Culp, Inc.	30,977
R. M. Hornor	29,919
Chip Franklin, Jr.	29,777
Charles Loeschner	29,776
Wooten Epes Company	29,326
Tunney Stinnett	28,867
Oneida Planting Company	28,443
H. W. Rohrschels	28,358
Robert F. Howe	27,912
M. M. Crisp	27,875
F. O. Griffin, Jr.	27,613
Loveless Farms, Inc.	27,211
James H. Crisp	27,063
William Robert Moore	27,058
David Brooks Griffin Trust	26,974
E. H. Harmon	26,354
Jake Crow	25,308
Wise Brothers	24,856
Sam J. Howe	24,786
Dean Roach	24,716
N. R. Hosey	24,650
Harry Lynn, Jr.	23,505
J. E. Meador	23,391
Caraway Bonner	23,128
Ralph Bunch	22,088
Danny Baxley	21,834
S. W. Cooke, Jr.	21,469
Claude Warren	20,858
Woodrow Reed	20,826
Grauman Farms	20,579
Lily Peter	20,095
Lester Crawford	20,078
C. C. Simmons	20,026

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Arkansas—Continued

Total payees in county (75) 2,621,781

POINSETT COUNTY

E. Ritter and Company	55,728
Cecil H. Justus, Jr.	52,319
D. V. Cravens	51,742
S. C. Chapin	51,647
Frank Dean	50,536
Clifford Clover	49,794
Fairview Farms Company	48,492
Benjamin Rowan Hyneman	47,469
Guy L. Prince	45,528
H. C. Bradford, Jr.	43,081
Dan F. Portis	43,053
Moreland Barton	41,714
C. D. Walker	39,547
Bill L. Hannah	38,023
Moon & Cash, Inc.	35,558
Donald Valentine	35,178
James H. Moon	35,076
Edward F. Ball	34,498
Morris P. Lansdale	34,240
Stuckey Bros., Inc.	34,077
W. H. Cross, Jr.	33,956
Walter H. Provost	33,908
Tommy Goldsby	33,268
Paul Earnhart	30,857
R. H. Taylor & J. C. Stuckey	30,501
Creodora Thompson	29,804
A. M. Weona Fms., Inc.	29,439
Wallace George Willoughby	29,304
Herbert S. Bingham	27,232
John B. Pritchett, Jr.	26,831
J. D. Fletcher	26,498
Lloyd Shelton	26,415
Citizens Gin Co., Inc.	25,151
J. P. Gooch	25,095
Worthy Neal	24,686
James O. Campbell	24,041
J. W. J. F., and Jimmy Harbison	23,963
Emrich Bros. & Sisters	23,809
Chickasaw Oil Mill, Inc.	23,146
W. G. Craig	23,057
Dayton E. Bream	22,982
John R. Young	22,669
John E. McDermott, Jr.	22,382
Charley G. Swindle	22,293
Robert L. Hughes, Jr.	21,957
J. Melvin Young	21,724
Robert Walker	21,635
B. L. Boyd	21,258
Tecota Farms	20,970
W. R. & Zula D. Payne, Est.	20,627
J. J. & J. Inc.	20,618
Harry Juergens	20,305
Guy C. Henderson	20,084

Total payees in county (53) 1,697,765

PRAIRIE COUNTY

John D. Naill, Jr.	27,513
George & Moore Farms	26,758

Total payees in county (2) 54,271

PULASKI COUNTY

W. A. Ratcliffe, Jr.	39,061
Walter Isgrig	37,539
Sammy McGhee	35,564
Reber McGhee	35,564
R. S. Bredlow, Jr.	28,727
Walderns Bros.	27,870
Walter C. Estes	27,584
Craig Planting Co.	26,367
Robert Earl James	25,572
Donald Chapman	24,384
Emmett Chapman	24,375
Odus Chapman	24,374
J. B. Morgan	22,860
Gene Adams	22,485
Henry Lanehart	21,320
A. T. Henry	21,068

W. George Alexander	20,817
Bob Dorsey	20,025

Total payees in county (18) 485,553

ST. FRANCIS COUNTY

Shannon Bros. Entp	66,094
W. E. Biggs	62,188
W. W. Draper, Jr.	60,284
Miller Lumber Co.	58,459
Sycamore Bend Plantation	51,739
Robert Brewington	48,930
Luke E. Burch, Jr., Inc.	48,204
Chappell & Moore	47,842
C. J. Beasley and Son	47,193
Glindall Co., Inc.	45,704
Davis Biggs	44,461
Lindsey Brothers	43,246
Red Gum Plantation	42,379
Belle Meade Plantation	41,415
B. and L. Farms, Inc.	41,376
Paul H. Finch	41,055
Wheatley Mill & Gin Co., Farm	40,267
E. L. Cupp	40,176
Oscie Hardy	39,139
Sweet Brothers	38,008
Joe Oswalt	37,829
Earl Dean Williams	36,755
Charles T. Adams, Jr.	36,177
Higgins Brothers, Inc.	34,882
John C. Lindsey, Sr.	34,662
Thomas McDaniel	33,982
Hammons Farms, Inc.	33,558
S. C. Rose, Jr.	33,525
Larry Reed	32,939
B. McCollum, Jr.	32,874
McCain Farms, Inc.	32,447
A. B. Malkin, Jr.	30,566
Joe Burch	30,536
C. D. Brown & Sons, Inc.	30,038
R. T. Landrum	28,660
Ernest Stough	27,580
J. C. Rice	27,580
Betty M. Stoddard	26,649
Claud Buford	26,114
Sam Ashworth	26,004
Ida Mae Norsworthy	25,216
Carl H. Morris	24,846
O. J. Gandy, Jr.	24,437
Bob K. McKenzie	24,207
Victor Beene	23,855
Floyd Martin	23,540
Wayne Campbell	22,515
Jimmy Wright	21,747
B. E. Beene	21,649
J. B. West	21,244
Jack Vaughn, Jr.	20,818
Rod Bryan, Jr.	20,296
Freeman E. Nichols, Jr.	20,007

Total payees in county (53) 1,875,893

WOODRUFF COUNTY

Gerald L. Morris, Jr.	55,086
Gregory Farm, Inc.	45,907
Bruce Tarkington	37,029
Gum Ridge Corp.	29,743
McAdams & Stovall Farms	26,492
W. P. Galloway	26,240
L. L. Cole & Son, Inc.	24,201
Jennings and McAlexander	23,843
W. Peyton Daniel	23,660

Total payees in county (9) 292,201

YELL COUNTY

W. H. McClure Trust	24,294
Billie Vaughn	21,773

Total payees in county (2) 46,067

Total payees in State (837) 27,872,556

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—California

[Amounts in dollars]

BUTTE COUNTY

Parrott Inv. Co.	35,635
------------------	--------

Wright Lands, Inc.	25,185
H. E. Nichols, Jr.	20,668

Total payees in county (3) 81,488

COLUSA COUNTY

Wm. D. Struckmeyer	32,884
Strain Ranches, Inc.	30,758
Myers Bros.	29,483
Wallace Bros.	28,900
H. & A. Andreotti	26,851
Davis Ranches	25,893
Plank & Maupin	22,068
Chas Yerxa	21,350

Total payees in county (8) 218,187

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Vaquero Farms, Inc.	28,906
---------------------	--------

FRESNO COUNTY

Vista Del Llano Farms	273,518
Giffen, Inc.	160,912
Pacific Farms Co.	114,114
Mouren Farming Co.	110,798
Comfort Farm, Inc.	106,143
Frank J. Coelho	97,460
Sumner Peck Ranch, Inc.	96,569
Redfern Ranches, Inc.	92,657
Pilibos Bros., Inc.	91,685
Graggani Bros.	88,950
Rabb Bros.	88,021
Sam & D. M. Biancucci	83,072
Goodman Traction Ranch	78,572
Deavenport Ranches, Inc.	76,244
William E. Giotz	72,523
Schramm Ranches, Inc.	71,391
W. J. Deal	71,212
Price Giffen Ranch	70,372
Edward R. Lewis	70,032
Airway Farms, Inc.	69,644
J. & J. Ranch	67,249
Wayne Sniffin	66,976
Coit Ranch, Inc.	65,740
Almer Comfort, Jr.	64,842
Anthony Lo Bue	64,262
Harold O. Banion	64,007
Martin E. Mason	63,442
V. C. Britton Co.	60,906
Kriesant Operating Co., Inc.	59,808
Don Gragnani	59,368
Victor Gragnani	59,368
Hanson & Fortune	58,643
Giusti Farms, Inc.	58,138
Robert Cardwell	57,751
Michael Giffen Ranch, Inc.	57,689
Melcombs Ranch, Inc.	57,352
Irby Abercrombie	57,343
Sierra Dawn Farms	57,314
Reuben Crosno	57,215
Enrico Farms, Inc.	56,609
Half Mn. Fruit & Prod.	56,432
J. C. Conn, Inc.	56,047
Linneman Ranches, Inc.	55,946
Clarence Matheson	55,848
S & S Ranch, Inc.	55,750
Clayton Brown	55,740
Teresa Harris	55,690
Wm. H. Noble	55,600
Hogue Produce Co.	55,500
H. B. Fries	55,226
John C. Harris	55,187
John A. Kochergen	55,130
Fred Rau	55,128
Davis Drier & Elevator, Inc.	55,093
Pucheu Ranch	55,065
Edwin R. O. Neill	55,000
Ronald S. Allen	55,000
M. J. Allen	55,000
Lawrence J. Wolfson	55,000
Edward Azhderian	55,000
Pappas & Co., Inc.	55,000
Rusconi Farms	55,000
Raymond Thomas, Inc.	55,000
E. & G. Farms	55,000
Far West Farming, Inc.	55,000
Weeth Ranches, Inc.	54,993
David A. Britz	54,993
Bob Wood	54,991
Leslie B. Hulse	54,891
J. E. O'Neill, Inc.	54,990

O'Neill Livestock Co.	54,990	Melvin Coelho	45,625	McKean Bros.	29,335
Carl Ross	54,976	Vierhus Farms	45,219	J. Teore & G. Tavares	29,267
Marvin Wood	54,975	Walter Willms	44,187	Jack Howard Ranch	29,102
Paul Wood	54,975	Diamond R Farms Inc.	43,910	United Packing Co.	28,915
Darrell Silveira	54,950	Tai Hing & Co.	43,714	Miriam M. Silveira	28,855
Richard K. Griffin	54,941	Del Testa Farms	43,690	G. H. Berry	28,569
R. G. Griffin	54,929	C. H. & G. Farms Inc.	43,674	Edward Wagenleitner	28,546
Harry John Marchini	54,911	Maui Childrens Tr.	43,498	Carvalho Farms, Inc.	28,097
Five Points Ranch, Inc.	54,908	Henry B. Wolfson	43,393	Roy Green	28,070
Bruno J. Marchini	54,895	Geo. & Jn. & Walt. Orlando	43,245	Toro De Oro Farms, Inc.	27,843
Peter S. Marchini	54,895	Mike Etcheberry	42,601	Carl C. Gunlund	27,583
Pacific Produce Dist.	54,874	Hale Bros.	42,135	John Wm. Kinnunen	27,457
Francis A. Orr	54,817	Marshall Baker	42,110	A. J. Lombardini	27,243
Frank Chounet Ranch	54,745	Sidney E. Gordon	42,085	John Goulart & Sons	27,077
Arthur J. Cuelho	54,722	Vernon L. Gordon	42,082	Metzler & Metzler	26,932
Michael J. Ryan, Jr.	54,693	H. L. Davidson	41,985	Fairless Bros.	26,816
Mayo Ryan	54,693	Pete A. Kochergen	41,935	Jack D. Jones	26,790
Eloise Arcelus	54,667	Ernest Carvalho	41,932	David Martin	26,762
M. R. Lowrance	54,666	Wm. Erickson	41,857	Davis Bros.	26,135
Sommerville Farms, Inc.	54,652	Albert Bufkin	41,440	Jack C. Woods	25,941
Robert M. Lee	54,527	Mary Fortney	41,401	Rod Cardella	25,753
James C. Anderson	54,511	Frank R. Telles	41,388	Alfred Russell	25,735
Billie Jo Mouren	54,511	Jess P. Telles III	41,333	S. R. Botelho	25,423
Alex Kochergen	54,461	Jess P. Telles III	41,333	Bernard Etchegoin	25,221
Crosno Farms	54,412	John G. Telles	41,388	Del Ko Farms	24,789
Patrick Peck	54,340	James W. Telles	41,388	Phillip Erro	24,713
Kathleen Peck	54,324	Frances Telles	41,388	D. E. Drew	24,704
Michael Peck	54,324	Martin Costales	41,339	Paul Crevolin	24,478
Richard E. Guenther	54,298	Roy Howard	40,595	J. C. Andresen, Jr.	24,452
Willson Farms, Inc.	54,157	W. F. McFarlane	40,385	D. E. Robison	24,428
Jarrott Ranch	53,864	Jack Cardwell	40,170	Clarence de Freitas	24,262
Frank C. Diener Ranch, Inc.	53,864	Carl Swearingen	39,715	G., Jr., and D. Ketscher	24,202
Ryan Farm Trust	53,864	Frank Trammell	39,617	Britz Chemical Co.	24,110
Edward F. Diener Farm Trust	53,864	Ru Ann Dairy	39,163	Echeveste & Elizalde	24,055
Simonich Farm Trust	53,864	Alfred Coelho & Sons	38,988	Indart, Inc.	23,973
De Mera Farm Trust	53,864	Richard Eggleston	38,411	Hans P. Gunlund	23,929
Joe C. Machado	53,607	Kenneth Peelman	38,036	Norman Fries	23,883
E. Weeth & Son	53,360	Perez Bros.	37,314	Thomas J. Lovelace	23,824
Vernon Swearingen	53,316	Otis Horn	37,209	Joe M. Lovelace	23,824
John F. Price	53,083	James W. Wilson	37,122	Mt. Whitney Farms	23,637
Rodney H. Parichan	53,082	Louis Gragnani, Jr.	37,057	Joe & J. F. Zumthurn	23,603
Donald E. Schramm	53,068	John A. Gentry Est.	36,838	Hedman Ranches	23,434
O. Banion Ranches	52,894	Re Al Farms, Inc.	36,711	Pierre Harguindeguy	23,229
Cardella & Johnston Inc.	52,578	Barbara J. Deal	36,676	Milo Jacobsen	23,209
Telles Ranch Inc.	52,569	Leonard E. Deal	36,665	Jack Harris, Inc.	23,185
Peter Lo Bue	51,869	Wm. J. Deal, Jr.	36,665	Harold D. Wels	23,155
Renton & Terry	51,837	Milo Erwin	36,201	Wm. R. Bettencourt	22,896
Bill & Ed Koda	51,576	Jack Perry	36,191	Arthur Hector Pifferini	22,714
D. J. Rowland	51,547	Jack Bray	36,191	Paul B. Fairless	22,714
Nichols & Wood	51,486	Des Jardins Bros.	36,179	Nicolini & Mattia	22,568
Richard J. Yraceburu	51,273	Irwin R. Efrid	35,835	P. R. Farms, Inc.	22,539
Leroy Hardy	51,087	Joseph L. Silva	35,795	John Noble	22,246
John L. Errecart	50,976	Gramis Bros.	35,794	E. G. Rank, Jr.	22,213
Fernando Machado	50,974	William Mouren	35,760	Armas Bros.	22,166
Dodd Family Living Trust	50,609	Howard Mouren	35,760	John & Jim Diedrich	22,099
Bidegaray & Sagardia Bros.	50,377	Tony Coelho	35,342	B. Parachou Est.	21,830
Levon Azhderian	50,352	Maria Coelho	35,342	Myrna Wolfson	21,697
B. T. V. Farms	50,251	Joe Coelho	35,342	Giacone Ranch	21,451
Michael F. Matheson	50,248	Coelho Farms	35,342	A. & D. Koligian	21,376
Roger C. Matheson	50,248	Frank J. Mendes, Jr.	34,438	Hyde Ranch	20,938
Davis & Huey Inc.	49,598	Frank Freitas	34,268	Joe Yribarren	20,611
C. L. Anderson	49,501	Joseph E. Yraceburu	34,182	Garvin White	20,604
Gerawan & Penner Ranches Inc.	49,437	Don L. Yraceburu	34,182	Thomas Couto	20,454
Earl Brinkley	49,370	Ernest Fordin	34,038	Stanley Willis	20,407
Viola Matheson	49,346	Richard S. Burford	33,920	Dillon Bros.	20,391
A & H Farms	49,291	C. R. Wilkins	33,113	John Narbantz & Sons	20,278
Starkey & Erwin	49,249	L. H. & G. W. Hanneman	32,975	Lockett Bros.	20,260
John Teixeira	49,219	Britz Fertilizer	32,813	Herman & Otto Walls	20,258
Poso Dairy Farms Inc.	48,861	E. J. Giovannetti	32,584		
Robert Mueller	48,629	John B. Giovannetti	32,584	Total payees in county (321)	14,607,106
George Butts	48,629	Ronald Giovannetti	32,584		
Henry A. Wolfson	48,629	Donald Giovannetti	32,584	GLENN COUNTY	
Warren L. Wolfson	48,629	Frank Ayerza	32,543	G. M. French	52,236
Donald C. Skinner	48,629	Eugene Nord	32,499	Baber Gibson Livestock	35,957
Turner Island Farms	48,629	Nino Groppetti & Sons	32,338	Shintaffer Farms	35,623
Gerald K. Hoyt	48,629	Three D Farms	32,194		
Matt J. Gaab	48,438	Getty Oil Company	31,333	Total payees in county (3)	123,816
Rogers Ranches Inc.	48,220	Harnish Five Points, Inc.	31,309		
J. C. Andersen	47,992	C. E. & R. B. Klepper	31,163	IMPERIAL COUNTY	
Leavelle Bros.	47,809	Walter E. Lambrecht	31,100	Adamek & Dessert	123,914
F. Silveira & J. Peterson	47,686	Ben Rusconi	30,899	Jack Bros. & McBurney, Inc.	108,274
Erskine Ranch	47,272	Alex Maul	30,863	Irvine Co.	105,588
Luther Bratton	47,164	Jura Farms, Inc.	30,756	Stephen H. Elmore	102,922
Markarian Farms	47,113	Jaurena Bros.	30,712	Maraccini, Inc.	99,022
Burnett Bros.	46,928	Wayne M. Hardy Est.	30,613	Jack Elmore	93,630
Motte Ranches	46,908	Richard Swearingen	30,467	Neil Fifield Co.	91,167
Drew Farms Inc.	46,680	D. T. Locke	30,366	Fifield Land Co.	87,896
Pucheu Bros.	46,603	Andre & E. R. Leroy	30,299	Stafford Hannon	86,091
Raven Land Co.	46,414	Triangle Ranch	29,790	Hugh Hudson Ranches	85,480
Donald Bellando	45,953	Linda Vista Farms	29,743		
Frankie E. Lopes	45,640	John A. Speakes	29,519		
		Paul W. Speakes	29,519		

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—California—Continued

Donald H. Cox	85,134
John R. Benson	84,832
Edwin Chew	81,542
Fritz Kuhn, Jr.	80,762
Robert H. Meyer	80,066
Dwaine J. Little	79,946
Three D Cattle Co.	79,502
Hausmann & House Ranches	77,257
H. B. Murphy Co.	75,405
Kenneth Reynolds	74,684
Lerno Bros.	71,295
Newsday Farms, Inc.	70,010
C. D. Meredith	68,956
John V. Merten	68,682
C. T. Dearborn	68,212
John V. Borchard	68,007
Abatti Bros.	67,672
J. N. Osterkamp Rches.	67,507
Darwin Cohee	66,715
Michael D. Ayala	66,655
Davis Beauchamp	63,125
Don Cannon	62,548
Hetty E. Jordan	61,985
R. B. Wilson Co.	61,531
Fad Farms, Inc.	61,431
J. C. Reeves	60,631
J. Emanuelli & Sons	60,471
Bonanza Farms	60,026
D. Arrigo Bros. Co.	59,584
Charles K. Corfman	59,407
Sweetwater Feeders	58,091
J. M. Bryant	57,477
Ed Wiest	57,364
Hawk & Sperber	56,937
Alvaro Deen	56,813
W. E. Young, Sr.	56,623
W. E. Young, Jr.	56,623
Charles Vonderahe	56,328
River Ranch, Inc.	56,166
Donald K. Donley	56,065
Fleming & Jack	55,712
Correll Farms, Inc.	55,417
Mohinder K. Samra	55,000
Beulah E. Garrett	55,000
Milas G. Russell	55,000
Harry Schmidt Farms	55,000
A. W. Schunk	54,997
Alice Denman	54,997
Aaron E. Quick	54,958
Carl J. Williams	54,958
Green Valley Farms	54,899
Jack Hannon	54,773
J. R. & B. R. Smith	54,440
R. A. Lyerly	53,779
Miriam Harthill	53,510
Strahm & Sons	53,061
F. L. Johnson	52,497
Edward M. Wavers	52,168
E. E. Otto	51,887
Lee M. Whittle	51,574
Roland Wilson	51,559
William Whittle	51,559
Homer Slater	50,146
John Fifield	50,068
Imperial farms	49,601
Lloyd Bascom Winter	49,239
H. E. Kelley, Sr.	48,072
H. E. Kelley, Jr.	48,058
Malcolm Kelley	48,058
Delmar A. Brady	47,970
Thomas P. Gargiulo	47,889
William C. Sterling	47,529
R. E. Roesling	47,529
E. K. Greer	47,529
Talfourd T. Wynne	47,529
Preclado Bros.	45,957
George A. Mallory	45,263
George B. Willoughby	45,239
George B. Willoughby II	45,229
Berryman Farms	44,911
Fernando S. Sanga	44,854
George Clarke	44,424
James A. Taylor	43,831
Dearborn Farms, Inc.	43,604
Rodney Reynolds	43,579
V. C. Anderson	43,237
Rex Wayne Farms	43,212
Raymond Lee O'Connell	42,990

Raymond R. O'Connell	42,990
R. S. Reese	42,870
C. & C. Farms	42,866
Charles C. Bowles	42,505
J. R. & Chas. & Chas., Jr., Ker-shaw	42,346
C. Alex Abatti	42,284
Andrew Andreotti	42,252
W. E. Young & W. E. Young, Jr.	41,323
Dessert Seed Co. Inc.	40,507
W. S. Zimmer	40,242
Haskell Jacobs	40,230
John P. Menville	40,230
Francis Griset	39,319
Ray Griset	39,319
Deol & Sunghera	38,778
W. M. Watkins	38,144
Martin Farms	38,004
Allen B. Griffin	37,809
Robert C. Brown	37,767
Earl W. Ashurst	36,743
Williams & Quick	35,649
Dixie Ranches	35,419
San Pasqual L & C Co.	35,369
Russell Farms	35,191
R. E. Bedwell	34,369
Nilson Bros.	34,289
Harold Orff	34,263
William C. Moore	34,043
Loma Farms	33,970
Robert Harp	33,607
Jackson Produce Co.	33,587
House & Haskell	33,269
Vessey & Co.	32,719
Perez & Morrell	32,656
John H. Borchard	32,593
Nelson Correll	32,574
Leroy Edwards	32,116
Holly Sugar Co.	32,084
Harold Brockman	31,824
C. W. Sanders	30,932
V. Borchard Land & Cattle	30,874
Kakoo & Rose Singh	30,838
Stanley Gorman	30,543
Sam Etchegaray	30,492
C. S. Sandhu	30,472
M. Huffman & L. Allen	30,309
Jean Layaye	30,199
Charles W. Thomas Jr.	30,139
Stephen H. Sturges	30,139
R. and G. Ranch	30,018
J. W. Sanborn	29,371
Bill Wiest	28,492
Elijah Bros.	28,200
Brandt Bros.	27,933
Claverie Bros.	27,922
Antonio Rodriguez	27,303
Robert C. Richter	26,950
J. Michael Cook	26,838
Jack Rutherford	26,706
Lee Rutledge	26,608
George Oyama	26,608
Julian Castillo	26,582
Russell Bros., Rches., Inc.	26,380
Hoxie Smith	26,269
L. L. Lyerly	25,930
P. W. Schoneman	25,660
Baljeet S. Thind	24,929
Luckey & Hellis	24,876
Albert Studer, Jr.	24,722
Charles E. Johnson	24,180
Roy A. Johnson	24,180
M. J. Labrucherie Rch.	23,281
Frank Augusta	23,172
Harry Schmidt	22,917
Adolph Weinberg	22,851
Frederick M. Young	22,578
F. E. Burnett	22,470
Walter R. Sager, Jr.	22,237
Marlin E. Medearis	21,860
Sam H. Robinson	21,799
Denman & Schunk	21,145
M. W. Coley	20,906
Inter Harvest, Inc.	20,828
L. O. Power	20,744
Niaz Mohamed	20,687
Don W. Brock	20,480
Lloyd Heger	20,165
J. P. McKim	20,084
Harold L. Wright	20,012

Total payees in county (187) 8,764,302

KERN COUNTY

Blackwell Land Co.	176,659
Joe Mendiburu	139,263
G. M. Bowles	119,213
El Tejon Cattle Co.	113,630
A. C. Engel	110,000
B. V. Farms	110,000
Tejon Ranch Co.	88,566
Michel & P. Etcheverry	88,418
S. A. Camp Farms Co.	84,709
Coberly West Co.	72,883
Grey Gammon Corp.	72,201
Santlaga Ranch	72,140
Kirschenmann Farms	71,250
I. & M. Sheep Co.	70,008
Belridge Land Co.	68,607
Sill Properties Inc.	65,435
Triple J Fms Inc.	63,632
E. O. Mitchell Inc.	62,471
Porter Land Co.	62,105
K. McClanahan & Sons	60,746
James O. Payne	59,609
Mervyn Voth	59,194
Millham Farms	57,826
R. E. Ballengee	57,284
Mark Ballangee	57,284
Jack Williams	57,140
McKittrick Ranch Inc.	57,118
Tony Iafra	56,766
D. Moore	56,762
C. J. Vignolo	56,746
Voth Farms	56,299
H. M. Bowles	56,249
Mason Snow	56,049
Cotton Associates	55,974
Thomas F. Walsh	55,776
Frank McKenna	55,775
J. S. Antongiovanni	55,774
A. H. Karpe	55,691
Merkel & Neufeld	55,558
J. B. Freidrich	55,543
M. Lane	55,442
Ray Jarrard	55,385
John Antongiovanni	55,385
O. D. Portwood	55,341
Schroeder & Holtermann	55,313
F. Pal'a	55,210
A. F. Little	55,185
H. A. Hanes	55,185
W. D. Henry	55,176
Jack G. Thomson	55,139
D. M. Steele & Son, Inc.	55,136
Frank Garone	55,060
Maple Leaf Farms	55,058
J. L. Frederickson	55,000
Otis T. Page	55,000
A. W. Adams	55,000
E. L. Armstrong	55,000
E. J. Selvidge	55,000
J. R. Tracy	55,000
J. C. Erreca	55,000
Dean A. Gay	55,000
A. Vincent	55,000
Robert Del Papa	55,000
Eugene Fanucchi	55,000
Angelo Fanucchi	55,000
Paul Pilgrim	55,000
F. A. Wegis	55,000
Thomas Belluomini	55,000
Philip J. Cerro	55,000
Howard Frick	55,000
Victor Cerro	55,000
R. A. Belluomini	55,000
C. F. Tracy	55,000
Wm. L. Gammon	55,000
R. W. Tracy	55,000
W. Selvidge	55,000
L. W. Frey	55,000
W. Alan Harrison	55,000
Jack L. Gammon	55,000
S. J. Balfour	55,000
Elmo Belluomini	55,000
A. C. Belluomini	55,000
Jack M. Frey	55,000
G. Belluomini	55,000
Kenneth Wegis	55,000
R. J. Vignolo	55,000
Robert D. Watson	55,000

Theodore R. Page	55,000	M. G. Farms	52,845	Pete Romanini Fms	46,692
Rainbow Ranch, Inc.	55,000	Jack Fry	52,836	B. S. Baldwin & Sons, Inc.	46,604
L. A. Robertson Fms, Inc.	55,000	George Fry	52,821	Vernon Blackburn	46,547
A. Neufeld Fms	55,000	O. Torigliani Farm	52,779	J. Pavlina	46,481
Kern Valley Farms	55,000	Glen Turner	52,768	P. Spolsdoff	46,305
Desert Farms	55,000	A. Palla	52,712	Kenneth Twisselman	46,269
Directors Enterprises, Inc.	55,000	L. B. Groezinger	52,650	Fred Banducci	46,063
Westside Almond Ranch 4	55,000	Gal Co. Farms	52,632	Valpredo Farming Co.	45,987
Carl Taftara	54,999	T. A. Grifinger	52,592	H. P. Wilson Fms	45,839
D. S. Harris	54,982	L. M. Press	52,592	W. P. Romero	45,665
D. L. Harris	54,982	A. S. Guerard	52,592	Giovannetti Farms	45,101
D. M. Gregory, Jr.	54,977	Peter Morrison	52,592	Freeborn Bros	45,071
H. T. Fulton	54,977	Wm. D. Evers	52,592	Destefani Farms, Inc.	44,689
Richard B. Brooke	54,977	J. M. Bryan Fmly. Tr.	52,592	A. Haddad & Sons Fm., Inc.	44,219
P. D. Costigan	54,977	R. Johnson	52,592	Zane J. Smith	44,207
H. W. Budge	54,977	R. H. Downey, Jr.	52,592	Stoller Bros., Inc.	44,135
Buckling M.	54,977	Wm. T. Jeffress	52,592	John Chicca	44,007
Geo. E. Hale	54,977	B. B. Roe	52,592	Louis Chicca	44,007
D. Beatty	54,977	O. A. Bolstad	52,473	Dale Snell	43,782
E. Conner Granite Lnd. Co.	54,977	Harold R. Jewett	52,473	Tollie Barton & Sons	43,760
M. L. Cummins, Jr.	54,977	Bill T. Lewis	52,472	W. E. & G. Delfino	43,365
D. Bloemhof, Jr.	54,976	W. B. Camp, Sr.	52,472	Melvin McConnell Fms	43,327
Henry Bloemhof	54,976	J. E. Sanders	52,468	R. Williams	43,263
Ted Bloemhof	54,976	Onie Sanders	52,468	Haddad Bros. Fms	43,012
Dave Bloemhof	54,976	C. Nowatzki	52,436	E. W. Suorez	42,919
S. K. FMS	54,967	C. L. Herrington	52,436	Jack H. Reed	42,868
H. S. Jewett	54,897	Don M. Camp	52,436	W. B. Reed	42,868
F. & E. Mosley	54,888	Lynn Rhodes	52,095	J. G. Garrison	42,718
R. Torigiani	54,887	D. Derington	52,095	J. Parsons	42,699
G. Torigiani	54,871	J. A. Bidart, Sr.	52,082	R. E. Blair Parsons Ranch	42,686
M. Torigiani	54,871	Emily Bidart	52,082	Charles Parsons	42,686
J. I. Freidrich	54,771	B. A. Bidart, Tr.	52,082	Larry R. Wedel	42,456
Nathaniel D. Barling	54,758	J. A. Bidart, Jr. Tr.	52,082	Kenneth L. Wedel	42,456
Sam Barling	54,758	P. J. Bidart Tr.	52,082	Ervin Baublitz	42,412
C. A. Henson	54,755	Bill L. Gibson	51,965	Victor J. Krause	42,348
John Landers	54,755	Wm. H. Gibson	51,965	L. W. Bergman	42,325
Ludy Bros	54,652	F. De Mareo, Jr.	51,935	J. Kroeker Sons	42,319
L. C. Kreim	54,642	Winston F. Foster	51,878	Mary Nickel James	42,278
Guido Romanini	54,512	H. Beral	51,878	Sally N. Mein	42,278
John C. Moore	54,480	E. W. Overstreet	51,878	G. W. Nickel, Jr.	42,278
C. Mettler	54,451	Alexander Wilson	51,878	Johnston Farms	42,118
Okey W. Houchin, Jr.	54,310	Gr. H. Meek	51,878	Table Top	41,939
Francis L. Houchin	54,294	J. B. Meek, Jr.	51,878	Lucky Tree	41,845
Clarence A. Houchin	54,294	S. C. Chillingworth	51,878	Double L Farms	41,758
Allen Bottorff	54,215	R. M. Olsen	51,878	Bob Cauzza	41,603
Baroncini Bros.	54,205	Sandrine Bros.	51,710	Waldrip Farms	41,515
EM. H. Mettler & Sons	54,067	F. B. Frick	51,660	Walker O. Fry	41,159
Reynold M. Mettler	54,060	Dante Baggiani	51,614	Kleen Seed Delinting Co., Inc.	40,984
Jim Garone	54,060	Gino Chicca	51,564	Willis Snow and Son	40,737
T. Barnard	54,004	Frank del Papa	51,536	Precie Farms	40,687
D. K. Barnard	53,990	Mike Hankins	51,150	R. A. Jacobsen Est.	40,636
Howard S. Chase	53,954	Joseph E. Kurtz	51,078	Roland M. Vallicella	40,486
Dwight R. Harmon	53,952	Romanini Bros.	51,019	Stanley Voth	40,386
Alfred Palla, Jr.	53,923	Carl Johns & Sons	50,890	Dennis Giannini	40,132
Louis Ricci	53,852	Weidenbach Bros.	50,890	Deno Fanucchi	40,075
Wm. H. Rogers	53,835	Loren S. Grant	50,570	Sil Lect Farms	39,907
N. S. Camp	53,534	Sterling W. Grant	50,560	Shafter Wasco Invest. Co.	39,810
H. F. Schuetz	53,534	Patterson & Hale	50,555	Hollis Ragsdale	39,713
J. Y. Camp	53,534	Frank Brazeel	50,506	Charles Fanucchi	39,596
H. Jones	53,534	H. D. Butts	50,380	Frank M. Fanucchi	39,596
K. Mebane, Inc.	53,534	Elmer Andreotti	50,260	Joe P. Fanucchi	39,596
M. L. Thomas	53,534	James Tazioli	50,216	Joe G. Fanucchi	39,580
B. R. Howard	53,534	Joe Tazioli	50,216	C. B. Dickey	39,462
F. Carlisle, Jr.	53,534	W. C. Walker	50,103	W. C. Mecham	39,462
D. M. Hart	53,534	T. J. Parrott	50,103	Edward Kraft	39,242
J. J. Murray	53,534	Doyle Ryan	50,103	Five Star Ctn. Co.	39,233
Jeffries & Lachenmaier	53,404	W. E. Tank	50,103	K. Frick c/o B of A Tr.	39,111
Elk Grove Ranch	53,363	Rodger C. Cole	50,103	Bruno Cauzza	39,072
Joseph J. Trino	53,329	Dr. R. W. Sheldon	50,103	E. Neuman	39,048
J. Romanini	53,322	H. M. Bartlow	50,103	E. A. Yaksitch	38,925
E. L. Goodspeed	53,296	A. E. Wells	50,103	Lowrimore & Wood	38,608
Fred J. Goodspeed	53,296	Paul Arnold	50,103	Merz Farms, Inc.	38,558
B. J. Mettler	53,290	Lorenzo Iturriria	49,972	Woods Stone	38,554
Michael R. Mettler	53,290	G. Mendiburu	49,972	John Hernstedt	38,431
V. Roberts	53,239	Robert Leppke	49,972	Arnold T. Cattani	38,337
T. J. Mазzie	53,239	K. Malofy & Son	49,642	A. T. Cattani, Jr.	38,337
E. C. Mазzie	53,239	Wm. B. Buerkle	49,596	Elo & Vido Fabbri	37,627
L. B. Mазzie	53,239	C. W. Buerkle	49,596	Jack L. Billington	37,206
Geo. K. Antoine	53,197	Louis E. Borel & Sons	49,209	Joseph Banducci	37,088
Opal Fry	53,113	M. B. McFarland & Sons	48,742	Roy Henson	37,058
Joe Garone	53,111	E. Ghilarducci	48,574	Joe Henson	37,047
Loren H. Voth	53,071	A. J. Torrigiani	48,381	Charles E. Cawley	37,047
C. Peese, Jr.	52,977	F. Torrigiani	48,371	J. G. Giumarra	36,903
P. M. Robertson	52,977	H & H Farms, Inc.	48,052	Larren C. Cole	36,866
D. D. Doyle	52,977	Livio Palla	48,049	Richard Romanini	36,762
W. A. Swinerton	52,977	R. H. Garlow Farms	47,573	B. W. Duncan	36,637
J. L. Sharp	52,977	Geo. Lewis Mahoney	47,529	N. L. Ritchey	36,531
J. L. Farley	52,977	Jimmie Icardo	47,386	Eugene Palla	36,382
W. P. De Martini	52,977	Keno Farms	47,385	H. Visser	36,303
Spencer Grant, Jr.	52,977	Crettol Farms	47,110	Columbus Rice	36,180
Otto H. Teller	52,977	Palm Farms, Inc.	47,072	Joe A. Costamagna	36,179
Jay G. Harris	52,977	G. H. Baumgardt	46,982		

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—California—Continued

D. Galleano	36,179	Furman & Wilson	26,562
The West Ranch	35,689	Morris Bros. Farms	26,422
Frank Franceschi	35,680	Bermuda Ranch	26,408
Gary Franceschi	35,680	Coombs & Renfro Fms.	26,388
Nell W. Purvis	35,555	A. M. Willis	26,344
G. Pizzo	35,120	J. A. & Adrien Eyraud & Sons	26,103
Miles H. Thomas	34,831	Jim Hronis	26,025
L. K. Olsen	34,802	Heloise Pfierfer	25,989
Shafter Wasco Ginn, Co.	34,735	Vergil Reed	25,901
Bernard J. Bone	34,690	Joe C. Eyraud	25,768
James Frick	34,440	Richard Elrich	25,753
Rene Fallot Est.	33,726	F. W. Handel Farm Co.	25,695
M. Parker	33,726	Schulte Farms	25,443
Buford L. Fox	33,713	E. & A. Sheep Co.	25,391
M. Ferini & D. Ardantz	33,680	Orlando Torigliani	25,375
Stoller Bros.	33,402	Bonanza Farms	25,333
Saldubehere Bros.	33,299	F. E. Andrews	25,143
Roger Jessup Fms.	33,297	R. S. Andrews	25,138
M. B. Molica	33,258	D. S. Andrews	25,137
C. M. Molica	33,258	Tex. Cal. Land Inc.	25,050
Geo. Norolan	33,125	M. & I. Farms	25,035
K. & P. Farms, Inc.	32,590	Pandol & Sons	24,887
J. B. 2 H Ranch	32,518	Elo Fabbri	24,632
Ryan Jeffries	32,500	Btw. Ld. & Cattle Co.	24,617
C. J. Shepherd & Sons	32,400	John Camp Farms	24,472
Meadow Gold Farms	32,329	R. Limi Tr.	24,407
B. Baggiani	32,255	R. Fanucchi Tr.	24,407
Lido Isola	32,255	R. Mettler	24,359
W. S. Kimmel	31,989	Beck & Sons	24,344
Paul Pierucci	31,888	Noriega Sheep Co.	24,200
Clare Rexroth	31,875	S. P. Land Co.	23,942
James Kalpakoff	31,845	Kermeth Anderson	23,834
Kendrick B. King	31,761	Wm. R. Foy	23,653
Derby Farms	31,710	R. Pascoe Ranches	23,446
A. & R. Farms	31,637	H. H. Costerisan	23,370
Banducci Farms	31,483	Double M Sheep Co.	23,368
Carlo Scarrone	31,406	R. R. Costerisan	23,363
Lawrence Scarrone	31,406	L. L. Costerisan	23,363
Roy F. Fast	31,343	Allen E. Neufeld	23,136
D. C. Bartel	31,343	James Banducci	23,032
W. T. Romero	31,317	Doris Walker	23,032
Teddy B. Olsen	31,314	F. Garone, Jr.	22,979
Harry Banducci	31,128	Coleman Farms	22,858
B. Moore	31,122	Stenderup Farms	22,746
Joe Freitas, Jr.	30,714	Gino Romanini	22,619
Louis Banducci	30,617	Albert Angus	22,597
Bell Farms	30,515	Lee Herring	22,488
A. Ghilarducci	30,420	A. S. Ediger	22,339
R. Palla	30,309	Joe Ghilarducci	22,308
Mario Buoni, Jr.	30,301	J. E. Wiens	22,294
Rose Ranch	29,999	John B. Cauzza, Jr.	22,244
R. Forrest	29,989	H. H. and J. C. Lewis	22,202
Leonard Gaede	29,877	Dan Tudor & Sons	22,195
W. C. Handel & Sons, Inc.	29,675	D. Corsaro	22,142
Vista Farms	29,270	Arthur Icardo	22,002
Louise Fox	29,205	Mitchell Brothers Co.	21,958
Emry Crawford	29,166	E. A. Neufeld	21,897
J. R. Mozingo	29,158	Poznoff Farms	21,846
D. C. Crawford	29,158	Jeff Reyes	21,835
Ansolabehere Bros.	29,050	Lloyd Bowman	21,822
Maple Ranch	29,030	Eugene Johnson	21,681
J. T. Sanders	28,795	G. Emerson Fms., Inc.	21,644
S. E. Willis	28,656	Lloyd Unruh	21,576
John L. Willis	28,647	Clara P. Rexroth	21,529
W. B. Camp & Sons	28,474	Mickey Hair	21,433
Twin Farms	28,430	Curtis Hair	21,426
F. L. Starrh	28,424	Hardy Hair	21,426
Frank C. Bury	28,377	Wilbur Kruger	21,423
Gano Torigliani	28,354	Leroy Barnett	21,391
Cowan Farms	28,261	Wedel Farms	21,370
Milne Stearns	27,953	Otto Handel	21,339
Tom Toretta	27,952	Piramo Luchetti	21,327
D. Toretta	27,952	Wayne Kirschenmann	21,104
Michael C. Lane	27,833	Mary May Enterprises	20,947
Gene K. Holland	27,805	Alvie Snow	20,900
C. Valpredo	27,685	David Cerrina	20,795
R. Frantz	27,671	Secondo Viarengo	20,795
Dan Frantz	27,671	M. L. Rockwell	20,610
Buttonwillow Gin Co.	27,620	Bergman & Isaac	20,558
Bill Menta	27,573	Martin Farms	20,434
Elmer Rossi	27,500	Al Pistoressi	20,334
Elmer Rossi	27,500	Donald Molatore	20,325
C. D. Ross	27,362	D. Antongiovanni	20,233
Robert Banducci	27,129	E. Antongiovanni	20,233
G. Banducci	27,129	Vincent Antongiovanni	20,233
Eugene Black	26,863	U. Antongiovanni	20,233
Neffs Ranch	26,733	J. R. Almklov	20,150
Dellis Farms	26,669		
Valley Irr. & Supply Co.	26,657		

Total payees in county
(538) 23,658,694

KINGS COUNTY

Westlake Farms	91,292
Gilkey Farms, Inc.	88,751
G. W. Nickel, Jr.	70,313
Wedderburn Bros.	68,669
Salter Land Co.	66,492
R. A. Rowan & Co.	66,085
James & Paul Avila	62,335
J. G. Stone Land Co.	59,084
Standard Oil Co.	57,467
South Fork Ranch, Inc.	56,545
Ross Borba, Jr.	56,304
Darril Borba	56,304
Ross Borba, Sr.	56,299
Boyett Farming	56,031
L. E. Culp DBA Culp Ranches	55,963
Wesley Hansen	55,843
C. R. Shannon	55,403
Aram Kinosian, Jr.	55,402
Clifford S. Luperelo	55,402
Jack Shannon	55,402
Norman R. Gabor	55,402
Elbow Enterprises, Inc.	55,402
Hogle Ford	55,402
James G. Shannon	55,402
Leroy E. Hutsell	55,402
Ronald S. Upton	55,402
R. S. Barlow	55,136
Gregory Stanton	55,090
W. H. Rowe	54,999
Oscar Ray Green	54,999
Leon L. Hall	54,980
Charles E. Rose	54,980
Nancy Nickel	54,919
James L. Nickel	54,919
Cynthia Selfridge	54,919
Joan S. Selfridge	54,919
L. A. Hansen	54,906
Philip D. Duvall	54,880
Robert E. Murphy	54,880
Philip P. Marskey	54,880
Daniel A. Newton	54,875
Thomas A. Newton	54,875
Patrick W. Newton	54,875
Daniel F. Newton	54,875
Louis T. Robinson	54,745
Harp Bros, Inc.	54,729
Harriet Hansen Trustee	54,729
Ralph Gilkey	54,514
Hazel R. Mitchell	54,307
Robert W. Anderson	53,077
Craig Anderson	53,077
Inco Farms, Inc.	52,991
C. Elmer Spafford	52,964
Couture Farms	52,836
Murray Farms, Inc.	52,570
William E. Thornton	51,312
Malcolm P. Powers	51,167
Chas. Schwartz	50,947
Vernon L. Thomas, Inc.	50,917
Floyd Wisecarver	50,781
G. E. Brewster Est.	50,614
B. Gonsales	50,614
Shaen Magan	49,393
W. W. Boswell, Jr.	49,060
John Hild	47,756
John Lawrence Stone	45,979
H. L. Thayer	45,979
William T. Stone	45,956
Lawrence M. Stone	45,956
Westfarmers A. Pts.	44,985
L. W. Newton	44,115
Glenn A. Gramps	43,917
Richard A. Newton	43,904
M. G. Pickett	43,748
D. E. Hildebrand	43,725
Fabry Farms, Inc.	43,108
J. B. Long	41,400
Leroy Avila	40,761
Paul Couture	40,649
Suzanne Couture	40,636
Stephen Couture	40,636
John A. Avila	39,285
Clarence Avila	39,273
Murray Bros. Farming	38,254
Verburg Bros., Inc.	36,790
Costa & Quintel, Inc.	36,516
Donald J. Gilkey	35,574
Don Riddle	35,574
Kenyon De Vaney	35,574
Double O Ranch	34,888
Franna Farms	34,861

Alvin Odle	34,712
Richard M. Stuhaan	34,612
P. Hansen Ranch	34,267
Ralph Marshall	34,024
Earle A. Howe	33,542
L. & R. Giacomazzi	33,244
L. E. Hansen Farms, Inc.	31,270
Dunlop Farms	31,255
Charles W. Yocum	31,031
H. L. Yocum	31,031
Kille Yocum	31,031
Robert Yocum	31,031
Nunes & Pires	30,754
George Sego	29,925
James B. Hansen	28,963
Jess V. Hansen	28,963
Duty Farms	27,304
Wesley Stanton	27,188
Barcellos & Wolfson	27,100
Hugh V. Johns	27,026
Manuel Vieira, Jr.	26,449
Larry Davis	26,329
R. L. Squire & Sons	26,100
Tony A. Bettencourt	25,890
Useton Ranch	25,238
M. S. Simas Est.	25,147
Tommy R. Avila	25,073
Broder Fabry	24,576
Kenneth G. Walker	24,309
B. J. M. Farms, Inc.	24,254
Fleming Bettencourt	24,165
Leslie B. Logan	24,121
South Lake Farms	24,111
John Verboon	23,760
J. E. Squire & Sons	23,723
M. J. & Ralph Whitmore	23,589
John Teixeira	23,464
Silva Brothers	23,207
William G. Squire	23,207
Grant W. Squire	23,207
Bettencourt Bros	22,968
Simas Bros.	22,832
Albert Martin	22,301
Dufur & Castadio	22,201
Circle L Farms	22,155
Rowena Mae Salyer	22,126
Mussel Slough Farms	21,824
M. E. Taylor	21,706
H. K. Richards	21,520
Pete Ysusi	21,519
A. C. Cardoza	20,938
Fagundes Bros	20,873
Marcy J. Silva	20,809
Myron & Theron Dutra	20,726
Tos Brothers	20,062

Total payees in county
(146) 6,154,514

LASSEN COUNTY

Fred Weisenburger	21,142
-------------------	--------

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

John Fuson	88,010
Swift & Co.	78,245
Godde & Ritter	61,641
Monrovia Nursery Co.	25,000
2d Morehart Trust	25,000

Total payees in county (5) 277,896

MADERA COUNTY

Forrest Clayton	58,551
J. A. & T. R. Hawkins	57,054
Burkhart Farms	56,658
Dave Mendrin & Sons	56,397
Bill G. Clay	56,039
B. A. Watson	55,282
Robert Hansen	55,203
Gary Brooks	54,994
Logoluso Farms	53,807
Baker & Hansen	52,571
Elmer Schuh	51,216
Jacob Schuh, Jr.	51,200
Sam M. Schuh	51,200
George Andrew	50,486
George E. Ross	48,018
James L. Sniffin	48,004
Triangle T Ranch	47,438

John M. Lasgoity	46,069
Larry Chapman	45,738
R. W. Hopper	44,908
Howard Glantz	43,831
Fred Toschl	43,230
A. K. Baker	41,459
El Peco Ranch	41,260
Donald Mercer	41,123
Ardell Hooper	40,331
Otha Hooper	40,331
Norman Kuhr	40,119
Ben Curutchet	39,116
H. M. Farming Co.	38,716
Johnny Deniz	37,708
Dan Branco	37,633
Richard Johnson	37,057
R. C. Weaver	36,556
Dale Maddalena	35,241
David Baker	33,518
Willard Haynes	32,915
Fred Van Tassel	32,675
S. A. Upton	32,130
Morgan Johnson	30,650
Red Top Cotton Grws	30,474
Floyd Williams	29,981
Sam Mariani	29,897
Kenneth B. Seibert	29,567
Wesson Farms	29,556
Leonard Frazier	29,138
Peter Maddalena	28,442
Clarence Ylarregui	28,332
S. E. Roberts	28,219
J. Frank Martin & Sons	27,929
John Galleano	27,206
Wm. Correia	26,733
Wm. E. Roberts	25,564
L. D. McRee	24,662
Guy Houk	24,536
L. B. Beshears	23,840
Averill Ranch	23,796
Alvin Gomes	23,770
Larry L. Jantzen	23,514
Edward Pistoresi	23,402
Millas Hart	22,363
Paul Toschl, Sr.	21,923
Robert Da Silva	21,434
John Farmer	21,357
G. J. Schuh	21,357
Arvid Allen	20,760
Charles D. Mays	20,636
C. F. Andresen	20,501

Total payees in county
(68) 2,505,321

Wolfson Land and Cattle	101,843
Dean Barrett	67,636
Vernon Porter	66,339
Sorg Bros	59,207
Lewis Maiorino	58,851
Lindemann Farms, Inc.	57,180
Santa Rita Ranch Co.	57,166
Findley M. Upton	55,574
Timco Div	55,294
Sam Hamburg Farms	54,363
Upton Bros.	54,035
Nina B. Nickel	53,365
John C. Nickel	53,365
Ray Buile	51,401
Chas. E. Andrews	50,097
Eagle Loma Farms, Inc.	49,704
Woo Bros	48,625
Carl Bryant	44,620
Carl Sumpter	43,881
Joe G. Machado, Jr.	39,701
Danco Farms	38,240
Talbott Sheep Co.	37,214
Clay Farms, Inc.	36,721
Delta Farms	35,043
Bob Porter	33,804
Joe H. Santos	33,601
Brights Nursery, Inc.	31,536
James Maiorino, Jr.	31,001
Striblings Nurseries	30,519
Henry Sorg	29,146
Kenneth Porter	28,721
Favler Cattle Co.	27,618
Pedretti Ranches	26,141
Etcheverry Bros	25,696
R. Palazzo and Co., Inc.	25,186
Ardans Bros	23,025

Ollie McDonald	22,464
Marvin Wooten	22,347
W. F. Sturgeon Farms	20,877
Herman Willis	20,753
Arambarri and Izoco	20,022

Total payees in county (41) 1,721,922

MONTEREY COUNTY

Bruce Church, Inc.	84,295
Frank Taylor	46,541
Martinus & Martinus	39,007
Inter Harvest, Inc.	30,333
William D. Crinklaw	28,258
William Whitney	27,100
Violini Sisters	25,162
Huntington Farms, Inc.	21,309
Harless Bros	20,989

Total payees in county (9) 322,994

ORANGE COUNTY

Rancho Santa Ana	24,999
------------------	--------

PLACER COUNTY

Evans Bros	23,995
Frank & Ross Riolo	23,654

Total payees in county (2) 47,649

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

J. R. Norton Co.	63,313
Fisher Ranch	58,979
Pi Land & Cattle Co.	56,440
Sunrise Farms	55,793
Gary A. Bryce	55,771
Albert P. Keck Co.	55,590
D. L. Mudd, Inc.	55,135
E. G. Nowell	55,000
Donald T. Williams	55,000
Larry Augusta	55,000
James Stafford	55,000
Robert M. Morton	55,000
Thomas Robinson	55,000
Ellsworth Epperson	55,000
Charles Robinson	55,000
G. T. Scott Ranches, Inc.	55,000
Leon Kennedy	54,737
Mark Kennedy	54,737
Don Riley	54,718
Henry W. Warne	53,687
Clarence Robinson	51,635
Harold Levin	51,108
Desert Ginning Co.	50,875
Rummonds Bros. Ranches, Inc.	50,830
Verne Wuertz	47,163
C. P. Richins & Sons	47,106
Travis Farms	47,106
John Pavao	45,798
Lawrence Chaffin	44,750
Dale Hull	42,593
BKM Ranchers	41,632
E. C. Apodac Est.	40,824
George Arakelian Farms, Inc.	39,447
W. K. Kenworthy	38,332
Henry Schindler	36,441
Louis Schindler	36,441
Suzy Bel Farms	35,266
Marshburn Bros.	35,118
Duane E. Berger	33,300
Motte & Sons	32,879
Bud Antle, Inc.	28,773
Harboe Ensley	27,958
Johnson Bros.	27,506
Frank Guilton	27,160
Rheingans Bros.	27,017
Amronland & Cattle	24,016
Bert Lauda	23,928
Clyde E. Smith	22,542
John B. Mainvil	22,367
J & R Enterprises	22,089
Nish Norolan Farms	21,921
Peter Rabbit Farms	21,575
Sam Keoseyan	21,310
Ramon F. Burrell	20,640
Rancho del Juan	20,160

Total payees in county
(55) 2,321,506

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—California—Continued

SACRAMENTO COUNTY	
Amistad Ranches	30,200
Lum Bunn & Sons	25,015
Silva Farms	20,921
George D. Wilson	20,287

Total payees in county (4) 96,423

SAN BENITO COUNTY	
Thomas Castle Farms	23,264

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	
M. and T. Inc.	72,712
John B. Meek	57,217
Jean Cubiburu	56,120
Reclaimed Island Lands	38,524
Tanaka Farms	27,970
A. & M. Farms	26,318
River Investment Co.	25,869
Joe Sabbatini	24,404
Watanabe Bros.	23,118
Jack Klein Estate	22,458
Moresco Bros. Farms	22,386
Frank Arbura	22,216
Kaiser and Lindeman	20,632
Augusta Bixler Farms	20,498
Saiyer Victoria, Inc.	20,457

Total payees in county (15) 480,899

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	
Jackson & Reinert	47,135
Miller Brothers	41,780
Frank Galainena	33,876
Kent Hansen	28,278
Van Horn Bros.	28,263
Camatta Ranch	27,802
Grayson Owen Co.	24,685
Ernest A. Hahl	24,500
William P. Wreden	23,881
Armendaris Ld. Dev. Cp.	20,058
Nels Beck & Sons	20,047

Total payees in county (11) 320,305

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	
Owen T. Rice & Son, Inc.	42,964
R. L. Calhoun	41,533
Andrew T. Petersen	34,947
Sinton & Brown, Co.	28,200
Del Mar Packing Co.	24,999

Total payees in county (5) 172,643

SOLANO COUNTY	
Chew Bros.	104,754
Gnos Brothers	41,405
C. Bruce Mace Ranch, Inc.	39,491
H. H. & J.	37,896
Peter Cook, Jr.	35,719
Anderson Brothers	30,671
Holdener & Wiegand	30,462
Giannoni Farms, Inc.	27,518
Albert Carrington	26,502
Steve Shubin	24,996
Bulkley Ranch	23,736
Tom Abel	23,395
George M. Struve, Jr.	22,772
Fred H. Rehman & Son	21,649
Belli & Fahn	21,421
Solano Farms, Inc.	20,649
Brann Bros.	20,530
Hastings Farms	20,470
Edgar Everett & Son Farms	20,429
Robert C. Schulze	20,402
W. L. Davey	20,384
Mayhood Ranches	20,372

Total payees in county (22) 655,623

STANISLAUS COUNTY	
Patterson Land Co.	25,000
Thorkelson Ranches	22,876

Total payees in county (2) 47,876

SUTTER COUNTY	
Newhall Land and Frmg.	178,562
Hamatani Farms, Inc.	34,956
Oji Bros. Farm, Inc.	31,354
E. E. McPherrin & Son	29,406
Lamb Bros.	25,984
Sutter Basin Corp.	25,711
H. L. Sanborn and Sons	21,909
James H. Akin	20,818

Total payees in county (8) 368,700

TEHAMA COUNTY	
The Pacific Farms	37,207
Sutlin Bros.	30,135
USP Corporation	27,500
Kaiser Aetna	27,500
O. M. C. Orchards	27,499
Associated Almond Orchards	27,499
Robert E. Mills	26,800
D. L. Williams & Son	23,538
Anchordoguy & Co.	21,664

Total payees in county (9) 249,342

TULARE COUNTY	
Southdown McCarthy Farms	155,414
Roberts Farms, Inc.	109,408
Nichols Farms	83,173
Marion Harris	75,733
C. J. Ritchie	63,957
M. Curti & Sons	63,222
W. M. & D. L. Colson	61,582
Marko Zaninovich, Inc.	60,335
John Valov	58,921
Fisher Bros.	57,741
George A. Efseaff	57,419
Mitchellinda Ranches	57,129
L. Raviscioni Farms	56,952
Andy Wheat	55,861
R. A. Hildebrand	55,104
Richard M. Shannon	55,000
Patrick T. Shannon	55,000
Kelly Ann Shannon Tr.	55,000
G. L. Bennetts	54,903
Shuklian Bros., Inc.	54,769
Bill Beshears	54,762
Watte Brothers	54,589
James G. Schott	54,573
Michael A. Schott	54,557
Glenn J. Schott	54,557
Clyde Quillin, Jr.	54,554
Sherman Land & Cattle Co.	54,517
Leroy Sunderland	53,354
Gene McClure, Inc.	53,354
A. E. Panetta Farms	53,224
G. E. Paxton	53,097
Charlie Minoletti	52,706
Richard McCarthy	52,631
Donald McCarthy	52,615
Leland McCarthy	52,615
Baker Bros.	52,170
Doyle Ritchie	51,757
Roy Kent	51,747
Attilio Belezzuoli	51,715
Guthrie Farming Co.	51,123
Sam & Bill Valov	51,008
John Torrez, Jr.	50,941
Paul Shannon	50,935
Carl Shannon	50,935
Bill White	50,819
Clarkland Farms	50,454
Geo. C. Rising	50,219
Earl Royer	49,735
Dane Stuhann	49,617
George Bassett, Jr.	48,745
Edward L. Irwin	48,540
L. W. Turk	48,514
Wilbur Ranch	47,963
Hochuli Bros.	47,393
Stuhann Farms	47,052
Onel C. Jackson	45,691
S. K. Warkentin	45,506
A. E. Quatacker	44,512
Benson Brothers	43,455
James Rodari	43,305
Louie F. Morris	43,197
Harriet L. Merritt	43,185
Richard W. Merritt	43,185
Mello & Martin Farming Co.	42,616

Thad Dresser	42,543
Ronald W. Harris	42,502
J. X. Bettencourt	42,238
Sam Perry	41,308
H. P. Anderson III	40,313
H. P. Anderson Jr.	40,313
Robert F. Bowman	40,221
Anthony V. Cardoza	39,926
S. & S. Ranches	39,810
Mary O. Cardoza	39,426
Glenn L. Cooper	39,378
Anthony Rodrigues	39,343
Delmart Farms	39,257
Vernon Hutsell	38,526
Darrell Taylor	38,306
Theodore Eberlein	37,683
E. D. Batsch	37,559
Brian Batsch	37,552
Gerald Lang	37,547
Hash Nursery	37,466
Theodore Smith	37,426
Alvin Correia	36,917
Joseph Correia	36,909
Don Jackson	36,849
Galbraith Brothers	36,829
Val Verde Farms Inc.	36,727
Los Feliz Inv. Co.	36,493
Kirby Wyllie	36,454
Sam W. Bell	36,360
A. M. Falconer	35,872
Donald R. Falconer	35,872
Harry L. Falconer	35,872
A. M. Falconer Jr.	35,872
James E. Kagler	35,774
Lawrence Taylor	35,629
Don Mac'fillan	35,283
Wesley W. Smith	34,835
Lesley W. Smith	34,824
Roscoe E. Smith	34,824
Ernest Ritchie	34,767
Richard Berry & Sons	34,758
Donald Thiesen	34,499
Vernon Thiesen	34,499
Roy D. Murray	34,382
Nagatani Farms	34,224
Andrea B. Henninger	34,195
Reynold Bisconer Estate	34,195
David Bisconer	34,195
Raymond Bisconer	34,195
Hillman Corpotaion	34,130
J. C. Ribeiro & Sons	33,941
Manuel Martin Jr.	33,745
Chas. Neufeld	33,722
Raymond Donaldson	33,371
W. K. Jackson Jr.	32,899
A. T. & J. R. Villard	32,720
Clark Bros.	32,508
Lapadula Farms	32,401
Howard Trimble & Son	32,280
Gobel Brothers	32,251
Schlitz & Twiford Farms	32,197
Uchita Bros.	32,156
Robert Taggart	32,017
Hercal Corporation	31,422
R. Wayne Lessley	31,387
Joe W. Ramos	31,225
Harvey Lauritzen	31,045
Ernest Menezes	30,595
Joe Menezes	30,595
T. I. Hampton	30,466
Overholt Brothers	30,459
Florence M. Doe	30,346
Manuel Picanso	30,308
Pete Lawrence	30,277
Lynn McCallister	30,139
Nickell Farms	30,098
Dub & Barbara Lusk	29,963
Russell M. Doe	29,955
Chas. E. Slaughter Farms	29,767
Jack C. Harris	29,578
Wm. R. White	29,546
J. H. & R. J. Cowart	29,452
Gary G. Pratt	29,257
Toomey Brothers	29,109
Serpa & Co.	28,527
Donald Bergantz	28,283
Ira Thompson	28,084
Don G. Dollinger	27,945
J. L. Pires & Co.	27,578
Don Elsner	27,412
C. Paul Johnson	27,222

Manuel Silveira	27,196
E. W. Merritt Farms	27,023
H. A. Vossler & Sons	27,006
Manuel I. Rocha & Co.	26,557
Ralph Bissell	26,430
R. G. Burns	26,419
C. D. Speer	26,110
Robert Hutcherson	26,028
Henry Flinck	25,965
Sam White	25,846
Nichols Living Tr.	25,662
Edgar Schieler & Sons	25,646
R. W. & G. Stadden, Jr.	25,559
Harold Bontrager	25,266
Lowell Loftis	25,114
Wm. L. Goins	25,087
W. A. Schwartz	25,007
Bowen & Jones	24,935
T. & R. Ranches, Inc.	24,670
Roy Langston	24,496
R. L. Westbrook	24,462
John E. Sela	24,403
E. L. Beaver	24,381
L. J. Chroman	24,114
Louis J. Goeman	23,892
Rollis Friend	23,885
Richard Stuhann	23,597
Gist Farms	23,525
Correia Brothers	23,448
Sam Lessley	23,230
Garth Cobbs	23,178
Allan Jones	23,149
Francis & Paul Johnson	22,780
R. J. Catron	22,637
George P. Orsio	22,539
Johnson & Johnson	22,455
Nielsen Farms	22,430
Coy M. Daffern	22,415
Tony Santos	22,318
Abe Wiens	22,205
Bill Faria	22,137
J. G. Fossett, Jr.	22,096
Charles Wolsey	22,061
Donald Marshall	21,982
Guido Lombardi	21,975
Bill Westbrook	21,973
Spencer A. Gilbert	21,599
Wm. & Jeff Hahesy	21,588
Julia De Campos	21,517
E. W. Gunther	21,490
Ritchie & Ritchie	21,459
Frank L. Day	21,457
Ronald J. Castro	21,455
Chas. Westbrook	21,392
Ed Hanni	21,382
S. Trigueiro, Jr.	21,303
Melvin Miller	20,959
Tag Farms	20,509
L. & W. Ellis	20,507
Melvin Santry & Son	20,480
Pradera Del Lago	20,245
Frank Schott & Son	20,174
Anton Caratan	20,155
Nika Caratan	20,155
Robert B. Engle	20,017

Total payees in county
(220) 8,170,619

VENTURA COUNTY

Rancho Ventura	52,188
----------------	--------

YOLA COUNTY

Heidrick Farms, Inc.	143,972
G. A. Hanks & Sons	66,224
L. Wallace Ex. E. Wallace Est.	58,457
Lloyd Eveland	46,098
E. A. and B., Inc.	44,298
E. L. Wallace & Sons	41,933
Meek and Lemaitre	41,309
River Garden Farms	32,196
Nishimura Bros	30,582
Vernon Eriksen	28,488
Edgar Jang	26,159
Layton Knaggs	26,074
Hatanaka Bros	24,953
Vernon A. Mast and Sons	24,240
Shimada Bros	24,070

Howard Correa	22,306
Scott Yamamoto	21,822
L. C. Ulrich	21,586
W. C. Payne	20,945
Joe Gnoss, Jr.	20,611
Joe Lopes, Jr.	20,426

Total payees in county
(21) 786,749

Total payees in State
(1,708) 72,305,073

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Colorado

ADAMS COUNTY

[Amounts in dollars]

Kalcevic Farms, Inc.	54,002
Monaghan Farms, Inc.	53,796
Danford & Champlin, Ltd.	48,674
Box Elder Farms, Co.	39,515
Ray M. Schmidt	27,330

Total payees in county (5) 223,317

ARAPAHOE COUNTY

Robert E. Carlson	23,254
Alfred Linnebur	21,988

Total payees in county (2) 45,242

BACA COUNTY

R. R. Rutherford	42,279
William Greathouse	39,147
C. V. Cogburn	33,194
Bernard Neill	32,309
F. M. Swanson	30,134
Samuel Thompson	25,674
T. F. Arbuthnot	24,047
Brownie Farms	23,726
Lewis Robbins	22,574
Wayne Orebaugh	2,155
Homsher Farms and Ranches	21,569
Russell Loflin	20,831
John W. Moore	20,028

Total payees in county
(13) 357,667

BENT COUNTY

George C. Camilli	32,686
Spady Brothers	29,160
Jake Broyles	28,257
G. Swift Est.	23,769

Total payees in county (4) 113,872

BOULDER COUNTY

Dom Echeverria	29,494
----------------	--------

CHEYENNE COUNTY

John Kriss	53,060
Dale Mitcheck	45,398
Knudson Ranch	26,817
Harold Rother	24,278
Archie M. Lowe & Sons	24,219
A. D. Reed	24,192
White Woman Creek Inc.	23,831
Marvin Lowe	23,529
Gail Woodard	22,348
Dannie McCormick	22,268
M. K. White	21,188
Andrew Schaefer	21,090

Total payees in county (12) 332,218

CROWLEY COUNTY

Crowley Land & Dev. Co.	94,888
Harold N. Hobart Jr.	56,128

Total payees in county (2) 151,016

DELTA COUNTY

McIntyre Livestock Corp.	28,552
Hotchkiss Ranches Inc.	22,854

Total payees in county (2) 51,406

ELBERT COUNTY

Butler Purdy Land and Cattle	21,856
------------------------------	--------

GARFIELD COUNTY

Bair Ranches	22,001
--------------	--------

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Wilson and Co. Inc.	72,854
---------------------	--------

KIOWA COUNTY

Wayne E. Tallman	49,319
Gene Schwerdfeger	43,420
Stum & Schuler	42,006
Harold Wyckoff	32,569
Bill Marx	28,762
M. E. Templar	27,199
W. Harold Tuttle	26,354
Jaem, Inc.	24,946
Eddie C. Templar	24,039
Aubrey Shotton	23,710
Edwin Negley	23,689
B. A. Brixey	21,248
William J. Weber	21,198
Wayne E. Tallman Farms Co.	21,093
James S. Garvey	20,892
John A. Stavelly	20,753
Jake Boehs	20,725
Arthur C. Wilks	20,352

Total payees in county
(18) 492,274

KIT CARSON COUNTY

Delmer Zweygardt	85,174
Hinkhouse Bros	77,993
Penny Ranch	54,411
Dannie Weaver	50,893
Anschutz Farms, Inc.	50,146
Raymond Schulte	46,318
Don Schelerman	38,822
Paul Gergen	34,313
Britt Bell	33,937
Russell Scott	33,255
G F Bollwinkel	33,197
Dale D Hanna	31,074
Leonard Feldhausen	30,257
Leon Silkman	29,241
Three Rivers Ranch Inc.	29,187
Iron Mueller Inc.	27,437
Q G Demmitt	26,565
Byron G Jarnagin	24,511
C E McCartney	23,918
Schutte Farms	23,356
Raymond Thomas Downey	22,821
Pickard Farms Inc.	22,624
Lohnnie Wall	22,402
Warren Hodge	22,345
Jim Newcomb	21,595
George Andrews	21,593
Mae Belle Crouse	21,501
Marvin Grusing	21,304
John R Zurcher	21,262
Plautz Corporation	21,001
W T Pottorff	20,436
Neal Dorsch	20,356
Russell Davis	20,138
Kenneth Scheleman	20,112

Total payees in county (34) 1,083,495

LARAMIE COUNTY

L Vernon French	21,710
-----------------	--------

LINCOLN COUNTY

Orval F. Parker, Inc.	30,745
Harold Kuckartz	21,147

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 9, 1972

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Colorado—Continued

C D Farms Inc.	20,147
Total payees in county (3)	20,147

LOGAN COUNTY

Geo. Henderson Co.	29,598
Yaw Farms, Inc.	24,730
Wood Land Co.	21,823

Total payees in county (3) 76,151

MESA COUNTY

Irving C. Beard	38,809
J. Perry Olson	33,619
Colorado Utah Livestock	25,969
Louis Arrayet	20,093

Total payees in county (4) 118,490

MOFFAT COUNTY

Smith Rancho, Inc.	58,848
Cross Mountain, Inc.	54,411
Two Bar Ranch Company	34,647
Visintainer Sheep Company	28,470
H. G. Culverwell	25,922
Papoulas Livestock Company	23,699
Gordon C. Winn Sheep Co., Inc.	21,130
L. C. Winder Company	20,011

Total payees in county (8) 267,138

MONTROSE COUNTY

Chuchuru Bros.	25,152
Paxton Family	20,245

Total payees in county (2) 45,397

MORGAN COUNTY

Raymond H. Roark	28,018
Andrew Blake	25,849

Total payees in county (2) 53,867

OTERO COUNTY

Highline Canal Co.	42,940
--------------------	--------

PHILLIPS COUNTY

Deden, Inc.	27,611
Schneller Farms, Inc.	26,747
Robert L. Gerk	26,226

Total payees in county (3) 80,584

PROWERS COUNTY

C. H. Fletcher	49,787
X. Y. Ranch Co.	44,819
Heath & Son & Turpin, Inc.	42,966
C. E. Willhite	39,493
L. W. Bailey	38,644
Howard A. Ragsdale	38,318
C. A. & Robert Barth	37,464
Reyher Farms	36,178
Jack Herrin	30,717
J. Marvin Willhite	29,805
C. Hart Farms, Inc.	29,696
Frank Duvall	29,570
J. Willhite and Son	29,497
Curtis Duvall	28,787
Sun Vue, Inc.	27,434
Eugene Rundell	24,306
J. G. Preisser	23,300
Dorenkamp Farms, Inc.	23,077
George E. Holmes	21,019
Creamer Ranch	20,712
William & Sam Grasmick	20,181

Total payees in county (21) 665,770

PUEBLO COUNTY

R. Lewis Fillmore	27,772
-------------------	--------

RIO BLANCO COUNTY

Etchart Bros.	24,912
Nick Theos	20,463

Total payees in county (2) 45,375

ROUTT COUNTY

Maneotis Sheep Co.	37,262
--------------------	--------

SAGUACHE COUNTY

McMahon Bullington	22,555
--------------------	--------

SAN MIGUEL COUNTY

Hughes Bros., Inc.	33,624
--------------------	--------

SEDGWICK COUNTY

Wm. Stretesky, Inc.	30,981
Ricker Farms, Inc.	21,006
Hodges & Sons	20,352

Total payees in county (3) 72,339

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Alfred Ward and Son	75,017
Floyd Starlin	29,708

Total payees in county (2) 104,725

WELD COUNTY

J. Burton Tuttle	107,167
Monfort Packing Company	78,178
Larry Rule	47,128
Buckeye Land & Livestock	44,247
Box Elder Sheep Co.	35,679
Lyle V. Cooksey	24,730
Jean Eichheim	22,780
E. E. Foster & Sons, Inc.	20,257
Albert Allison	20,112
Walter John Peters	20,004

Total payees in county (10) 420,282

YUMA COUNTY

Leonard L. R. Dutton	40,686
Thomas Brophy	34,622
Loren Dickson & Sons, Inc.	32,036
Chester Whomble	28,825
Ralph & Jack Bowman	28,017
Robert Poltz	23,560
Henry Wiltfang	22,724
George W. Wingfield	21,606
Ray Max Wiley	21,557
Edward Trautman	20,065

Total payees in county (10) 273,698

Total payees in State (175) 5,478,430

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Florida

ALACHUA COUNTY

A. E. & R. E. Summers	20,304
-----------------------	--------

GLADES COUNTY

Arbank Farms, Inc.	58,458
John Tiedtke	49,846
Click Farms, Inc.	46,321
Lykes Bros., Inc.	30,866
Hicpochee Farms	27,924
J. E. Frierson	27,071
R. D. Yoder	22,015
Moore Farms	20,176

Total payees in county (8) 282,677

HENDRY COUNTY

US Sugar Corp.	1,267,401
OV Land Co.	81,325
A. F. Saunders, Inc.	66,557
M. L. Bishop	26,589

Peace Cattle Corp.	24,755
Three Rs Inc.	23,682
Ewell Farms	21,135

Total payees in county (7) 1,511,444

JACKSON COUNTY

J. G. Williams	21,163
----------------	--------

PALM BEACH COUNTY

Gulf & Western Food Prod. Co.	698,801
Talisman Sugar Corp.	421,249
Florida Sugar Corp.	221,664
S. N. Knight Sons, Inc.	163,805
Closter Farms, Inc.	163,407
A. Duda Sons, Inc.	153,347
New Hope Sugar Co.	124,104
715 Farms Ltd.	107,796
Billy Rogers Farms	86,965
Wedgworth Farms Inc.	84,587
Double D Ranch Inc.	80,689
Seminole Sugar Corp.	79,822
Fla AT Land Corp.	79,446
C. A. Thomas	74,568
Sam Senter Farms Inc.	73,082
Hatton Brothers Inc.	72,155
Trucane Sugar Corp.	70,962
Eastgate Farms Inc.	69,989
South Bay Growers Inc.	68,207
Vandergrift WLMS FMS Inc.	61,178
J. T. Boynton Farms Inc.	54,273
Vinegar Bend Farms Inc.	44,894
Okeechobee Farms Co.	40,540
F. W. Farms Inc.	39,702
Hayes Quackenbush Inc.	38,371
Harley Watson Farms	33,902
Flava Farms Inc.	33,701
Stein Sugar Farms Inc.	30,520
Camayan Farms	28,381
Miami Sod Co.	28,325
Chase Company	28,240
Manatee Plantations Inc.	27,869
Brown Sugar Corp.	25,283
R. W. Bishop	24,584
Valentine Farms Inc.	22,925
Robert C. Hatton Inc.	21,754
W. H. Vann Inc.	21,680
Hooker Jones Co.	21,317
E. L. Parker	20,446

Total payees in county (39) 3,542,530

SANTA ROSA COUNTY

J. E. Golden	52,196
J. W. Bauldree	50,922
Lem Strickland	48,380
Wayne Godwin	36,693
James Thomas, Jr.	28,696
Paul S. Golden	28,070
Lewie F. Smith	27,442
N. L. Golden	26,071
W. T. Stewart	25,278
Willie H. Jones	24,339
Luke Golden	23,386
Adone J. Lloyd, Jr.	21,604
Woodrow John Cooley	21,102

Total payees in county (13) 414,179

Total payees in State (69) 5,792,297

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Georgia

BAKER COUNTY

Newberry Angus Farms, Inc.	21,160
----------------------------	--------

BALDWIN COUNTY

Albert L. Tanner	26,107
------------------	--------

BARROW COUNTY

P. R. Smith	20,596
-------------	--------

BARTOW COUNTY

W. P. Lanier	45,151
H. E. Harris	44,256
Robert Dabbs	34,718
Ivan Evans	33,589
Noble Maxwell	33,327
J. C. Evans	32,439
Smith Gin Company	27,595
J. M. Maxwell/W. Smith	25,567
Neal C. Dabbs	24,074
George Cagle	23,845
Bobby Maxwell	23,837
Glenn Nelson	23,394
William Carl Maxwell	23,026
Howell L. Smith	21,716
Joe G. Brandon, Jr.	20,948

Total payees in county (15) - 437,482

BEN HILL COUNTY

J. H. Dorminy, Jr.	23,741
Royce Williams	21,382

Total payees in county (2) - 45,123

BLECKLEY COUNTY

Carlton Lawson	38,751
Four County Farming Co.	34,188
W. H. Hill	31,439
Theo. Williams	27,279
J. W. and W. A. Meadows	25,997
Jerry Dykes	24,551
Allentown Warehouse Company	23,944
Charles Williams	23,760
Marvin Trice	21,227

Total payees in county (9) - 251,136

BROOKS COUNTY

H. R. Crosby	38,079
--------------	--------

BURKE COUNTY

B. G. Collins	60,634
Eliz. O. Barefield	58,275
James Beall	57,307
J. H. Rowland	51,189
Ray Delaigle	50,639
Kitchen and Land	50,375
R. L. Webster	49,254
T. R. Rowland	45,779
Frank C. Griffin	41,939
A. H. Sandeford	39,476
H. W. Mobley	37,663
Q. U. Lively	37,539
Quinton Rodgers	35,553
W. T. McBride	35,412
J. B. Walden	34,084
R. L. Quick	34,057
W. R. Chance	33,639
Porter W. Carswell	32,034
Paul Shivers	31,965
Alvin Roberson	31,906
Farris L. Wren	30,441
Jimmie R. Robinson	28,878
Julian H. Johnson	28,835
Irvin Reeves	28,530
G. F. Agerton, Jr.	27,781
Lamar Prescott	26,975
Joe C. Lewis, Jr.	24,505
B. K. Anderson	23,341
Marvin Roberson	23,127
Caroyln Dixon	23,780
George F. Williams	22,137
Hammond Blanchard	22,055
J. O. Cates	21,578
Roy R. Dixon	21,318
David M. Hill	21,129
M. H. Sikes	20,776

Total payees in county (36) - 1,242,905

CALHOUN COUNTY

Chauncy Taylor	43,233
David Bruner	41,715
J. S. Coward Jr.	30,228
Ralph M. Jordan Jr.	24,117
J. R. Brooks	21,741

Total payees in county (5) - 161,034

CARROLL COUNTY

J. R. Walker	26,392
--------------	--------

CLAY COUNTY

Jack Hattaway	29,000
J. D. Thursby	26,707
Coy Isler & Sons	21,134

Total payees in county (3) - 76,841

COLQUITT COUNTY

Samuel F. Brewer	34,584
Donald Parker	31,487
Jacob Summerlin	31,436
Jimmy Strickland	30,508
Horace Parker	30,448
L. L. Tucker	29,382
R. C. Moss	26,337
Joe Parker	24,709
Donald Simmons	23,922
William L. Whitfield	21,820
R. L. Carr	21,349
Homer C. Lewis	21,025
J. H. Ivey	20,582

Total payees in county (13) - 347,589

COWETA COUNTY

W. J. Estes	43,245
Frank Wilkinson, Jr.	21,773

Total payees in county (2) - 65,018

CRISP COUNTY

Noel Williams	65,262
Farrow Baker	55,503
Owen Bagwell	52,188
W. H. Williams	49,062
H. E. Bridges, Jr.	43,670
L. E. Williams, Jr.	40,768
Malcolm Lilly	37,650
W. H. Barry	36,868
J. R. Barry, Jr.	36,804
G. E. McCay	36,300
H. W. McKinney	32,255
Charles Bagwell	31,766
C. W. Williams	30,472
John F. Haynie	28,727
J. R. Barry, Sr.	28,066
L. M. Smith	27,468
Harold Jackson	25,987
W. T. & L. C. Greene	25,513
B. C. & M. C. McKinney	24,801
J. R. Dowdy, Jr.	23,640
Harold Collins	21,721
R. M. McKinney	20,030

Total payees in county (22) - 774,521

DODGE COUNTY

James J. Mullis	65,782
Norman Hardy	38,012
Wilton Woodard	28,455
S. C. Cadwell	26,672
Candler Farms	26,475
Doyle Yawn	25,864
Watson Hardy	21,306
Stuckey Timberland, Inc.	20,958

Total payees in county (8) - 253,524

DOOLY COUNTY

Asbury Wright	64,476
Ralph Bowen	61,742
Richard Doster	61,249
Madison B. Coley, Jr.	61,046
William Lloyd Horne, Jr.	59,132
RHA McCleskey, Jr.	58,896

Eugene McCleskey	58,245
Alton Draughon	58,068
J. D. Lockerman, Jr.	57,771
Clint Shugart	56,948
W. C. Griggs	56,338
Herbert E. Roney	55,550
Van Peavy	55,112
Ben T. Ambrose	54,989
Anderson Reed	53,917
Ike Everett	52,629
F. H. Sparrow	52,583
R. L. Calhoun	52,559
Warren Taylor	52,258
Leon Broome	50,873
Tippett Peavy	50,254
Millard Peavy	47,220
J. W. Sanders	46,754
W. G. Smith	46,149
J. P. West	45,852
Ossie T. Spradley, Jr.	45,061
Ellis H. Davis	44,447
Carl Bowen	44,056
Rudolph Royal	43,161
Clarence R. Bodrey	42,876
W. R. Jackson, Jr.	40,973
Herbert Saliba	39,919
W. G. Joiner	38,675
Carl F. Williams	38,288
J. W. Sparrow	37,920
Raymond Davis	35,339
William Harvey Cross, Sr.	35,102
C. V. Cross	35,100
Ronnie Evridge	34,362
Marcus Evridge	34,362
Horace West	33,672
Bamon L. Hill	33,241
Mercer Porter	32,877
Danny West	32,669
Marvin Capus Jones	32,382
Roy Noble Co.	32,312
Otha Peavy	32,188
Marion A. Thompson	31,777
Lee Bailey, Jr.	31,133
Marshall Davis	30,691
Ronney Ledford	30,363
Olen J. Burton	30,363
Clinton B. Thompson	29,198
Dewitt Clewis	28,560
Marion A. Thompson, Jr.	28,192
W. J. Evridge	27,812
John S. Williams	27,652
W. R. Groves	27,243
R. L. Bowen	27,063
L. M. Joiner	27,005
J. P. DeLoach	25,924
Lamar Smith	24,723
Gary Peavy	24,545
Cliff West, Jr.	24,174
James Kinard	24,160
J. O. Cross, Jr.	23,669
Raymond E. Nutt	23,042
Claude Bowen	23,029
James M. Moore	23,002
William Andrew Sparrow	22,986
J. B. Ryner	22,967
P. E. Thompson	22,721
Walter Franklin Cason	21,875
D. W. Smith	21,402
J. D. Williford	21,182
T. H. Robertson	21,052
Ernest L. Taylor	21,008
Charles Bowen	20,976
L. L. Minor, Sr.	20,838
G. M. Ellis	20,551
Donald W. Peavy	20,400

Total payees in county (81) - 3,040,870

EARLY COUNTY

Singletary Farms	50,695
J. E. Tabb	36,333
Everson Farms	31,451
G. S. Pickle	27,519
Leonard White	27,160
H. L. Martin	25,776

Total payees in county (6) - 198,934

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Georgia—Continued

ELBERT COUNTY	
Ralph King	34,090
S. N. Brown	31,196
Calvin Hill	29,402
R. A. Eavenson	25,281
H. L. Addison	20,197
Total payees in county (5)	140,166
EMANUEL COUNTY	
John E. Whetsell	24,774
Billy Walden	24,230
H. L. Wimberly	21,790
Total payees in county (3)	70,794
FLOYD COUNTY	
Jerry Looney	34,292
Lovell Bros.	25,602
A. A. Looney	25,351
L. G. Evans	25,047
Total payees in county (4)	110,292
FRANKLIN COUNTY	
Thomas H. Cheek	50,050
GLASCOCK COUNTY	
John Everett Hadden	25,757
Murray Hadden	23,090
Total payees in county (2)	48,847
GORDON COUNTY	
Dwight B. Greeson	22,554
GRADY COUNTY	
E. E. Nixon	23,124
HANCOCK COUNTY	
L. S. McDonald	26,690
HART COUNTY	
Hubert Cheek, Jr.	57,210
L. M. York	46,523
Kenneth York	24,442
Hugh D. McLane	21,097
Charles Cheek	21,031
Total payees in county (5)	170,303
HOUSTON COUNTY	
Clinton M. Heath	56,897
Robert C. Richards	38,005
W. V. Brannen	35,716
Charlie T. Kersey	33,412
Gunn Farms	32,074
C. T. Kersey, Jr.	31,192
Wendell J. Kersey	20,328
Total payees in county (7)	247,624
IRWIN COUNTY	
Othello Hudson	22,693
JEFF DAVIS COUNTY	
Vernon Williams	20,347
JEFFERSON COUNTY	
Bryants Incorporated	57,814
G. C. and Johnny McGahee	48,746
Julian Streeter	41,900
Judson McNair	39,240
R. J. Jones	35,881
Harry and A. P. Jones	31,464
Lewis Alford	30,009
T. B. Kelly Estate	28,955
Paul and Larry Cobb	27,433
Jimmie Hancock	26,879
W. P. Smith and Sons	26,700
P. A. Rheney	26,501
Luie Godowns	24,780
A. H. Braswell	24,519
R. M. Samples, Jr.	22,913

William J. Lamb	21,136
S. W. McNair	21,096
Total payees in county (17)	535,966
JENKINS COUNTY	
Charles W. Lanier	36,743
Buck Brinson	27,248
T. L. Black	24,852
W. R. Roberts	21,309
Virgil H. Black	21,090
Total payees in county (5)	131,242
JOHNSON COUNTY	
Tarver Price	44,949
W. R. & J. L. Jackson	33,047
E. L. Price, Jr.	23,858
John H. Powell	20,419
Total payees in county (4)	122,273
LAURENS COUNTY	
W. A. Rountree	65,331
W. H. Lovett	52,429
Ed Roche	34,471
Marshall R. Lord	31,033
Jack Cook	30,183
Estate of E. B. Claxton Dec.	27,137
Herman L. Hall	27,052
William Slade	26,929
B. Moorman and B. F. Watson	23,751
Thomas J. and Ray Walker	23,285
Ervin Lovett	22,606
H. L. Harper	21,627
Total payees in county (12)	385,834
LEE COUNTY	
Plez Hardin	48,357
Geise Ury	23,972
Wilmar Timber Corp.	20,422
Total payees in county (3)	92,751
MACON COUNTY	
Ralph Raper	41,631
S. H. Bryan, Jr.	31,924
Don Hunsicker	31,501
B. B. Murph Estate	28,096
Malatchie Farm	27,216
Hixon Guest	26,573
Felton Riddle	26,547
F. A. Ricks Estate	25,177
Harp Farms	25,098
C. J. Harp, Jr.	23,762
Mack Ham	23,509
Buck Creek Farms	22,357
F. W. Smith	21,101
Walter Forsling	20,726
Gordon Sutton	20,289
Total payees in county (15)	395,507
MADISON COUNTY	
Whitehead Farms	53,244
MARION COUNTY	
Thomas Miller	41,863
M'DUFFIE COUNTY	
George Reeves	26,700
James E. Harrison	22,854
Total payees in county (2)	49,554
MERIWETHER COUNTY	
A. G. Estes, Inc.	51,676
Gay and Keith	47,903
W. R. Arnall	35,497
Total payees in county (3)	135,076

MILLER COUNTY	
Lonnie Wesley Tabb	30,214
Curtis Williams	21,939
Total payees in county (2)	52,153
MITCHELL COUNTY	
Ronald Thompson	30,660
H. G. McGahee	21,811
Norman L. Cox	20,838
Total payees in county (3)	73,309
MORGAN COUNTY	
Barnett H. Malcom	59,241
Bonny Shepherd	52,326
E. A. Hanson	39,375
Eugene & Marvin Ruark	37,535
Bennie Malcom	32,892
Bonnie Hawk	31,346
Brown & Wells	29,691
Joe Whitlock	28,467
H. D. Thomas	20,144
Total payees in county (9)	331,017
NEWTON COUNTY	
Garland Kilgore	36,879
J. H. Anderson	32,547
Total payees in county (2)	69,426
OCONEE COUNTY	
F. F. Dickens, Jr.	48,440
Joe D. Murrow	34,749
Fred W. Dickens	25,768
Total payees in county (3)	108,957
OGLETHORPE COUNTY	
Carl C. Culbertson	51,863
PEACH COUNTY	
Marion Maddox	33,339
M. A. Burnett & Son	25,111
Bateman Co., Inc.	20,258
Total payees in county (3)	78,708
PIKE COUNTY	
R. D. Crawford	29,434
Floyd Turner	21,033
Cochran Caldwell	20,579
Total payees in county (3)	71,046
POLK COUNTY	
Geston Womack	27,203
PULASKI COUNTY	
John W. Dawson	75,401
B. E. Dunaway	44,393
W. S. Dunaway	42,460
R. F. Dunaway	42,459
C. L. Mays	35,548
J. H. Anderson	27,348
L. V. Peavy, Sr.	26,523
J. T. Sparrow	25,839
H. E. Dunaway	25,426
Lorin S. Williams	23,183
George P. Anderson	22,643
A. L. Dunaway	21,667
Donald Gregory	20,817
Total payees in county (13)	433,707
QUITMAN COUNTY	
Sunny View Farms	22,970
RANDOLPH COUNTY	
Grubbs Bros.	36,867
E. E. Morris	34,982
James Riley Curry, Jr.	27,097
Melvin H. Peavy	21,552
Reid Andrews	20,223
Total payees in county (5)	140,721

RICHMOND COUNTY	
R. A. McElmurray, Jr.	30,733
R. S. Auldridge	22,450
Wayne Rhodes	20,375

Total payees in county (3) - 73,558

SCREVEN COUNTY	
Paul K. Newton	32,916
Melbourne Godbee	30,577
Millhaven Co.	29,385
G. L. Rouse	24,909
T. V. Parker	24,672
R. E. Oliver, Jr.	23,127
W. P. Sanders	20,207

Total payees in county (7) - 185,793

SEMINOLE COUNTY	
Raymond Odum	48,649

STEWART COUNTY	
W. C. Bradley, Co.	80,482
M. J. Lane	37,256
Johnnie F. Giles	21,308

Total payees in county (3) - 139,046

SUMTER COUNTY	
J. C. Jones	39,826
Floyd J. Frazier	39,202
Newcomb Farm	39,120
John G. Frazier	34,315
Pittman Turner Farm	26,356
Hixon Guest	25,799
W. C. Cornwell	24,801
T. E. Stephens, Jr.	22,079
George E. Daniel	21,119
Roy F. Daniel	21,119
Neill Hodges	20,400

Total payees in county (11) - 314,136

TAYLOR COUNTY	
D. W. Payne, Jr.	39,934
Ed Richardson	38,626
R. C. Barrow	38,222
E. H. Swearingen	34,338
E. B. Swearingen	34,338
Willard Brunson	25,999
T. W. Taunton	24,493

Total payees in county (7) - 235,950

TERRELL COUNTY	
Wilbur Gamble	67,489
W. K. Jones	60,647
Wylie McLendon, Jr.	51,404
Huson Brim	33,236
Ray Christie	32,897
Alston Brothers	31,717
W. H. McLendon	31,159
Featherfield Farms Inc.	29,339
Chickasawhatchee Farm	27,051
Daniel Brothers	24,751
B. C. Arthur	23,958
R. T. Brim	23,572
W. J. Martin	22,582
Lavonne Speir	21,331
Don Bridges	21,248
Isaac Morris Chambless	20,210

Total payees in county (16) - 522,591

THOMAS COUNTY	
Griffin Farms Inc.	40,620
S. R. Bryant	36,386
C. M. Anderson	22,895
Julius Chastain	22,515

Total payees in county (4) - 122,416

TOOMBS COUNTY	
J. P. Gordy	20,287

TREUTLEN COUNTY	
Manning Mimbs	33,327

TURNER COUNTY	
Kenneth Smith	32,460
Pirkle Farms	21,537
J. F. Gibbs	20,899

Total payees in county (3) - 74,896

TWIGGS COUNTY	
Sam Floyd Sr.	34,286
Charlie Faulk	25,647
M. S. Faulk	21,904
Alton V. White, Jr.	21,050

Total payees in county (4) - 102,887

WALTON COUNTY	
Alex Harden	53,962
T. J. Chandler	45,716
T. H. Adcock	38,353
Robert B. Chandler	37,319
Carl Lemonds	34,859
M. W. Farmer	32,981
Robert M. Hawk	30,164
Byron Mitchem	26,121
Robbie Adcock	25,079
John Everett	24,967
Juanita Johnson	24,318
H. A. Malcom	24,259
Garyel D. Malcom	24,248
C. R. Brown	23,704
Bennie R. Anderson	20,904

Total payees in county (15) - 466,954

WARREN COUNTY	
Guy H. Shivers, Jr.	51,912
Donald F. Palmer	51,593
Quality Crops, Inc.	40,572
Harrison Farms	27,878

Total payees in county (4) - 171,955

WASHINGTON COUNTY	
E. B. Price	61,139
L. A. Garrett	43,796
Washington Ginning Co.	38,956
Gilmore Bros	36,692
Olen Price	32,035
Arthur Hartley and Son	24,744
Jewell Bridges	22,219
Ernest C. Smith	21,579
C. W. Harrison	21,497
B. W. Lord	20,759

Total payees in county (10) - 323,416

WEBSTER COUNTY	
G. W. Jones	26,655

WHEELER COUNTY	
J. M. Johnson	23,677

WILCOX COUNTY	
Cecil L. Bagwell	39,087
William Worley	34,116
D. F. Veal	28,145
Marcus Reeves	24,048
Whelchel & Whelchel	23,907

Total payees in county (5) - 149,303

WORTH COUNTY	
C. R. Cross	25,427
Cecil L. James	24,429
Isaac Hall	21,448
Lenwood Sutton	20,650
J. T. Carlton	20,190

Total payees in county (5) - 112,144

Total payees in State (450) - 14,532,825

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Hawaii

HAWAII COUNTY	
Hawaiian Com. & Sugar Co.	1,277,725
Oahu Sugar Co. Ltd.	826,333
Hutchinson Sugar Co. Ltd.	555,863
Pioneer Mill Co., Ltd.	465,171
Kahuku Plantation Co.	458,271
Lihue Plantation Co. Ltd.	454,140
Kekaha Sugar Co., Ltd.	428,194
Mauna Kea Sugar Co. Inc.	407,204
Kohala Sugar Co.	378,251
Honokaa Sugar Co.	365,742
Hawaiian Agricultural Co.	365,265
Pepeekeo Sugar Co.	364,377
Laupahoehoe Sugar Co.	338,917
Grove Farm Co. Inc.	330,444
Hamakua Mill Co.	320,427
Olokele Sugar Co.	408,881
Wailuku Sugar Co.	296,999
McBryde Sugar Co. Ltd.	293,908
Puna Sugar Co. Ltd.	245,448
Paauhau Sugar Co. Ltd.	213,583
Kilauea Sugar Co. Ltd.	201,274
Gay and Robinson	176,527
Robert M. Yamada	31,325
K. Mizuno and Sons Inc.	20,880

Total payees in county (24) - 9,125,149

Total payees in State (24) - 9,125,149

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Idaho

ADA COUNTY	
Carl E. Nicholson and Sons	42,960
BANNOCK COUNTY	
Dale Koester	27,113
Hugh E. McGuire	25,425
E. L. Christensen	22,723

Total payees in county (3) - 75,261

BEAR LAKE COUNTY	
Demar Romrell	20,217

BENEWAH COUNTY	
George B. Mills, Jr.	27,233

BINGHAM COUNTY	
J. Walt Vanderford	61,946
D. & D. Parks Ptrshp.	55,477
Lloyd Stolorthy, Inc.	39,460
Pahl Ruff Ptrshp.	38,447
Lenard Schritter	37,707
Matsuura Bros. Co., Inc.	37,634
Rsling River Ranches	29,957
Cooks Heglar Ranch	27,461
J. Stolorthy & Son	26,172
Simplot Industries	24,584
Stroschein Ranches	24,482
Wallace W. Driscoll	23,444
Vincent R. Benson	22,933
Chester Wahlen	22,581
C. Leslie Williams	22,511
Welland A. Hansen	21,239

Total payees in county (16) - 516,035

BLAINE COUNTY	
Campbell Land & Livestock Co.	37,704

BONNEVILLE COUNTY	
Jess Croft & Son	56,050
E. Bud Johnson	54,746
Snake River Equipment Co.	44,701
Karl Brown & Merle Brown	35,300
Weeks Brothers & Sons	34,376
Clements & Jackson	34,100
Thompson Sheep Co.	32,986
J. R. Hays & Son, Inc.	28,620
Elmer N. Jensen	28,094
Ernest Martin	27,274
Schwieder Brothers	25,889

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Idaho—Continued

George Lovell	25,730
L. B. Holden Farm Co.	25,297
Jack Thomas	24,529
Lynn Brown	20,717

Total payees in county (15)	498,409
-----------------------------	---------

BOUNDARY COUNTY

Tucker Farms Inc.	26,732
-------------------	--------

CANYON COUNTY

Farm Development Corp.	98,646
Walter C. Russell	40,550
Elmer H. Tieg	29,805
Glenn Allen and David Allen	28,245
Nampa International, Inc.	21,617
Kondo Farms, Inc.	27,576
Ario Smith	25,801
Kenneth Tieg and Sons, Inc.	24,766
Allen T. Noble	24,486
Lawrence V. Gray	24,341
Skogsberg Sky Ranch	23,203
Allen I. Noble Farms, Inc.	22,781
Pintler and Son	21,695
Basil Aldecoa	21,423
David C. Spencer	20,578

Total payees in county (15)	461,513
-----------------------------	---------

CARIBOU COUNTY

Dette, Inc.	45,885
Don C. Rigby Family Ptn.	38,408
Frank Jouglard	22,830
King Creek Grazing Assn.	20,178
Don C. Loosle	20,166

Total payees in county (5)	147,467
----------------------------	---------

CASSIA COUNTY

R. C. Rich Sheep Co.	62,202
Heglar Ranch, Inc.	54,029
Parr Bros., Inc.	48,919
Riviera Farms, Inc.	44,284
Pickett Ranch and Sheep Co.	38,039
Anderson Bros.	34,551
Raymond H. Johnson	34,152
Cold Springs Farm	31,397
Vernon Rehn	28,467
Gorringe Bros.	26,237
Rex Taylor	24,569
Grant Gloorfield	21,321
Critchfield Land & Livst.	21,313
John Basterrechea	20,664

Total payees in county (14)	490,144
-----------------------------	---------

CLARK COUNTY

D. V. Hagenbarth Est.	31,186
Idaho Ag Experiment Station	25,766
Laird and Jones, Inc.	24,122
Cockeye Land and Livst.	23,103
Blaine Grover	20,142

Total payees in county (5)	124,319
----------------------------	---------

ELMORE COUNTY

Simplot Livestock Co., Inc.	91,471
Eugene Swenson	41,130
Hammett Livestock Co.	39,521
Bill Smith	28,142
Robert Blanksma	27,462
Wayne M. Hodson	25,896
F. W. Bennett and Son, Inc.	25,055
Flying H. Farms	24,941
M. L. Investment Co.	23,630

Total payees in county (9)	327,248
----------------------------	---------

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Evan O. Koller	23,661
----------------	--------

FREMONT COUNTY

Siddoway Sheep Co., Inc.	34,890
Max D. Parkinson and Son, Inc.	28,913
Farrel Black Ranches, Inc.	25,499

Total payees in county (3)	89,302
----------------------------	--------

GEM COUNTY

Highland Livst. & Land Co.	33,248
----------------------------	--------

GOODING COUNTY

Ralph Faulkner Land, Inc.	56,449
Idaho Hereford Ranch	47,300
Arkoosh & Zidan, Inc.	39,671
Jones/Sandy Livestock Co.	26,592
Josephine Astorquia	20,869

Total payees in county (5)	190,881
----------------------------	---------

IDAHO COUNTY

George E. Wilson	34,719
James Green	33,704
Roy Green, Jr.	33,704
John McBoyle	21,609
Hauger Ranches, Inc.	21,092
Norman Dean	20,824
Cornelius Baune	20,443
T. E. Robinson	20,002

Total payees in county (8)	206,097
----------------------------	---------

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Brownings, Inc.	35,906
Wm. A. Munnell	31,587
Walker & Gneiting	27,580
Ball Bros.	26,846
Orle W. Robison	20,425

Total payees in county (5)	142,344
----------------------------	---------

KOOTENAI COUNTY

Drechsel Bros.	26,043
----------------	--------

LATAH COUNTY

Gary Morris	25,313
Jensen Bros.	21,811

Total payees in county (2)	47,124
----------------------------	--------

LEWIS COUNTY

Joe Lux	33,273
Joe Wagner	29,857
Aubrey Pratt	22,762
W. W. Riggers & Sons	22,070
Richard Renner	21,356

Total payees in county (5)	129,318
----------------------------	---------

LINCOLN COUNTY

Oneldas, Inc.	29,963
---------------	--------

MADISON COUNTY

Parkinson Farms, Inc.	34,797
Howard and Robinson	30,589
Jensen Brothers	28,580
O. J. Neeley Ranch, Inc.	27,487
Summers Bros.	27,144
Webster Deep Well Farm, Inc.	25,878
Ed S. Covington	21,711
Val Schwendiman	20,458
Ricks Bros.	20,125

Total payees in county (9)	234,769
----------------------------	---------

MINIDOKA COUNTY

Flat Top Sheep Co.	55,044
James V. Haley	38,958
Rosemary H. Clinton	38,958
Richard D. Blincoe	34,641
G. L. Dean and Sons, Inc.	33,256
Garro Sheep Co., Inc.	31,950
Gerald Morgan	30,665
W. H. Shillington	30,665
Morgan Shillington Farms Co.	28,011
Wilbert H. Moller	23,925
Warren W. Heins	22,220

Jean P. Etcheverry	22,170
Mack Neibaur	21,558

Total payees in county (13)	412,021
-----------------------------	---------

NEZ PERCE COUNTY

Meacham Land and Cattle Co.	55,438
Stanton Becker Farms	39,766
Tom Wagner	39,193
Herndon Farms	35,270
Happy Ridge Land Co.	28,250
Winston Mader	28,141
McGregor Farms Inc.	27,510
Van Sullivan	27,261
George Brammer	26,442
Edward Bozarth Estate	26,255
Richard Wagner	24,452
Dwaine McIntosh	23,807
Kenneth W. McIntosh	23,807
June I. McIntosh	23,806
Wittman Farms	23,303
Gary Schwank	22,944
Loren Crow	22,654
Claude Webb	21,774
E. J. McCann	20,880

Total payees in county (19)	540,953
-----------------------------	---------

ONEIDA COUNTY

Jones Sheep Company	41,736
L. C. Alder & Sons Inc.	25,628
W. L. Baker Company	25,091
J. F. Fredrickson Co.	21,542

Total payees in county (4)	113,997
----------------------------	---------

OWYHEE COUNTY

Spring Valley Livestock Co.	33,334
-----------------------------	--------

PAYETTE COUNTY

American Fine Foods	32,997
---------------------	--------

POWER COUNTY

Melvin R. Funk	47,151
Jay H. Hulet	47,138
John B. McNabb	44,235
Rex Hayter	40,836
Zimmerman Brothers	37,616
Fred G. Mayer & Sons	29,681
Dean Meadows	27,519
Lynn Thompson	26,732
Wallace Hayes	25,659
Ralphs Brothers	25,107
Neibaur & West Farms	24,494
Vern Duffin	22,686
Garth Thompson	21,635
Ferdinand Gehring	21,592
Cecil Weisenburger	20,569
Wayne Kendall	20,360

Total payees in county (16)	483,010
-----------------------------	---------

TETON COUNTY

Shayne Linderman	31,674
Rammell Brothers	23,642
J. Clint Hoopes	21,908
Demar Bott	21,908
Earl N. Hoopes	20,316

Total payees in county (5)	119,348
----------------------------	---------

TWIN FALLS COUNTY

Delbert Clamplitt	59,420
W. B. Savage Ranches	33,074
NOH Sheep Co.	27,755
W. T. Williams Inc.	25,501
Guerry Inc.	24,785
Glen Dale Farms Inc.	21,015

Total payees in county (6)	191,550
----------------------------	---------

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Soulen Livestock Co.	65,934
Snake River Sheep Co.	26,810

J. B. Barker..... 23,537
 Charles F. Kindall..... 20,980
 Total payees in county
 (4)..... 137,261
 Total payees in State (197) - 6,012,463

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program pay-
 ments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding
 loans—Illinois

ADAMS COUNTY
 Adwell Corp..... 46,492
 Richard Wittler..... 24,110
 Total payees in county (2) - 70,602

ALEXANDER COUNTY
 Elott Raffety Farms, Inc..... 43,272
 E. J. Showmaker..... 24,370
 Total payees in county (2) - 67,642

CHRISTIAN COUNTY
 Donald Linton..... 23,006
 Donald L. Kuhle..... 21,287
 Total payees in county (2) - 44,293

DE KALB COUNTY
 O. M. Johnson..... 27,776

DE WITT COUNTY
 C. H. Moore Trust Est..... 89,563
 Thorp Seed Co..... 22,337
 Total payees in county (2) - 111,900

FORD COUNTY
 John P. Gallahue..... 21,190

FULTON COUNTY
 Meadowik Fms C/O I. H. Reiss... 85,977
 Truax Traer Coal Co..... 28,456
 United Elec. Coal Co..... 24,095
 Total payees in county (3) - 138,528

GALLATIN COUNTY
 Pat Scates, Sr..... 34,078

GREENE COUNTY
 Henry Longmery..... 28,058
 Hartwell Ranch..... 24,312
 Total Payees in County (2) - 52,370

GRUNDY COUNTY
 Scully Trust..... 39,451

HENDERSON COUNTY
 Shelby H. Romine..... 20,046

HENRY COUNTY
 C. D. Ford & Sons, Inc..... 21,029

IROQUOIS COUNTY
 Edward C. Sumner, Jr..... 37,017

KANE COUNTY
 Arthur Hagemann..... 27,509

KANKAKEE COUNTY
 Cote Farms Inc..... 54,379
 Tallmadge Ranch Inc..... 43,288
 Total payees in county (2) - 97,667

KNOX COUNTY
 Midland Coal Co..... 23,365

LAWRENCE COUNTY
 Earl Minderman..... 25,054

LEE COUNTY
 A. H. Nichols..... 20,909
 LOGAN COUNTY
 John L. White..... 22,338
 Elizabeth K. Drake..... 20,869
 Total payees in county (2) - 43,207

M'HENRY COUNTY
 Meyer & Schuring..... 29,828
 L. O. Napier..... 23,870
 Getz Farms..... 22,019
 Earlroy Farms..... 21,693
 Total payees in county (4) - 97,410

M'LEAN COUNTY
 Theo. Funk Tr..... 22,385

MENARD COUNTY
 Duane Cullinan Trust..... 21,353

MONTGOMERY COUNTY
 W. D. Kilton, Est..... 35,184

PERRY COUNTY
 Southwestern Coal Co..... 31,271

PIKE COUNTY
 Bob Richter..... 21,336

POPE COUNTY
 Dixon Springs..... 39,996

PULASKI COUNTY
 Richard Pike..... 25,316

RANDOLPH COUNTY
 Peabody Coal, Co..... 34,992
 Behnken & Behnken..... 25,443
 Total payees in county (2) - 60,435

SANGAMON COUNTY
 Dowson Bros A Ptrp..... 26,555

WAYNE COUNTY
 Wm. L. O'Daniel..... 20,116

WHITESIDE COUNTY
 Wilder Farms Inc..... 22,464

WINNEBAGO COUNTY
 Harold E. Nelson..... 21,377

WOODFORD COUNTY
 Martin Bros. Implement Co..... 23,676

Total payees in State (46) - 1,392,507

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program pay-
 ments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding
 loans—Indiana

BENTON COUNTY
 Watland Farms Inc..... 32,239
 Herschbach C/O Doane AG..... 24,865
 Total payees in county (2) - 57,104

DAVISS COUNTY
 Graham Farms Inc..... 30,289
 Caphart Farms..... 21,076
 Total payees in county (2) - 51,365

GIBSON COUNTY
 Princeton Mining Co..... 28,914
 Emge Packing Co..... 28,104
 Total payees in county (2) - 57,018

JASPER COUNTY
 James D. Green Tr..... 24,623
 Fred Moore..... 24,193

Total payees in county (2) - 48,816

KNOX COUNTY
 Schenk Farms Inc..... 39,310
 Thompson Farms Inc..... 32,758
 Robert Carnahan..... 20,763
 William R. Huey..... 20,531
 Total payees in county (4) - 113,362

KOSCIUSKO COUNTY
 Creighton Bros..... 30,599

NEWTON COUNTY
 Merlin Karlock..... 45,189
 Robert A. Churchill..... 27,029

Total payees in county (2) - 72,218

PARKE COUNTY
 Adams Farm Company, Inc..... 21,432

POSEY COUNTY
 New Harmony Realty..... 26,125
 Edward C. Culley..... 24,710
 Total payees in county (2) - 50,835

PULASKI COUNTY
 Overmyer Farms..... 57,111
 Arthur P. Gumz..... 40,126
 Total payees in county (2) - 97,237

STARKE COUNTY
 Richard Gumz..... 53,056

SULLIVAN COUNTY
 John Gray Kelly..... 52,812
 Mann Seed Farms..... 20,192

Total payees in county (2) - 73,004

VANDERBURGH COUNTY
 Donald E. Kolb..... 33,115

VIGO COUNTY
 James Harlan..... 25,485
 Burch Harlan..... 22,695

Total payees in county (2) - 48,180

WHITE COUNTY
 Leroy Keesling..... 32,094
 Richard W. North..... 20,931

Total payees in county (2) - 53,025

Total payees in State (28) - 860,366

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program pay-
 ments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding
 loans—Iowa

AUDUBON COUNTY
 Garst Co..... 33,409
 Melville Farms..... 21,014

Total payees in county (2) - 54,423

BUCHANAN COUNTY
 Charles Hoffman..... 22,206

CALHOUN COUNTY
 F. W. Miller..... 20,257

CARROLL COUNTY
 Collison Bros..... 21,776

DES MOINES COUNTY
 Robert L. Gabeline..... 29,605

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Iowa

FLOYD COUNTY	
Beverly Land Co.	28,156
Julius Huxsol	20,982
Total payees in county (2)	49,138

FRANKLIN COUNTY	
Lawrence W. Hamilton	27,869

FREMONT COUNTY	
Payne Valley Farms, Inc.	53,490
Reeves Farms	21,717
Total payees in county (2)	75,207

HANCOCK COUNTY	
Fraser Farms, Inc.	26,679

IOWA COUNTY	
Amana Society	55,000

LEE COUNTY	
William J. Pieper	22,447

LINN COUNTY	
Witwer Grocer Co.	36,990

LYON COUNTY	
Ralph L. Koolker	22,793

MONONA COUNTY	
Charles Lakin	72,722
Franklin D. Seitzinger	24,849
Total payees in county (2)	97,571

SAC COUNTY	
Shinrone, Inc.	47,016

TAYLOR COUNTY	
H. Dean Beemer	22,724

WEBSTER COUNTY	
Litchfield Realty Co.	29,810
Total payees in State (21)	661,511

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Kansas

ALLEN COUNTY	
Harold Whitaker	28,365

BARBER COUNTY	
Fred Schupbach, Jr.	27,760
Riedel Co., Inc.	25,900
Z Bar Cattle Co.	22,224
Schrock, Inc.	20,478
Total payees in county (4)	98,362

BARTON COUNTY	
Richard C. Brining	24,277
Schartz Bros.	23,673
Total payees in county (2)	47,950

BUTLER COUNTY	
Robert F. Lowrey	21,146

CHEROKEE COUNTY	
P. & M. Coal Mng. Co.	29,032

CHEYENNE COUNTY	
Lloyd M. Kontny Est.	44,530

COFFEY COUNTY	
Evans & Nee Ptr.	20,365

COMANCHE COUNTY	
Darrol W. Miller	20,366

DICKINSON COUNTY	
Roy Clemence	26,149
Laurence Clemence	23,442
Total payees in county (2)	49,591

EDWARDS COUNTY	
David Britton	25,571
McLean Bros.	23,772
Total payees in county (2)	49,343

ELLIS COUNTY	
Leo J. Dreiling	20,389

FINNEY COUNTY	
Garden Cy Company	90,755
Andrew E. Larson	51,724
Leland L. Crist	42,669
Roger Ramsey	32,587
George L. Potter	30,940
Emanuel Doll	28,558
Brookover Feed Yard, Inc.	27,227
Thomas W. Linville	25,244
Lawrence Miller	25,217
Raymond Crist	25,089
Raymond G. Morris	24,842
John Miller	24,327
Eugene F. Ware	23,985
G. R. Byrd	23,609
Leigh Warner	22,864
Marion L. Russell	22,431
Clarence Gigot	22,006
Frank McClure	21,941
Leroy F. Cooley	21,877
Cyril Schiffler	21,573
W D Daniels	20,450
Max Engler Jr.	20,284
Ralph A. Greathouse	20,233
Total payees in county (23)	670,432

FORD COUNTY	
Dwight E. Winger	34,271
Dale R. Steele	31,676
George Herrmann	28,251
Everett Steele	24,277
Eleanor O. Rost	23,879
Total payees in county (5)	142,354

GOVE COUNTY	
R. S. Coberly	26,634
A. L. Swart	23,567
Total payees in county (2)	50,201

GRAHAM COUNTY	
Lindenman Bros.	20,478

GRANT COUNTY	
Tuttle & Tuttle & Mawhlrtter	45,921
Arthur B. Williams	31,311
J. Davis Sullivan	28,726
Higgs Farms & Carl Higgs	28,106
Howard L. Miller	27,650
Herman Cockreham	27,441
C. E. Battin	27,178
Lysle Davidson	22,932
John F. Boylan	22,668
Alexander Bros.	20,754
Wendell Cheek	20,149
Total payees in county (11)	302,836

GRAY COUNTY	
Sidney Warner	40,114
Cecil Obrate	35,682
James R. Adams	25,984
W. D. Brady	25,060
George Loewen	24,918
Ingalls Feed Yard, Inc.	23,944
Stephen Irisk	22,466

Lester Clark	22,439
Melvin L. Shrauner	20,150
Total payees in county (9)	240,757

GREELEY COUNTY	
Smith Ranch Company	48,709
L & M Steele Farms	47,896
Kleymann Brothers	47,638
Myron E. Sell	29,767
Floyd Tuttle & Son	29,475
Ervin Schneider	28,895
Jay A. Hoffman	24,806
L. & M. Farm & Cattle Co.	24,490
J. V. Kuttler	24,079
John & Edwin Floyd	22,814
Dick Holland	22,240
H. C. Wear	21,773
George Nickelson	21,364
Garfield Ochsner	20,479
Duane F. Schneider	20,350
Total payees in county (15)	434,775

HAMILTON COUNTY	
Young & Cooper Cattle Co.	31,018
Herbert E. Ramsey, Jr.	25,200
Richard Plunkett	23,104
Total payees in county (3)	79,322

HARPER COUNTY	
Loy Frank	20,525

HASKELL COUNTY	
Haskell Land Co.	67,939
Kirby B. Clawson	63,478
Paul J. Brown	49,672
Ed Hall	45,903
Forrest Cox	32,530
Schulz and Meier Part.	30,196
Randall Bird	29,229
Lawrence Withers	23,173
W. E. Orth	23,607
John W. Kelman	22,596
Lewis & Decker Cattle Co.	21,706
Stonestreet Farms	21,570
Howard Redd	20,446
Total payees in county (13)	455,045

JEWELL COUNTY	
Nell Durham	25,544
Laura Spiegel and Sons	20,781
Total payees in county (2)	46,325

KEARNEY COUNTY	
Ethel M. Martin	40,766
Raymond Dienst, Sr.	36,512
Gordon W. Crone	31,814
Vernon G. Kropp Est.	28,110
Ray Rohman	25,468
Max R. Miller	24,801
W. D. Foster	24,439
Charles Eskelund	23,543
B. E. Miles	22,739
Harold Stevenson	21,569
Edward E. Wiatt	20,830
Bob L. Landon	20,556
Total payees in county (12)	321,147

KIOWA COUNTY	
Pleasant Valley Farm & Ranch	26,868

LANE COUNTY	
Sharp Bros. C/O Gail Sharp	38,781
Larry Huck	23,739
Eston Schwartz	21,098
Edwin A. Borell & Sons	20,932
Total payees in county (4)	104,550

LOGAN COUNTY		RICE COUNTY		STAFFORD COUNTY	
Keller Bros.	58,766	Arthur Dobrinski	23,237	Carl McCune Sons	23,453
V. A. & John W. James Est.	41,463			Meryle R. Heyen	20,033
J. Ernest Bertrand	40,769				
Charles Bertrand Tr.	37,652				
Delton W. Hubert	25,834				
Louis Bertrand Jr.	23,002				
Leon K. Stoppel	20,931				
Total payees in county (7)	248,417			Total payees in county (2)	43,486
MARION COUNTY		BOOKS COUNTY		STANTON COUNTY	
Vestring Bros.	23,311	Earl Sutor	20,348	Clarence Winger & Sons	77,079
M'PHERSON COUNTY		SCOTT COUNTY		G. H. J. Farms, Ltd.	55,972
Jim Stroble	20,653	J. Ely Est.	53,025	Theodore J. Julian	39,389
MEADE COUNTY		Delmar L. Wesseler	35,583	Kans. Univ. Endow. Assoc.	38,237
W. R. Cottrell	42,467	Floyd M. Krebs	30,708	Lester Canny	37,762
Maud Collingwood Est.	37,530	Hattendorf Bros.	27,237	Kendrick Farms	37,554
John E. Frazier	25,971	Felt Farms	26,778	Edna E. Collingwood	36,369
Holmes C. Bender	25,793	Bernard I. Rose	25,646	Gary Baker	31,555
G. H. Tschudy	20,363	Marion Hutchins.	25,603	Charles Lucas	30,753
Total payees in county (5)	152,124	Albert Savolt	22,959	Robert Seger	29,951
MITCHELL COUNTY		Keith Janzen	22,959	Max Hume	29,825
Paul Mears	34,986	Luke & Son	22,586	J. A. Ramsay and Sons	29,740
Neil Fuller & Sons	24,101	Jack Corn	21,890	John Lewis	28,451
Miles E. File	23,447	Farm Lease, Inc.	21,839	Paul E. Plummer, Jr.	27,372
Ogden A. Kadel & Sons	20,711	Glenn Novak	20,225	Guy Rorick	26,886
Total payees in county (4)	103,245	Loren Janzen	20,037	Herbert Shironaka	26,744
MORTON COUNTY		Total payees in county (14)	377,075	F. G. Collingwood	26,263
W. J. Light	32,116			John Shore	25,908
Ralph Breeding	23,504			David M. Roach	25,713
Otis L. Daniels	21,959			Walter Herrick	25,432
Leon Jackson	21,710			Stanley A. Julian	24,365
J. E. Light	21,544			Milt Graber	23,741
John Baughman Tr.	21,501			Plummer Hall Farm	23,150
Harold Anderson	21,110			Hernandez and Sons	21,728
Charles Breeding	20,552			Roger Hurst	21,534
Total payees in county (8)	183,996			Irvin Pauls	21,092
NEOSHO COUNTY				Plummer Irrigation Co.	20,700
Wesley Kroeker	44,546			G. D. Troutman Est.	20,603
NESS COUNTY				Sam Ashida	20,517
Frank G. Davison	22,027			D. E. Cockrum	20,211
R. T. McCreight	20,887			Total payees in county (30)	904,596
Total payees in county (2)	42,914			STEVENS COUNTY	
OSBORNE COUNTY				Carl N. Brollier	51,155
Adrian Schweitzer	22,336			Warren Spikes	38,528
OTTAWA COUNTY				Fred Walkemeyer & Son	33,616
H. Francis Meiller	24,570			Vincent Youngren	29,973
Dick Diedrick	20,354			A. E. Kramer Agt. Pelajo Prop.	29,737
Total payees in county (2)	44,924			Lawrence J. Lightcap	29,368
PAWNEE COUNTY				Gerald L. Schmidt	27,455
Milford Zook	21,502			Harry Leonard	22,736
Melvin Bryant	20,366			Thurrow Miller Ptnr.	21,342
Total payees in county (2)	41,868			Charles Dudley	20,879
PHILLIPS COUNTY				J. I. Cullison	20,259
John B. Wyrill, Jr.	38,857			Total payees in county (11)	325,048
Cox Farms, Inc.	23,242			SUMNER COUNTY	
John B. Wyrill, Sr.	21,485			Stewart Farm Account	42,335
Total payees in county (3)	83,584			John L. Larsen	23,377
POTAWATOMIE COUNTY				Robert Casner	22,881
Peddicord Bros.	24,882			Ralph E. Miller	20,075
Total payees in county (2)	41,868			Total payees in county (4)	108,668
PRATT COUNTY				THOMAS COUNTY	
Don Fincham	25,028			Marshall Farms	35,258
Ronald Hoener	21,774			B. A. Hutton	28,289
Fred H. Kerr	20,537			Rex Cranston	22,574
Total payees in county (3)	67,339			Dumler Farms	22,161
				Carl B. Stephens	21,888
				Medford Farms, Inc.	21,883
				Sam Medford	21,555
				H. & H. Farms, Inc.	21,506
				Total payees in county (8)	195,114
				WALLACE COUNTY	
				Orville Walker	47,725
				Robert McKinney	35,026
				Edward M. Waugh	27,417
				Bernard S. Gradwohl	27,274
				Wm. H. Akers	25,044
				R. D. Walker, Inc.	24,084
				Gareth J. McFadden	23,346
				Russell I. Unruh	22,677
				Vernon L. Popp, Agt.	21,138
				Frasier Farms	20,673

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Kansas—Continued

N. D. Sexson..... 20,579
Harold E. Shuman..... 20,503

Total payees in county (12)..... 315,486

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Herman Bott..... 41,441

WICHITA COUNTY

Jaeger Farms..... 57,865
Glee S. Smith..... 41,496
J. W. Zellner..... 28,778
Eugene Berning..... 26,458
Leonard F. Harper..... 23,587
Gerald Smith..... 23,347

Total payees in county (6)..... 201,531

WILSON COUNTY

Harold Pierpoint..... 21,158

Total payees in State (297)..... 8,323,953

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Kentucky

FULTON COUNTY

James E. White..... 42,328
Sanger Farms, Inc..... 26,449
Morrow Bros..... 25,747
Joe Lattus..... 20,824

Total payees in county (4)..... 115,348

HENDERSON COUNTY

Reynolds Metals Co..... 33,479

HICKMAN COUNTY

Larkins Bros..... 23,814

TRIGG COUNTY

S. D. Broadbent, Jr..... 28,515
Cundiff Farms..... 22,227

Total payees in county (2)..... 50,742

UNION COUNTY

W. A. Anderson..... 21,864

Total payees in State (9)..... 245,247

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Louisiana

ACADIA PARISH

Isaac I. Richard..... 30,741
Ashton S. Petitjean..... 28,420
Henry Cormier..... 23,457
Clarence L. Richard..... 20,101

Total payees in parish (4)..... 102,719

ASCENSION PARISH

Lemann & Thibault, Inc..... 27,241
Peytavin FM Co. & Minnie, Inc..... 24,896
Palo Alto, Inc..... 23,009
Sunshine Pltn. Co..... 21,584

Total payees in parish (4)..... 96,730

ASSUMPTION PARISH

The Southcoast Corp..... 316,217
Churchill & Thibaut..... 74,539
Savoie Industries..... 51,990
Tex Emma, Inc..... 48,950
Est E. G. Robichaux..... 48,193
Dugas & Leblanc, Ltd..... 46,511
B. & D. Thibaut..... 33,358
Harang Farms, Inc..... 29,104
Lillie Belle Arcement..... 27,880

Total payees in parish (9)..... 676,742

AVOYELLES PARISH

Hass Inv. Co., Inc..... 43,650
John V. Coco..... 31,546
Darrell Lemoline..... 25,227
Orney Dauzat..... 22,835
Marlon Goudeau..... 22,617
J. B. Luke..... 21,908
Marion B. Townsend..... 21,890
C. W. Tebow..... 21,375
Lloyd & Burton Newton..... 20,707
E. A. Townsend & F. C. Townsend..... 20,068

Total payees in parish (10)..... 251,823

BOSSIER PARISH

R. J. Viola..... 54,392
Joe Clark..... 51,139
Milton Pittman..... 42,180
W. F. Nicholson..... 38,117
Curtis Planting Co..... 36,932
E. D. Barnett..... 30,277
I. W. Whittington, Jr..... 28,583
Henry L. Cox..... 27,397
J. N. Averett..... 25,355
Scopena Plantation..... 24,712
Elmer L. Spears..... 24,448
Franklin D. Roemer..... 23,552
C. H. Lyons III..... 23,552
Randal H. Lefler..... 23,552
C. E. Roemer III..... 23,552
T. C. Pearson, Jr..... 23,128
R. T. Stinson..... 23,084
B. H. Snyder..... 22,441
Marvin McCalman..... 22,297
Tim White..... 21,698
Atkins and Sonnier..... 21,497

Total payees in parish (21)..... 611,885

CADDO PARISH

Dalton R. Pittman..... 58,831
L. R. Kirby, Jr..... 57,399
Stinson Brothers..... 57,333
Sam W. Smith, Jr..... 55,499
Robinson Co..... 54,969
A. C. Dominick, Jr..... 52,916
Dan P. Logan..... 52,034
C. N. Frierson..... 50,190
G. A. Frierson..... 50,190
Dan P. Logan, Jr..... 45,906
L. S. Frierson, Jr..... 45,457
G. W. Van Hoose, Jr..... 43,556
G. W. Van Hoose, Sr..... 42,405
Carroll W. & Malcolm W. Feist..... 41,049
Bryan Connell..... 38,885
C. M. Hutchinson, Jr..... 38,409
A. L. Sentell..... 35,802
Bruce Lynn..... 35,537
T. A. Tinsley..... 35,113
E. R. Cupples..... 33,880
Jack F. Shaw..... 33,589
Margaret L. Ingram..... 33,579
Underwood Farms Inc..... 33,579
R. L. Nance, Jr..... 33,140
Yearwood Bros..... 31,425
W. L. Sibley..... 31,101
Paul Dominick..... 30,078
Paul Dominick, Jr..... 30,059
Chris Dominick..... 30,023
Jasper Lynn..... 29,800
Floyd E. & Ray Valentine..... 29,706
Tom P. Moore, Jr..... 28,607
J. W. Glassell..... 28,147
J. L. Teer..... 26,880
W. M. Yarbrough..... 26,741
J. H. Gardner..... 26,121
Malcolm Dutton..... 24,557
Clifton Dodson..... 23,490
W. A. Shaw..... 23,218
M. A. Robertson..... 22,840
Doles Farms..... 22,798
Wayland Carlisle..... 22,655
R. R. McKinney..... 22,471
Leo Ducote..... 22,243
Irene Bruce Lynn..... 21,295
W. J. James..... 21,294
M. P. Connell..... 20,544

Total payees in parish (47)..... 1,654,340

CALDWELL PARISH

Lelon Kenney..... 48,027
Rowland Bros..... 47,683
Olan L. Rucker..... 31,501
Jack Keahey..... 28,960
Mann and Jackson..... 28,238
R. B. McClanahan..... 24,958
Chester Ellis..... 22,580
U. M. Youngblood..... 21,932

Total payees in parish (8)..... 253,879

CATAHOULA PARISH

Jimmy Goode..... 55,268
R. M. Hammons..... 54,904
Gregory C. West..... 54,616
Harry Goode..... 54,466
William A. Yarbrough..... 53,256
George Yarbrough..... 52,251
Eugene Yarbrough..... 26,377
Wayne Crawford..... 23,594
Smithland Pltg. Co..... 21,606
J. C. Thompson..... 20,768

Total payees in parish (10)..... 417,106

CLAIBORNE PARISH

B. G. Sanders..... 21,012

CONCORDIA PARISH

Kenneth L. Isbell..... 56,545
Panola Land Dev. Co..... 51,678
Harriss and Sons..... 49,224
B. U. Miller..... 38,569
R. S. Rife, Jr..... 26,063
D. A. Biglane..... 25,079
Rota Quinta Pltn..... 24,287
Lucerna Planting Co..... 24,129
Sam Calvert Sons Inc..... 23,552
Burley and Schiele..... 23,191
Tommy F. Dennig..... 22,077
Max Huff..... 21,522
P. L. Rountree, Jr..... 20,812
Martha J. Rabb..... 20,585

Total payees in parish (14)..... 427,313

DE SOTO PARISH

James E. McMullen..... 43,498

EAST CARROLL PARISH

Hollybrook Land Co., Inc..... 58,759
Jack S. Hamilton, Inc..... 54,806
Gilfoli Farms, Inc..... 53,874
H. D. Harvey..... 53,830
Houston Condrey..... 53,425
Keener Howard..... 49,298
W. T. Presley..... 47,231
F. H. Schneider, III..... 43,541
Pearson Farming Corp..... 43,008
Doris Pltn..... 42,679
H. H. Howington, Jr..... 42,029
J. P. Brown..... 41,649
Wendell Downen..... 40,955
Rodney Fortenberry..... 39,479
W. H. Bullock..... 39,466
Blair Pltn, Inc..... 38,809
Philip Brown..... 37,220
Edward Burgess..... 36,302
J. B. McPherson, Sr..... 35,610
W. H. Crews..... 35,384
Thomas H. Shields, Jr..... 34,541
James Shepherd..... 33,454
Bernard Rosenzweig..... 32,603
Troyce B. Dukes..... 30,400
Mack L. Howington..... 27,766
James E. Howington..... 27,755
Elaine C. Fortenberry..... 27,101
David Harvey..... 26,605
Wallace N. Oliver..... 26,472
L. W. Baker..... 26,472
Ted J. Oliver..... 26,468
C. B. Thompson, Jr..... 26,241
George R. Wise..... 24,887
Howell Pippin..... 24,863
Roy Burgess, Jr..... 24,426
A. J. Hawsey..... 23,845
John Hankins..... 23,808

Richard Howard	23, 187
Clinton Fortenberry	22, 283
R. W. Fletcher	22, 226
Reese Coleman	21, 623
Reynold Minsky	21, 468
J. E. Brown	21, 297
Jack Brown	21, 291
Michael Brown	21, 291
Quitman Fortenberry	20, 701
Earl Stanley	20, 689

Total payees in parish (47) - 1,571, 117

EVANGELINE PARISH

Albert Campbell	23, 217
-----------------	---------

FRANKLIN PARISH

Earl Carroll	55, 808
Carroll Jordan	55, 306
Gerald Sadler	54, 800
Larry T. Sadler	54, 128
William D. Batey	53, 081
Riley M. Graham	52, 782
Carl D. Batey	51, 536
Gilbert M. Hammons	35, 175
L. Aubrey Kincaid	34, 476
C. J. Grayson	32, 683
J. B. Eley Farms	29, 039
Charlie W. Stephens	25, 928
Clovis C. Bringol	25, 501
B. C. Kimble, Jr.	24, 631
M. R. Young	24, 143
G. A. Price	22, 944
W. M. Snyder, Jr.	22, 298
King Swazer, Jr.	22, 073
J. W. Ballance	21, 196
O. D. Johnson	21, 033
Lucille F. Braswell	20, 805
James M. Valentine	20, 799
T. J. Martin, Jr.	20, 799
H. B. Wallace	20, 686
Charles C. Feltus	20, 449
Lantz Womack	20, 089
James H. Stephens	20, 054
Donnie McMurry	20, 016

Total payees in parish (28) - 882, 202

GRANT PARISH

Ceres Devp., Inc.	45, 492
Gordon Randolph	44, 662
Wallace E. Summerford	30, 572

Total payees in parish (3) - 120, 726

IBERIA PARISH

Duhe Bros. Ptg. Co.	38, 429
M. A. Patout & Son, Ltd.	31, 516
W. C. Lanie & Sons, Inc.	26, 461
Clarence Lemaire	23, 508
J. Paulin Duhe, Inc.	22, 679
East Linden Farms	21, 605

Total payees in parish (6) - 164, 198

IBERVILLE PARISH

A. Wilberts Sons L/S Co.	61, 259
J. Supples Sons Ptg. Co. Ltd.	28, 869
Wm. T. Burton Inds., Inc.	26, 313
E. J. Gay P/M Co., Ltd.	23, 887
J. G. Rivet/Sons, Inc.	21, 913

Total payees in parish (5) - 162, 241

ALFAYETTE PARISH

Youngs Industries, Inc.	28, 694
Eugene Rosinski	26, 374
Rodney Trahan	20, 885

Total payees in parish (3) - 75, 953

LAFOURCHE PARISH

Valentine Sugars, Inc.	50, 457
J. B. Levert Land Co.	35, 370
Wilson Melancon	26, 403
Webre Farms	22, 219
Laurel Valley Ptn., Inc.	20, 454
Arabie S. Farm	20, 137

Total payees in parish (6) - 175, 040

MADISON PARISH

Deltic Farm & Timber Co., Inc.	59, 883
Dudley Pillow, Jr.	55, 977
Dudley Pillow, Sr.	55, 340
Elton Fortenberry	50, 398
E. C. Woodyear	45, 318
M. C. Sevier	38, 478
Evanco, Inc.	33, 185
Maxwell Plantation	31, 665
Albert H. Paxton	31, 001
Howard Sevier	27, 924
Killarney Plantation	27, 239
C. E. Jobe	26, 805
Robert Graves	26, 240
Bobby Joe Lee	24, 676
L. F. McClain	22, 883
J. M. Gilfoil	22, 544
Richland Foster, Inc.	21, 618
Waymon Coady	20, 902
Harry Barrett	20, 371

Total payees in parish (19) - 642, 447

MOREHOUSE PARISH

F. Earl Hogan	56, 172
Davenport Bros.	55, 267
Duke Shackelford	55, 090
Erle M. Barham	52, 793
Barham, Inc.	52, 571
Wesley Bunch	50, 960
James U. Yeldell, Jr.	50, 545
Conrad Stallings	48, 925
James A. Brown	45, 660
B. B. Hunt, Jr.	44, 845
J. D. McAdams	44, 770
Joe Monroe Mott	39, 395
King Mott	38, 304
Don Sims	37, 693
Ivan Morris, Jr.	37, 575
David Doles, Jr.	37, 292
Bob Erle Clark	36, 670
Nell W. Mott, Jr.	36, 557
Bolin Farms	36, 078
C. L. Clark, Jr.	35, 414
John M. Yeldell	33, 396
J. B. Holley	32, 565
W. C. Norsworthy	32, 048
C. E. Shepard	31, 988
Kelly Bros.	30, 538
W. T. Blackwell, Jr.	29, 846
J. B. Newman	29, 216
Wayne J. McDonald, Jr.	29, 103
W. H. Parker	27, 621
Luther Allen Day, Jr.	27, 424
Henry Ferrell, Jr.	27, 195
Joe S. Carter, Jr.	26, 650
Thomas West Barham	26, 234
Erle Edwards Barham	26, 234
Jeff L. McCain	25, 712
G. L. Shepard	25, 016
James O. Pearson	24, 934
John Knox Nunn	24, 924
Herbert Johnson	24, 634
Carl N. Wright	24, 469
Rudie Mardis	24, 054
N. W. Mott	23, 995
Norman McDuffie	23, 255
Warren White	21, 854
James McKoin	21, 641
David Pipes	21, 545
Sherrod T. McKoin, Jr.	21, 542
H. A. Pipes, Jr.	21, 380
Zelma P. Milliken	21, 380
Caleb Pipes	21, 377
Johnie T. Kovac	21, 180

Thomas H. B. Rankin	21, 004
Cecil Harp	20, 504

Total payees in parish (53) - 1,737,034

NATCHITOCHES PARISH

Murry Lambre	55, 367
J. Alton Lambre	55, 223
J. H. Williams	55, 021
Ralph C. Ingram, Jr.	54, 868
Russell M. Cook	53, 757
R. B. Dalme	45, 678
Bayou Camitte Plantation	44, 155
O. R. Miller, Jr.	41, 694
Starlight Plantation	41, 227
James R. Stacy	39, 651
Est. of H. Cohen & Sons	38, 930
Richard L. Williamson	37, 950
Est. Sarah J. Hertzog	37, 796
U. V. Durr	36, 678
Mack James	35, 509
Est. of J. C. Carnahan	32, 322
Kenneth Prudhomme	32, 214
J. Alphonse Prudhomme, Jr.	32, 214
Deloy Blewer	29, 867
G. C. Messenger	28, 780
Lewis E. Jones, Jr.	28, 177
John T. Batten, Jr.	28, 097
Desiree C. Prudhomme	28, 097
Paul E. Messenger	27, 850
Herman Taylor, Jr.	27, 293
Henry Lemoine	26, 678
Sam H. Hill & Son	25, 248
T. H. McNeely III	24, 343
Worster Anderson	20, 277

Total payees in parish (29) - 1,064,961

OUCHITA PARISH

W. A. & T. A. Calloway	59, 703
J. B. Johnston, Jr.	57, 330
J. A. Moore	49, 315
Travis Howard	46, 138
A. C. Ransom & Son	45, 391
Fred W. Huenefeldt	41, 972
C. M. McMullen	37, 692
T. A. Calloway	33, 103
George P. Smelser	32, 686
J. M. Pratt, Sr.	30, 223
Bruce F. Gregg	29, 054
Glen Crossley	28, 837
Emmit Lee	27, 871
Frank Mardis	27, 754
Shelby B. Lenard	27, 599
John H. Filhiol	27, 068
R. Z. Johnson	26, 766
J. T. Lee	23, 944
Wm. King Stubbs	22, 705
M. L. Mason	21, 562
Tom Pete Godwin	21, 562
R. T. Faulk	21, 417
J. W. Perry	20, 790
Robert W. Willis	20, 190

Total payees in parish (24) - 780, 672

POINTE COUPEE PARISH

Walter P. Hobgood	34, 408
Alma Plantation Ltd.	32, 663

Total payees in parish (2) - 67, 061

RAPIDES PARISH

Frank J. Dautremont	46, 297
Inglewood Ld. & Dev. Co.	46, 002
Henry C. Boone, Jr.	32, 121
Well Company, Inc.	30, 495
Edward W. Lyles	29, 219
Louis A. Marlen	29, 211
John H. Robert	28, 397
Greenwood Plantation	27, 747
Woodrow Dewitt	25, 932
Lucian A. Branch, Jr.	25, 818
Carpenter and Jackson	25, 647
Charles F. Gaiennie	24, 743
R. M. C. Duncan	24, 474
Woodrow W. Carter	23, 849
Odom Farms	23, 818

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Louisiana—Continued

Ferdinana Vandeveld, Jr.	22,317
Roy A. James	21,088
Witchwood Plantation	21,005
Nutwood Plantation	20,965
Gregory Mathews	20,443

Total payees in parish (20) 549,588

RED RIVER PARISH

Saline Lake Farms Inc.	48,817
J. T. Bierden, Jr.	44,062
R. C. Legrand	40,743
F. I. Waltman	36,467
Larry Bundrick	27,990
Ed F. Lester	25,914
Paul Bundrick	25,564
Creighton Webb	21,440
Burnell Webb	20,281

Total payees in parish (9) 291,278

RICHLAND PARISH

C. W. Pardue Estate	55,000
K. E. McDonald, Jr.	44,415
Robertine R. Cobb	43,506
Goldmine Plant	42,419
Jane R. Oliver	39,938
O. G. Morris	39,554
Dallas Thomason	38,422
W. E. Finley, Jr.	35,820
Edward E. Holley	34,361
Hulen Allen	34,145
Estate of C. M. Noble, Inc.	33,733
Charles D. Ware	33,374
Pennzoll Producing, Inc.	33,253
C. L. Morris	33,125
J. E. Tarver	31,438
Riverbend Farms, Inc.	29,944
Claude Morgan	29,551
Francis V. Jordan	29,362
C. W. Earle Estate	28,062
J. B. Ratcliff	27,441
W. C. Cooper	27,160
W. H. Hubbard	26,407
Geo. B. Franklin & Son, Inc.	26,012
Ralph Powell	25,658
Winston Hill	24,704
Guy C. Pardue	24,373
James F. Parrish	24,074
R. L. Bell & Sons	23,257
Roy Weston	21,602
Donald Chapman	21,277
Fred L. Cheek	21,159
J. U. Douciere	21,115
G. C. Hill Jr.	21,093
Stark Properties	20,867
Pat H. Earle	20,412
N. E. Thames	20,286
Earl Patrick	20,168

Total payees in parish (37) 1,106,487

ST. CHARLES PARISH

Douglas J. Arable	22,165
-------------------	--------

ST. JAMES PARISH

Graugnard Farms	50,779
Uncle Sam Pltg Co.	22,050
Schexnayder Farms	21,269
Clarence & Carol Hymel	21,043
Charles & O. J. Gravois	20,584

Total payees in parish (5) 135,725

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Caire & Graugnard	56,948
T. Lanaux Son	31,305
Terre Haute Pltn Inc.	24,421
Goldmine Plantation Inc.	20,637

Total payees in parish (4) 133,311

ST. LANDRY PARISH

J. A. Pickett	53,442
Nick D. Dubuisson	38,527

Hudspeth Bros	38,189
Delano Plantation Inc.	37,224
Stanley Doucet	28,029
Joe J. Artall	27,857
Sam Yander	27,487
John W. Bertrand	25,959
K. H. and R. L. Gordon Plant, Inc.	24,055
Richard Sanders	23,179
Louis Burleigh	22,770
Melvin Solleau	22,701
George Bourgeois	22,571
Marion V. Goudeau	20,629
Furdy Lafleur	20,519

Total payees in parish (15) 433,138

ST. MARTIN PARISH

Levert St. John, Inc.	59,762
Willis Brothers	28,246
Regis Lagrange	23,821

Total payees in parish (3) 111,829

ST. MARY PARISH

Sterling Sugar, Inc.	135,096
Harry L. Laws & Co., Inc.	62,172
Patout Roane, Inc.	41,117
Katy Plantation	35,366
A. V. Allain & Sons, Inc.	31,467
Cyremont Farms, Inc.	30,231
Shadyside Co., Ltd.	27,460
Sunrise Planting Corp.	26,906
The Maryland Co., Inc.	23,047
P. J. DeGravelles, Inc.	22,706
Frank Martin Farms, Inc.	22,179
Clay Terry	20,863

Total payees in parish (12) 478,610

TENSAS COUNTY

Panola Co.	65,412
E. S. Moberley	59,455
E. R. McDonald, Sr.	57,263
Frank Burnside	51,977
G. C. Goldman	45,606
Wade Vinson, Jr.	42,322
Cypress Grove Pltn.	39,557
Lake Bruin Development Corp.	36,625
Jim Huff	33,186
Russell Ratcliff	29,973
E. R. McDonald, Jr.	28,632
W. B. McDonald	28,632
H. C. Miller III	28,574
J. C. Crigler	27,933
R. E. Lancaster, Jr.	26,598
Virginia Wilkerson	26,327
Osceola Pltn.	25,157
J. R. Coor	25,061
Jack Day	24,212
Lakeplace Pltn.	23,433
Monticello Plt. Co.	23,363
Mid Delta Land Co.	23,179
George Bagley	22,551

Total payees in parish (23) 795,028

TERREBONNE PARISH

Southdown Lands Inc.	184,093
Prentice Oil & Gas Co.	28,592

Total payees in parish (2) 212,685

UNION PARISH

E. R. Rogers	30,235
--------------	--------

WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH

Milliken & Farwell Inc.	75,241
Poplar Grove Pltg./Ref. Co.	42,673
Margaret Pltn.	30,538
Devall Co. Inc.	22,056
Allendale Pltn.	20,338

Total payees in parish (5) 190,846

WEST CARROLL PARISH

Larry Crowe	56,448
Murray C. Crowe	55,000
Eugene A. Harper	38,282
Claude M. Crowe	27,517

Total payees in parish (4) 117,247

WEST FELICIANA PARISH

Louisiana State Penitentiary	88,553
------------------------------	--------

WEBSTER PARISH

Williams & Hicks Co.	20,739
----------------------	--------

Total payees in State (498) 16,801,380

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Maryland

KENT COUNTY

Edwin C. Fry	21,659
--------------	--------

TALBOT COUNTY

I. R. Swann	25,743
-------------	--------

Total payees in State (2) 47,402

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Michigan

CASS COUNTY

Donald McKenzie	20,540
-----------------	--------

INGHAM COUNTY

Diehl Fields	29,758
--------------	--------

LENAWEE COUNTY

Leland Bush & Sons	39,779
Richard Walters	24,633
William Goetz	23,794

Total payees in county (3) 88,206

MONROE COUNTY

Albert Heath	25,603
--------------	--------

SAGINAW COUNTY

Walter Walat	24,878
Melvin Price	22,975
Mistequay Creek Farms	20,040

Total payees in county (3) 67,893

SANILAC COUNTY

Grabitz Bros.	21,596
---------------	--------

Total payees in State (10) 253,596

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—excluding loans—Minnesota

BIG STONE COUNTY

Lismore Stock Farm	20,303
--------------------	--------

CLAY COUNTY

Paul Horn Farms, Inc.	29,843
Valan Seed Farm, Inc.	21,912
Benedict Farms, Inc.	21,704

Total payees in county (3) 73,459

DODGE COUNTY

Owatonna Farms Co.	28,194
--------------------	--------

FARIBAULT COUNTY

Pirsig Bros	49,720
Henry C. Wessels	20,773
Everett C. Wessels	20,611

Total payees in county (3) 91,104

FREEBORN COUNTY

R. Peter Louters	22,466
------------------	--------

KITTSOON COUNTY	
Prairie Farms.....	27,288
Miller Brothers Farm.....	23,692
John Bogestad.....	21,301

Total payees in county (3) - 72,281

MARSHALL COUNTY	
Vernon J. McFarland.....	33,079
Art Howard.....	21,749
Harry Howard.....	21,186
Kuznia Farms, Inc.....	20,780
Earl Hvidsten.....	20,155

Total payees in county (5) - 116,949

MARTIN COUNTY	
Merwin Moore & Sons, Ptnshp....	21,033

NORMAN COUNTY	
C. H. Underlee and Sons, a part..	27,367

REDWOOD COUNTY	
John H. Reque.....	31,522
Leonard K. Wittwer.....	23,330
John Clair Larson.....	21,207

Total payees in county (3) - 76,059

RENVILLE COUNTY	
Frank Farms, Inc.....	35,930
Frank O. Johnson.....	20,681
David L. Johnson.....	20,585
Parks Dahlgren.....	20,364

Total payees in county (4) - 97,560

SWIFT COUNTY	
Minn Farms Co.....	24,546
Sheldon Reippel.....	21,335
J. Burton Johnson.....	20,304

Total payees in county (3) - 66,185

WATONWAN COUNTY	
Tilney Farms.....	39,337

WEST POLK COUNTY	
Keith & Raymond Driscoll.....	40,581
Useldinger Brothers.....	27,178
Vernon Hagen.....	24,687
Anderson Farms.....	24,612
Armin Ross and Son.....	24,326
James and Joe Fanfulik.....	22,243
Leonard Driscoll & Son.....	22,018
Francis Deboer.....	20,155

Total payees in county (8) - 205,800

WILKIN COUNTY	
James J. Walton.....	32,211
Ivan Miller.....	30,586
David Miller.....	22,841

Total payees in county (3) - 85,638

Total payees in State (41) - 1,043,735

1971 ASCS and Great Plains Program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Mississippi

ADAMS COUNTY	
Joseph W. Parker, Jr.....	55,299
T. J. Isbell.....	36,750

Total payees in county (2) - 92,049

ALCORN COUNTY	
J. E. Marsh.....	23,769

ATTALA COUNTY	
Arnold C. Lowe.....	36,903
Charles Donald.....	34,975

James L. Stewart.....	32,614
Hugh B. England, Jr.....	29,954
Horace G. McMillan.....	28,976
Gideon W. Atwood.....	26,288
Willie B. McCrory.....	26,169
W. B. Wade.....	24,635
H. S. Smithson, Jr.....	23,766
H. S. Smithson, Sr.....	23,220
H. E. Jenkins.....	21,407
Maurice Crowder.....	20,009

Total payees in county (12) - 328,916

BENTON COUNTY	
Leak Brothers.....	29,043
C. F. Bryan.....	26,676
Wyatt Thomas.....	21,465

Total payees in county (3) - 77,184

BOLIVAR COUNTY	
Allen Gray Estate.....	91,003
Delta and Pine Land Co.....	65,509
Charles A. Russell.....	58,364
J. A. Howarth, Jr.....	58,227
Denton Mfg. Co., Inc.....	57,592
Zumbro Planting Co.....	56,443
W. J. Sumrall.....	56,411
R. C. Malone.....	56,154
Maryland Plantation, Inc.....	56,003
James B. McGowan.....	55,744
Charles J. Wilson.....	55,596
Joe R. Ross.....	55,042
Ralph W. Ray.....	55,000
Charles Speakes.....	54,738
Carr Planting Co.....	54,607
Allendale Planting Co.....	54,558
James House.....	54,544
T. E. Pemble Farms, Inc.....	54,438
A & B Farms, Inc.....	54,197
Huddleston Farms, Inc.....	53,815
G. P. Short.....	53,582
Dossett Plantation, Inc.....	53,320
McMurphy Farms.....	53,172
Rex Morgan.....	53,126
Bostick Brothers.....	52,680
H. B. Hood.....	52,546
Charles Evans.....	52,392
Duke Morgan.....	52,005
Noel Morgan.....	52,004
Shelby Farms.....	51,794
Rogers Hall.....	50,942
Gerald D. Denton.....	50,820
Jones Brothers Farms, Inc.....	50,772
Don Robertson.....	50,347
Milton E. Jefcoat.....	50,289
Carolyn Jefcoat Martin.....	50,280
Jerry C. Jefcoat.....	50,268
B. E. McDearman, Jr.....	49,839
Andrew R. Carr Trustee.....	48,947
E. M. Walton.....	48,504
Riverland Plantation, Inc.....	48,119
George B. Noland.....	48,034
W. E. Pentecost, Jr.....	48,020
W. F. and W. H. Hardin.....	46,885
Rainbow Plantation, Inc.....	46,757
L. & R. Plantation, Inc.....	46,196
E. F. Findley.....	46,071
Clear Lake Farms, Inc.....	45,848
A. D. Murphree, Jr.....	45,467
Lewis Barksdale, Jr.....	45,342
J. E. Williams.....	45,159
D. A. Williams.....	45,159
F. H. Nance.....	44,746
M. A. Bell.....	44,696
S. D. Long.....	44,604
Myles Looney.....	44,364
James L. Maxwell.....	44,229
B. H. Bass, Jr.....	43,391
J. K. Walker.....	42,517
J. R. Parkinson.....	42,201
Max Dilworth.....	42,068
Elm Farms, Inc.....	41,209
J. P. Skelton.....	40,933
C. Milton Smith.....	40,738
J. B. Lowe.....	40,651

H. R. Willson.....	40,506
Tony Antiel.....	40,341
H. H. Lawler.....	40,122
Dossett Planting Co., Inc.....	39,691
Austin Hester.....	39,637
Harry Featherston.....	39,547
Blizzell Farms.....	39,504
M. J. Dattel.....	38,913
Albert Day.....	38,635
R. P. Herbison.....	37,682
Clarence R. Smith.....	36,687
C. T. Stanford.....	36,658
Alfred Butler.....	36,580
Elmer Prewitt.....	36,465
H. H. Harrison.....	36,398
Jimmie Pierce.....	36,006
Pleasant and Co.....	35,726
James House, Jr.....	35,626
Alex Belenchia.....	35,482
L. E. Murphy.....	35,111
E. J. Conn.....	34,985
Parks Place, Inc.....	34,850
Charles Hicks.....	34,743
H. R. Childress.....	34,585
Guy F. Warfield.....	33,603
Allen E. Warfield.....	33,593
Scott Warfield.....	33,593
J. W. Reynolds.....	33,372
W. L. McCool.....	33,272
Game Inc.....	33,198
C. D. Long.....	33,044
M & D Planting Co., Inc.....	32,916
Norman Brown.....	32,884
W. H. Frederick.....	32,714
W. C. Brown.....	32,537
A. J. Cowart.....	32,266
H. A. Wellman.....	32,228
Perry L. McCool.....	32,212
Terry D. Russell.....	32,180
W. S. Adams.....	32,138
J. A. Harris.....	31,997
Rudolph Massey.....	31,928
H. E. McCaslin.....	31,684
Cedar Ridge Dairy.....	31,565
Draion Franks.....	31,468
Hubert Gant.....	31,325
F. R. Armstrong.....	31,013
W. H. Howarth.....	30,852
The Wolfe Co.....	30,511
W. T. Tullos III.....	29,861
Bolivar Farms.....	29,613
Triumph Farms.....	29,214
G. A. Hood.....	29,145
J. H. Avritt, Jr.....	29,117
W. F. Ervin.....	29,111
Leroy McKee.....	28,842
Gee Ferretti.....	28,777
G. W. Litton.....	28,738
J. R. Taylor.....	28,727
L. V. Dickerson.....	28,709
Will Gourlay.....	28,563
Pete Bramuchi.....	28,385
Dalton Taylor.....	27,926
John G. Gourlay, Jr.....	27,813
Helen P. Gourlay.....	27,813
Virgie P. Hiter.....	27,514
Henry P. Hiter.....	27,514
Kenneth Hood.....	26,970
A. D. Murphree, Sr.....	26,804
Hugh Swindoll.....	26,377
William Peacock.....	26,358
John F. Watts.....	26,353
F. B. Aylward.....	25,970
W. M. Payne.....	25,905
M. L. Payne.....	25,901
M. L. Turpin, Jr.....	25,863
Garnett K. Scott.....	25,843
Delbert Farmer.....	25,761
W. A. Welshans.....	25,218
A. C. Wiggins.....	25,013
Charles W. Jones.....	24,968
Paul Jones.....	24,731
J. R. Turner.....	24,193
John W. Comfort.....	24,020
James Walker.....	23,910
I. C. Rayner Jr.....	23,551
Lawrence Gibson.....	23,051

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Mississippi—Continued

Clayton Holder	22,860
J. E. DeFord	22,447
Lyle Dilworth Farms	22,732
H. L. Dilworth	22,639
H. A. Hood	22,392
J. L. and J. V. Newman	22,144
C. E. Williams	21,965
Lamar Stanford	21,897
Mello Sandroni	21,468
Sue Rayner Trust	21,237
Murphree Farms, Inc.	21,225
Carlis Lyons	21,221
E. F. Abel	21,190
C. R. Ingram	21,138
J. R. Dodson	21,123
Raymond Sandroni	21,118
Victor J. Aguzzi	20,948
Joe Aguzzi	20,948
J. T. Reed	20,946
Hard Scramble Plantation	20,925
John Glorioso	20,879
Dr. D. Tuminiello	20,879
W. P. Skelton	20,870
Ruth W. Bobo	20,810
Mary Adele Walters	20,804
Eleanor B. Walters	20,804
Alden Bell	20,574
Bryn Bright	20,422
Carolyn Rayner Trust	20,050

Total payees in county (181) 6,642,788

CALHOUN COUNTY

Grady Easley	46,806
Harold Hamilton	40,400
H. L. Hardin	24,870
John Swilley	24,595
W. A. Jennings	21,166

Total payees in county (5) 157,837

CARROLL COUNTY

Russell Hoop	55,224
Oklahoma Farms	53,472
J. E. Hobgood	45,691
Ralph Redditt	34,771
Hugh Ferguson	32,555
W. E. Taylor	31,954
R. C. Colvin	29,693
John C. Calhoun	28,169
H. F. Williams	24,274
Roy Meeks	23,638
Wilton L. Nash, trustee	23,413
M. B. Whitten	22,693

Total payees in county (12) 405,547

CHICKASAW COUNTY

W. J. Linn	55,398
Kenneth Coleman	54,994
R. W. Coleman	54,994
J. Q. Demoville	38,397
J. T. Brand	24,168
Larry Carter	22,307

Total payees in county (6) 250,258

CHOCTAW COUNTY

Rex Swindle	31,991
Oren Swindle	26,729
James L. Green	20,453

Total payees in county (3) 79,173

CLAIBORNE COUNTY

James Beasley	45,695
Wiley Hatcher	26,916
Barland Brothers	25,491
Jim S. Middleton	20,917
E. A. Porter	20,361

Total payees in county (5) 139,380

CLAY COUNTY

J. T. Brand	31,835
J. S. Brand	22,088
Total payees in county (2)	53,923

COAHOMA COUNTY

Connell & Company	58,270
Oakhurst Company	57,958
J. F. Humber, Jr.	57,835
Carr Mascot Pltn. Inc.	57,797
J. B. McKee Estate	57,262
Leon C. Bramlett	57,252
F. B. McKee Estate	56,869
McKee Farms Inc.	56,371
Sigmon Planting Company	56,300
Margaret McKee	56,265
John B. McKee, Jr.	56,265
Taylor Flowers	56,107
E. E. Lacy	55,921
R. W. Jones & Sons, Inc.	55,855
Omega Planting Co.	55,820
Pauline K. Sacks Est.	55,769
Bobbette Kline	55,769
Reva K. Marcus	55,769
John W. Nance, Jr.	55,698
J. B. Laney Farms, Inc.	55,649
Fant Brothers	55,580
W. L. McKee	55,414
Roy Flowers	55,324
Oscar Connell	55,266
Eaglenest Pltg. Co.	55,200
T. M. Luster	55,136
J. T. Massey, Jr.	55,000
Alcorn Russell, Sr.	54,677
Preston P. Bennett	54,659
Kirk Haynes	54,413
C. E. Presley, Jr.	53,984
King & Anderson, Inc.	53,840
J. T. Longino, Jr.	53,699
R. R. Count	53,615
R. L. Perryman	52,955
Young Farms, Inc.	52,698
Robert A. Boyce	52,535
W. E. Meredith	52,457
William P. Howell	52,122
James Spaggiari	51,872
King & Anderson Ent.	51,754
J. L. Stribling, Jr.	51,420
B. B. Smith	51,322
J. W. Henderson	51,282
James W. Henderson, Jr.	51,282
Dulaney Farms, Inc.	50,933
David B. Mullens	50,677
H. M. Haney Estate	50,443
Harry Flowers	50,211
R. B. Flowers	50,204
Graydon Flowers, Jr.	50,204
Roundaway Planting Company	50,132
Levingston & Sack, Inc.	50,117
Nordel, Inc.	50,117
Ellendale Planting Co.	49,467
Carr Childrens Trust	49,459
C. M. Allen	49,343
Jennie W. Haynes	48,905
Lea & Stone, Inc.	48,326
R. N. McWilliams	48,107
Weeks Plantation, Inc.	48,023
Rives & Brewer	47,595
John T. Hays & Son	47,184
G. L. McWilliams, Sr.	47,082
E. F. Massey Corp.	46,957
W. K. Anderson, Jr.	46,915
John P. Pelegrin	45,975
Allen Farms, Inc.	45,492
Edwin J. Mullens	45,482
Wilbur Welch	45,366
Weakley Brahan	45,197
H. H. Twiford	44,862
Allen C. Evans	44,477
Paroli Farms, Inc.	44,012
Mattie B. Boone	43,898
Rocco G. Morris	43,602
C. B. D., Inc.	43,442
Noel D. Ogley	43,307
Robert G. Johnson	42,439
M. J. Commer	42,198
Joe Garrison Farms	41,837
W. T. Salmon	41,290

M. C. Stovall, Inc.	41,231
Louise M. Heaton	41,167
R. B. Lyon	41,116
W. C. Luckett Farms	41,008
Morris Eason	41,002
R. M. Aust	40,059
J. T. Longino III	39,772
W. S. Heaton, Jr.	39,532
Belmont, Inc.	39,165
Champion Farms, Inc.	39,031
Marlon Farms	38,371
Graham Bramlett	38,010
Dan Crumpton, Jr.	37,578
Michael W. Curtis	37,398
Massey Farms, Inc.	37,390
J. H. Pruett	37,388
Sammie D. Hamblin	37,388
Floy J. Haney	37,380
L. B. Shipp	37,143
Elizabeth Garrett	37,033
W. H. Garrett, Jr.	37,033
Eva Mae Crumpton	36,928
Andrew J. Conelson	36,697
Waterloo Planting Co.	36,478
J. H. Sherard, Inc.	36,126
Beverly S. Pettey	36,115
Harry L. Black	35,887
Joe & Richard Noe	35,731
Richard Russell	35,570
H. A. Greene	35,125
Carson Pelegrin	35,031
Reno Borgognoni	34,812
James A. Russell, Jr.	34,301
L. S. Powell Estate, Inc.	34,230
Heaton Pltg. Company	34,095
L. T. Payne	34,092
W. H. Maynard, Jr.	33,995
W. L. McKee III	33,859
Charles Monty, Jr.	33,446
Malavassi Farms	32,415
H. D. R. Corporation	32,182
W. W. Cooper Est.	32,167
Lake Roberson, Jr.	31,820
Travis H. Taylor, Jr.	31,551
E. V. Catoe, Jr.	31,548
Van Meek, Jr.	31,292
F. R. Ashley	30,529
John J. Mohead	29,857
William H. Mohead	29,848
James E. Mohead	29,248
Lent A. Ross III	29,794
Billy Campbell	29,759
H. J. McMillian	29,733
Adams Farms	29,494
T. O. Fulton	29,257
Phillip Tavoletti	29,231
Dominic Tavoletti	29,231
Anthony Tavoletti	29,231
Johnny Tavoletti	29,231
Mary Tavoletti	29,231
Monty Planting Co., Inc.	28,894
Tony Morris	28,831
Montgomery Farms	28,776
Ruck Jose	28,156
Bobby Goss	27,878
John F. Rodgers	27,791
Fyfe Brothers	27,496
Harry S. Anderson	27,238
H. B. Heidelberg	27,215
Eugene C. Allen	27,215
Horace Ritch	27,103
Butler Planting Co., Inc.	27,102
Berryhill Farms, Inc.	27,005
Graydon Flowers	26,876
W. H. Rainey	26,761
Howard Smith	26,727
Kent Haney	26,593
Mike Antici	25,981
Wheeler Graham	25,872
T. R. Rodgers	25,764
T. S. Hays	25,535
Vito Sbravati	25,499
Elizabeth Bramlett	24,979
River Bend Pltn., Inc.	24,883
Harold Mosby	24,451
Henry Cobb, Jr.	23,777
John H. Garmon, Jr.	23,646
Manker Pltg. Co., Inc.	23,600
Allan B. Adams	23,557

Nell Smith	23,114
Frank Aderholdt	22,756
Lawrence Malone	22,709
Paul Clark, Inc.	22,431
C. V. Wiltshire, Jr.	22,220
Robert Louis Demilio	22,048
Jim Smith	21,650
Lucille & C. W. Fyfe, Jr.	21,497
Raymond Francis	21,412
Panther Lake Ptn., Inc.	21,209
W. W. Vaught & Son	21,091
Jimmie Hardin	21,082
J. W. Gray, Jr.	20,818
Malcolm Mabry Farms, Inc.	20,402

Total payees in county
(186) 7,383,287

COPIAH COUNTY

W. S. Reed	42,246
C. E. Strong	28,570
James West	28,201
Allen Hood	25,993

Total payees in county (4) 125,010

DESOTO COUNTY

R. S. Jarratt	58,277
M. W. Jefcoat Estate	58,084
Tract O Land Ptn.	57,845
Warren W. Sullivan	57,397
S. M. Blythe	50,334
Herman Koehler	48,437
Carthel Todd	47,033
Howard Plantation	46,697
Swindoll Farms, Inc.	45,999
Richard Leatherman, Jr.	42,322
E. M. Upchurch	42,122
John Graves	42,085
Minor B. Lewis	40,880
William Gerber	40,880
Dudley Bridgforth	38,791
J. S. Dollahite	38,605
Penton Planting Company	37,421
Readus Hudson	36,241
A. A. Whitten	35,043
Milton W. Jones	33,014
Pat Jack Farms	32,238
Clarence Sparks	29,899
C. E. Clifton	29,621
J. H. Miller	28,772
R. M. Treadway	26,679
George B. Banks	26,608
J. R. Summers	25,654
R. M. Treadway & Sons	24,760
D. F. Wilson	21,525
M. J. Sparks	21,055
Lewis B. Marrow	20,385
Minor M. Leblanc	20,385
Walton Scott	20,191

Total payees in county (33) 1,225,279

GRENADA COUNTY

W. J. Hobgood	39,360
T. E. Guest	34,303
Paul L. Gray	26,185
Hiram E. Davis	24,392
John M. Little	23,127
B. A. Little	22,384
R. E. White	22,042
Alex Smith	21,326
Reginald E. Forrest	21,103
Bobby E. Gillon	20,061

Total payees in county (10) 254,283

HANCOCK COUNTY

Palmer C. Boothby	27,304
Chandler Ladner	20,574

Total payees in county (2) 47,873

HINDS COUNTY

Gaddis Farms Inc.	67,268
Gilkens Farms Inc.	59,900
B. H. Virden, Jr.	56,264
J. A. Tucker, Sr. Est. & J. A., Jr.	50,763
John Gill	49,787
C. C. Floyd	45,222
J. S., Sr., J. S., Jr. & R. C. Mellon	41,673
Gaddis & McLaurin Inc.	39,587
R. & B. Land Co.	32,765
Ward Carraway	29,649
Tom Virden	28,984
C. D. Noble	28,242
Robert Mashburn	27,693
Jimmy R. Mason	24,851
Harold Simmons	24,527
J. P. Stubbs	24,520
Ray R. Cannada	22,707
J. B. White	22,489
J. C. Logan	21,727
O. R. Harris	21,614
Charles G. Floyd	21,073
Jack W. Lilley	20,575
R. E. Floyd	20,386

Total payees in county
(23) 782,266

HOLMES COUNTY

W. J. Waits	58,590
E. W. Hooker	57,206
Paul Wilson	56,171
J. T. Thomas, III	55,447
J. P. Love	55,000
Byron B. Sharpe	55,000
J. E. Cunningham	55,000
Wayne Watkins	55,000
Jimmy Love	55,000
Pluto Planting Company	55,000
Stonewall Planting Company	55,000
H. L. Nichols, Jr.	54,996
Louie B. Nichols	54,996
S. J. Foose, Jr.	54,883
J. T. Thomas, Sr.	54,805
Bardin Reddett	52,612
Donald Parrish	52,024
R. T. Hardeman	51,454
J. E. Mathias	50,941
J. E. Hays	50,380
Thomas Farms, Inc.	50,229
R. L. Peaster Company	49,505
A. B. Archer, Jr.	47,404
J. A. Killebrew	47,322
Charley Wade	44,656
Bonanza Plantation	43,880
E. E. O'Reilly	41,055
Gum Grove Planting Co.	39,422
H. F. Flemming	39,203
Shotwell Plantation, Inc.	39,107
J. A. Barrett	34,380
J. E. Cunningham, Jr.	33,614
H. H. Howard	33,552
George D. Wynn	33,448
W. G. Gwin	33,442
James Killebrew	32,475
Paul F. McCain	30,473
Eden Farms Corp.	29,284
D. C. Conn	28,984
E. I. Harris	28,891
B. W. Humphrey, Jr.	28,861
Harris C. Humphrey	28,609
Posey Wideman	28,601
Frank Gwin, Jr.	28,444
James F. Jacks	28,287
D. S. Shuttleworth	28,256
C. R. Logan, Jr.	26,151
Frank A. Jones	25,972
J. R. Peaster, III	25,306
Margaret Peaster	25,298
Thomas G. Peaster	25,298
H. M. Brock	24,522
C. V. Maxwell and Son	24,056
T. C. Watkins	23,877
Glenn M. Brock	22,801
E. J. Hines & Son	21,944
R. K. O'Reilly	21,689
Kenneth Parrish	21,562
N. B. Parrish	21,416

D. C. Scott	21,146
T. R. Barrett	20,138

Total payees in county (61) 2,372,065

HUMPHREYS COUNTY

Spencer H. Barret	58,848
A. B. Jones, Jr.	58,553
O. B. Nerren	56,771
R. D. Hines	56,655
B. A. Holaday Company	56,356
O. J. Turner, III	56,123
S. U. Smith	55,883
B. W. Smith, Jr.	55,683
Wm. L. Dillard	55,651
B. A. Planting Co.	55,325
Cotton Delta, Inc.	55,272
B. W. Smith Planting Co.	55,236
C. B. Aycock, Jr.	55,110
R. D. Bearden	55,089
E. L. Parker	54,532
E. L. Nerren	54,307
B. J. Barrier III	54,291
T. M. Simmons, Jr.	53,684
Jones Planting Co.	53,252
B. A. Seward	52,654
Curtis F. Johnson	52,460
D. W. King	44,598
Homer Martin, Jr.	44,149
T. N. Turner Farms, Inc.	43,864
Gladstone B. Mortimer	42,489
Jack Reed	41,012
Auvergne Williams	40,011
R. P. Hairston	39,432
R. R. Roberts Est.	38,590
G. H. Hairston, Jr.	38,326
Powell Farms	38,227
Byrdie J. Faulkner	37,745
Richard D. Bearden, Jr.	37,363
J. M. Bearden	37,363
Irby Turner	37,359
O. M. Parker, Jr.	36,807
S. R. Pinson	36,558
James R. Walker, Jr.	36,427
D. G. Rutledge	35,130
T. J. Corley	34,680
R. Y. Wright	34,473
Blue Sack Ptn., Inc.	34,244
Robert Millwood	33,925
T. E. Fouche	33,493
W. Denon Braswell	32,406
Hollowell Bros.	32,240
M. D. Rodgers	32,043
Bill H. Rodgers	32,043
James S. Reed	31,666
J. D. Upshaw	31,632
S. W. Gardner	31,069
W. T. Turner	30,792
Randolph Martin	30,515
James G. Outlaw	30,462
Lone Star Ptn., Inc.	29,620
L. G. Shelton	29,001
W. A. Pearson	28,885
Stoner Farms	27,766
Carolyn R. Stevens	27,181
Wesley W. Hester	26,611
Tom Hill & Sons	26,047
Bill Sears	25,461
John H. Daniels, Jr.	25,443
Fred Champion	24,943
Del P. Lott, Jr.	24,743
W. A. McMorrough	24,532
Bill Parks	24,175
J. A. Bridges, Jr.	23,931
R. P. Ellis	23,753
Nettie B. Williams	23,639
Maurice T. Reed, Jr.	23,477
Mildred H. Reed	23,477
Agnes D. Reed	23,477
T. L. Reed III	23,477
Calvin Crawford	23,075
Hilton Crawford	23,075
Dave Bobbitt	22,681
Bob Bearden	22,066
W. H. Allen Estate	20,063

Total payees in county (39) 2,973,267

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Mississippi—Continued

ISSAQUENA COUNTY

W. T. Touchberry	56,853
Glenn Poole	55,124
Harper R. Myres	54,684
H. Marshall Herman, Jr.	54,684
O. J. Sharpe	50,316
W. W. Heigle & Son	49,913
James T. Mabus, Jr.	49,689
James T. Mabus	49,689
Ferrel Heigle	47,032
W. C. Woodruff	40,176
W. I. Robertson	38,637
Rudy Pitt	35,061
W. E. Fleeman, Jr.	28,217
Charles Leon Delaney	27,382
Esperanza Pitt	26,233
Harold D. Heigle	24,404
L. T. Wade	22,825
Florence A. Fleming	22,261

Total payees in county
(18) 733,180

ITAWAMBA COUNTY

Jimmy Pearce	22,593
--------------	--------

LAFAYETTE COUNTY

J. T. Smith	35,521
James S. Downs	27,375
D. H. Surrence	26,309
Donald A. Waller	23,707
Walker E. Downs	20,611

Total payees in county (5) 133,523

LAMAR COUNTY

Bass Pecan Co.	35,397
----------------	--------

LEAKE COUNTY

Glen Allen	46,864
Joseph W. Langford	45,542
John H. Evans	27,872
Jimmie D. Arthur	21,223

Total payees in county (4) 141,501

LEE COUNTY

H. R. Morgan	30,304
Earl N. Loftin	26,957
Wayne Griffin	23,538
Joe Bucy	20,920
Rex Harris	20,100

Total payees in county (5) 121,819

LEFLORE COUNTY

Race Track Plantation	58,166
Ed Hunter Steele	57,461
Ray Tribble	57,098
Jeff L. Cole	56,859
Whittington Planting Co., Inc.	56,515
Sturdivant & Bishop	56,472
L. W. Wade Farms, Inc.	56,386
W. P. Brown, Jr.	56,247
J. Wayne Bush	56,170
W. P. Brown III	56,125
D. E. Reynolds, Jr.	55,915
W. J. Roberson	55,833
Joe Pugh	55,593
Hobson Gary	55,513
M. C. Tillman	55,446
Miller Bush	55,187
Equen Planting Co., Inc.	54,999
Jack Shaw Farms, Inc.	54,854
Rufus Wier Farms, Inc.	54,854
R. C. Shaw	54,764
John D. Ashcraft, Jr.	54,764
J. P. Cole, Jr.	54,760
C. R. Benz	54,599
Donald W. McShan	54,599
Aven Whittington	53,895
W. M. Whittington	53,883
Dale Barham Bratton	53,305
Lake Henry Plantation	52,709
I. T. McIntyre III	52,565

F. J. Poindexter	51,480	W. H. Gillon, Jr.	23,580
B. G. McGeary	51,439	Don Corley	23,500
Elizabeth N. Barham	50,767	Rex Makamson	23,425
W. L. Craig	50,239	A. J. Wilson	23,425
L and H Farms, Inc.	50,089	P. M. Kimbrough	22,920
Albert R. King	48,442	Morris Johnson	22,813
Joseph S. King	48,442	Reese Makamson	22,686
Mallory C. Davis, Sr.	48,205	Jack Massey	22,544
Shoe String Plantation, Inc.	47,335	E. L. Gilliland	22,210
Julius E. Howard	47,132	Robert M. Morton	21,541
Wilford R. Webb	47,064	Robert W. Powell	21,536
C. L. Patridge	46,809	John Bariola	21,481
W. D. Simmons	45,593	C. J. Hammond	21,468
MBG Farms, Inc.	44,544	Melza Wilson	21,033
W. D. Bradford	44,459	John F. Bratton	20,898
Wingfield B. Jones	43,653	Cottonland Pltn., Inc.	20,598
Caralisa B. Pollard	43,649	Edgar B. Cannon	20,466
W. G. Somerville	43,284	David R. Gillon	20,374
Kathryn B. Pond	43,283	Rufus P. Stainback	20,374
Ed Jones Bledsoe	43,283	Homer T. Vining	20,369
W. H. Morgan	42,786	T. R. Hodges	20,366
W. H. Morgan, Jr.	42,786	James H. Simpson	20,361
Robert L. Pillow	42,351	Lem D. Mahoney	20,092
Hayward Jacks	42,221		
James Morgan, Jr.	41,944		
Hugh A. Warren III	41,379		
T. J. Carter	41,354		
Lock Eleven	41,329		
Mary W. Davenport	40,809		
Sam Balkin Trust Estate	40,224		
Walter Pillow III	40,148		
Hunter Chitton and Co., Inc.	39,809		
E. D. Strain, Jr.	39,143		
Derwood Strain	38,575		
Lakeview Plantation	38,405		
Fort Loring Plantation	38,186		
F. R. Morgan, Jr.	38,075		
BCS Corporation	37,606		
R. T. Wade	37,176		
F. T. Leavell	36,584		
A. V. Leavell	36,573		
F. L. Whittington	36,573		
Fred R. Metcalfe	34,968		
Carrie P. Avert & Jones	34,964		
Walter Walt	34,308		
L. W. Wade Planting Co.	34,057		
Leo Murphree	32,743		
D. C. Branham, Jr.	32,705		
H. B. Hawkins	32,299		
Frank H. Coleman	31,419		
Loyce Makamson	31,167		
Lamar Makamson	31,018		
John Ellis Williams, Jr.	31,012		
Est of J. M. McIntyre	30,998		
C. G. Nichols, Jr., est.	30,998		
Kenneth Creswell	30,877		
L. E. Rowland	30,287		
H. C. Pleasants	30,217		
James R. Kent	30,166		
Kimble Makamson	30,022		
James Stowers	29,980		
E. B. Smith, Jr.	29,908		
T. U. Black, Jr.	28,858		
Mickey E. Black	28,858		
Timothy Thimmes	28,856		
Kathryn Ryan	28,856		
W. P. Kimbrough, Jr.	28,735		
J. E. Gwin, Jr.	28,029		
Jesse Stockton	27,933		
W. R. Gee	27,933		
James D. Green	27,871		
H. Y. Fraiser, Jr.	27,695		
Betty Hughes Gwin	27,499		
Lenora M. Fraiser	27,393		
Lakeland Farms, Inc.	27,107		
August Lape	26,394		
Tom J. Gary	26,221		
Jane G. Coleman	26,208		
Memrie G. Wells	26,208		
Margaret S. Gary	26,208		
Rebecca Gary	26,208		
N. W. Carver, Jr.	26,206		
Watson Pillow	25,970		
Harold Coleman	25,530		
R. C. Colvin	25,482		
Clifton Bishop	25,176		
J. J. Walker	25,108		
L. L. Walker, Jr.	25,108		
Elizabeth G. Saunders	24,972		
Cecil M. Bolland	24,841		
W. C. Haynes	24,233		

Total payees in county
(143) 5,325,932

LINCOLN COUNTY

C. C. Clark	37,002
-------------	--------

LOWNDES COUNTY

James C. Richards	37,298
Gilmer Plantation	34,470
Leon Kesler	30,861
Saunders B. Carson	29,955
Virgil Hanson	26,216
Gene D. Holliman	26,128
E. L. Robinson	24,653
Tommy Spruill	20,762
B. E. Aldridge	20,537

Total payees in county
(9) 250,880

MADISON COUNTY

P. W. Boseman	59,299
Sim C. Dulaney	56,664
Dudley R. Bozeman	56,423
Ben H. Stribling	55,864
Billy McMullen	53,247
M. S. Cox, Jr.	52,238
J. D. Rankin	51,509
Mona G. Wells	51,199
E. D. Mansell	48,837
James Stewart	46,284
Charlie Williams	43,433
E. K. Bardin	41,652
Thomas L. James	41,356
James A. Cook	41,016
A. B. & W. Mansell	38,837
J. S. Harris, Jr.	35,762
Julius Edgar	35,377
J. R. Tate	35,152
A. W., Sr., Jr. & M. W. Hardy	34,850
W. S. Patrick	34,508
Henry M. Waldrop	34,115
Roy E. Tate	33,284
Billy Ray Stribling	28,825
Donald J. Powell	28,191
L. A. Millsaps, Jr.	26,811
New Paragon Gin Co.	25,546
G. H. Moore, Jr.	23,861
Ruby H. Moore	23,860
William L. Moore	23,859
Carl P. Murphy	21,407
Robert Endris	20,128

Total payees in county (31) 1,203,394

MARSHALL COUNTY

Johnny Taylor	50,293
L. E. Devore	49,327
J. M. Ash	44,331
Byron Hurdle	42,725
Jack McClatchy	41,217
Charles McClatchy	41,202
John L. Loftin	38,307
C. B. Robinson	33,773
Chester Hurdle	33,300
William S. Payne	32,285

Hugh McClatchy	32,179
Russell G. Houston	30,875
C. S. Hurdle	30,868
Everett Edlin	30,491
J. W. Cocke	30,136
Raymond Patrick	28,934
Jobe Whaley	28,411
Tom C. Lacey	27,728
Artie Edlin	24,903
Edgar Lee Bolden	24,870
John R. McDermott	24,581
Walter Allen	24,268
Hargis Hurdle	23,258
Janie C. Hurdle	22,163
Wayne Hurdle	21,824
Marvin StJohn	21,257
Guy K. Shaw	21,081
Tommy Woods	21,049
Lester Graham	20,629
Egbert Jones	20,016

Total payees in county (30) 916,281

MONROE COUNTY

Sid T. Sanders	51,369
Frank R. Millender	42,066
Fred Bell	36,381
Richard S. Cole	35,994
Thomas E. Millender	33,490
Dennis R. Self	33,421
Delmer Holloway	31,856
Fay Nevins	30,105
Carlos A. Thompson	22,633
Riley Dabbs	21,945
Lee H. Harrington	21,097
W. B. Watkins	21,035
Preston Tubb	20,506
M. V. Burks	20,206

Total payees in county (14) 422,104

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

James W. Latham	28,649
Sidney Branch	28,411
Melvin W. Kirk	23,060

Total payees in county (3) 80,120

NOKUBEE COUNTY

Harrison Evans	65,517
A. T. Evans	65,517
Ralph Spurgeon, Jr.	49,956
Valley Farm	42,948
Circle M Ranch, Inc.	42,251
A. B. Stevens, Jr.	34,105
Joseph D. Pugh	33,595
The Deerbrook Co.	30,871
Paula M. Roberston Estate	24,343

Total payees in county (9) 398,103

PANOLA COUNTY

W. S. Taylor, Jr.	57,313
Derryal Glen Gates	55,525
F. P. Lunceford Farms, Inc.	55,214
Robert McMillan	54,376
Hays Bros. & Hall	53,584
Crenshaw Bros, Inc.	43,695
Donald Bartlett	41,299
Whitworth Farms, Inc.	37,616
M. H. Sumner or C. N. Sumner	36,688
W. P. Lemaster	35,782
Lent E. Thomas, Jr.	35,209
Alton Milam	33,046
Estate of Fred Taylor, Sr.	31,857
Raymond Birdsong	31,359
Short Brothers	31,027
Maury R. Harris & Sons, Inc.	30,650
Evander Smith	30,483
David Ross Craig	29,451
A. C. Atkinson	27,795
James Montleth	27,512
Hosey White	27,000
Joe Reid	26,773
Dave Pointer	26,365
James W. Sorrells	25,604
Curtis McNemar	25,175
H. G. Short	23,913

Taylor Bros	23,652
Emily J. Pointer	23,231
Leon Crigler	23,057
E. C. Darby	21,328
Sanford McNemar	21,305
Otis Jenkins	20,796
G. W. Hudson	20,635

Total payees in county (33) 1,088,315

PERL RIVER COUNTY

Louis Carmadelle	38,000
William A. Powe	27,700
A. J. Jones	27,499
J. O. Ladner	26,780
La Row Investment Co.	22,501

Total payees in county (5) 142,480

PONTOTOC COUNTY

W. G. Hodges	32,848
--------------	--------

PRENTISS COUNTY

A. B. & B. C. Arnold	23,050
----------------------	--------

QUITMAN COUNTY

L. J. Barksdale	55,979
B. O. Tedford	55,330
E. Q. Vance, Jr.	55,299
Ben E. Pittman	55,000
C. W. Denton	52,473
Joe E. Benson	51,246
David Ford	50,439
John B. Ford	50,439
H. T. Pittman	50,377
A. L. King, Jr.	49,429
Arthur Fulmer	49,254
Fletcher S. Haynes	47,582
Thomas B. Barnes	46,274
T. C. Potts	46,216
W. K. Self	44,778
Mrs. Marjorie Self Crabil	44,778
Mrs. Evelyn S. Holcomb	44,778
Henry C. Self	44,778
Mrs. Miriam S. Blalock	44,778
Mrs. Mary T. Burroughs	43,918
Clifford Cobb, Jr.	41,769
Richard Shellman	41,611
E. H. Anderson	40,702
Cotton Dixie, Inc.	40,433
B. W. Wadlington, Jr.	39,907
Ben S. Yandell	39,752
W. M. Yandell, Jr.	39,752
Noel Wilborn	38,937
Clifton Planting Co.	38,360
Shannon Planting Co.	37,747
F. Raynor Starr	37,176
Thomas A. Harris	37,155
James A. Tedford	36,963
Michael G. Harris	36,907
T. C. Haley	36,573
F. R. Wright, Jr.	36,464
Miss Penitentiary Board	35,853
R. A. Carson	33,439
James D. Peterson, Jr.	33,037
W. W. Hughes, Jr.	32,280
John M. Moyer	32,153
C. B. Sigler	31,258
Gerald W. Tedford	30,804
Perry Bailey	30,617
Longstreet Pltg. Co.	30,276
B. H. Cobb	30,003
Crenshaw Planting Co., Inc.	29,797
James A. Jackson	29,701
Hubert Haynes	29,472
Cuatro Corporation	28,671
H. W. Howze, Jr.	28,529
Smith Planting Company	28,217
Paul Malatesta	28,165
S. P. Henry	27,684
Ottis F. Meredith	27,588
F. R. Trainor	27,013
Mrs. Linda V. Henry	26,890
J. E. Furr, Jr.	26,558
I. L. Henry	26,355
Gordon Farms	25,845
Ed Benson	25,620
Herbert R. Wilson	25,534
E. B. Smith	25,360

Hubert L. Respes	25,135
F. R. Starr	24,717
Mrs. Lillian G. Carson	23,004
Norris W. Faust	22,486
T. S. Hale, Jr.	22,188
V. A. Furr, Jr.	21,933
O. A. Davis, Jr.	21,353
Victor Bailey	21,100
L. J. Kerr, Jr.	20,999
N. H. Sutton	20,790
Mark N. Ham	20,694
Mrs. Josie Starr	20,136
James G. Harris	20,134
J. K. Pearson, Jr.	20,052

Total payees in county (77) 2,694,793

RANKIN COUNTY

J. W. Patrick, Jr.	32,993
J. B. Williamson	32,780
Paul Cross	32,441
F. C. Lawrence	31,255
John R. Chaffin	30,195
Ray Gordon	20,417
J. D. McKay	20,315

Total payees in county (7) 200,396

SCOTT COUNTY

Dan R. Boyce	53,188
--------------	--------

SHARKEY COUNTY

Powers Company, Inc.	60,557
Fields Planting Corporation	59,303
Evanna Plantation, Inc.	58,622
Helena Pltn, Inc.	58,007
Lynndale Planting Co., Inc.	57,726
Murphy Jones	57,233
G. C. Cortright	56,665
Baconia Plantation, Inc.	56,570
James A. Boykin	55,788
Thomas Bruton	55,711
Reality Plantation, Inc.	55,554
Hagan Farms, Inc.	55,440
B. H. McGee	54,217
Burrell McGee	54,217
June F. Grundfest	53,084
Norris E. Hill	52,405
J. H. Hill, Jr.	52,405
Hiram W. Hill	52,405
J. H. Hill, Sr.	52,405
Estate of Capitola M. Dean	49,152
Greer, Incorporated	48,740
Keyho, Inc.	46,670
W. W. Moore	45,362
J. H. Moore	45,362
Council Bend, Inc.	45,320
Darden Company, Inc.	43,659
W. R. Rodgers	42,027
Ben Lamensdorf	38,255
Jones Plantation, Inc.	37,592
W. E. Patterson, Jr.	36,894
Charles Kline	36,703
Patton Planting Co.	35,996
W. H. Hoonett	35,736
M. J. J., Inc.	35,663
H. W. Hubbard	35,643
James Hand, Jr.	35,093
Rives C. Carter	35,092
Mary V. Watson	35,093
Jere B. Nash, Jr.	35,093
Jere B. Nash	35,093
James Hand III	35,093
Robert H. Moses	33,166
W. A. Chase	32,199
Raymond Brown	32,078
J. M. Brown	32,078
A. B. Williams, Jr.	31,918
Grosvenor Farms, Inc.	31,707
Geraldine R. Dean	31,277
Pat R. Dunaway	31,089
Mabel D. Whitfield	30,415
T. W. Harris	29,277
Capitola D. Edmondson	28,685
Miriam D. Heard	28,685
McKinney and Son	28,562
Clinkscales Bros.	28,334
Martin Planting Co. Inc.	28,230
James R. Carter	27,827
Laurence W. Carter	27,819

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Mississippi—Continued

Wallace Carter, Jr.	27,819
S. W. Bennett	27,402
Catherine O. West	26,809
Carol D. Sterling Estate	26,809
A. B. Williams	26,771
M. C. Ewing, Jr.	25,861
W. T. Ewing	25,852
Benard O. Lovorn	25,371
Carl Dunaway, Inc.	25,330
James Charles Askew	23,762
Sojamax, Inc.	23,527
G. M. Baggett	23,228
Charles Huff	20,120

Total payees in county (71) 2,769,653

STONE COUNTY

H. H. Batson	24,395
O. B. Brown	20,802

Total payees in county (2) 45,197

SUNFLOWER COUNTY

Parchman Farms	75,221
Duncan Farms, Inc.	63,932
H. T. Bonds	57,296
A. K. Maxwell	56,837
Dick Barrett	56,515
William M. Pitts	56,336
T. A. Murtagh	56,257
Kansas Plantation, Inc.	56,187
Garrard Est.	56,067
Allen & Brashier Pltg. Co.	55,794
Kelly R. Mahan	55,719
Joseph A. Oglesby, Jr.	55,677
N. H. McMath	55,644
W. T. Skelton	55,250
W. E. Austin	55,184
Frank T. Brumfield	55,144
Bruce Brumfield	55,143
Edwin L. Parker III	55,143
J. C. Allen, Jr.	55,000
Rodgers Brashier	55,000
Thomas J. Mahan	54,997
C. W. Barrett	54,993
Pauline V. Adair	54,991
George J. Rice	54,966
Millard P. Austin	54,962
George A. Rice	54,919
Harris Russell	54,847
P. H. B., Inc.	54,846
H. M. Arant	54,790
Leslie R. Fletcher	54,772
W. B. Fletcher, Jr.	54,772
J. B. Falling	54,646
Brewer Morgan	54,508
F. L. Tindall	54,402
Maury McIntyre, Jr.	54,388
Lipe Farms, Inc.	54,284
Philip Fratesi	54,145
J. H. Hall	53,876
H. T. Miller, Pltg. Co., Inc.	53,674
David Keith	53,566
Parker Planting Co.	53,266
Richard Cummins	53,206
F. T. Clark	52,475
F. E. Mitchell	51,675
B. R. Ammons	51,511
George C. Scroggins	51,451
Calvin W. Montgomery	51,426
J. M. Montgomery, Jr.	51,426
H. P. Watson	51,348
W. H. Baird	51,103
Doddsville Farms, Inc.	50,846
Douglas Mallette	50,594
S. B. Johnson	50,529
John J. Hall, Jr.	50,504
J. G. Prichard	50,144
W. L. Prichard	50,144
Billy Brewer	49,307
Jessie Russell	49,299
Hugh G. Fisher	49,205
Will Green Poindexter	49,095
Scott Poindexter	49,095
Jim Muzzi	48,849
J. P. Fisher, S.	48,720

J. C. Robertson	48,707	Allen Fox	30,902
W. T. Robertson	48,707	R. L. Shurden	30,835
Leroy Anthony	48,526	C. R. Skelton	30,760
Black Bayou Pltn, Inc.	47,878	J. P. Barbour II	30,560
Max A. Hodges	47,868	Gorden Dement	30,443
J. A. Ely, Jr.	47,683	Powell Poe	30,331
George L. Evans	47,230	H. C. Eastland	30,130
Ted J. Stingley	46,707	A. W. Shurden	29,654
Dyche Plantation, Inc.	46,246	Howard L. Gritman, Jr.	29,329
Lucy B. Hill	46,042	James E. Reed	29,314
B'ue Lake, Inc.	45,907	James L. Beckham	29,198
John Brewer Reed	45,629	P. C. Nichols	28,782
W. O. Shurden, Inc.	45,405	Spann Robertson	28,782
L. K. Johnson	45,068	M. A. Tanksley, Jr.	28,736
W. A. Price, Jr.	44,087	W. J. Toler	28,708
Sidney Shurden	43,630	Fred V. Jones	28,688
John Dodd	43,529	W. E. Wright	28,611
W. C. Lester	43,086	W. B. Lovett	28,374
M. Pickett Myers III	42,962	Carl M. Prewitt	28,219
W. E. Jefcoat	42,871	M. G. Walker	27,975
J. S. Parker, Jr.	42,825	W. E. Lamastus, Jr.	27,814
C. H. McClatchy	42,644	Nannie S. Parks est.	27,623
J. B. Baird	42,433	Ted Borodofsky	27,492
Ethel Lyon	42,229	Edward M. Lyon	27,413
R. M. McClatchy	42,131	A. C. Tidmore, Sr.	27,293
Carl T. Harkins	41,820	W. D. Baird	27,180
E. E. Shurden	41,677	Thomas B. Givens	26,327
Charles E. Clark	41,676	J. W. Baker	25,982
Thomas J. Baird	41,583	David Woods	25,840
H. W. King	41,570	J. R. Martin	25,460
George E. Baird, Jr.	41,563	David E. Roberts	25,232
Sidney Livingston	41,504	C. B. Fisackerly	25,130
Herman Guest	41,457	Norman Pentecost	25,116
Sylvia L. Sklar	41,434	D. R. Mallette	24,779
Alfred A. Livingston	41,425	J. B. Lee	24,750
L. A. Davidson	40,298	A. E. B. Britt	24,494
R. K. Clark	39,503	R. J. Vanlandingham	24,403
Noel Barrett	39,408	B. N. Marlow est.	24,252
Jack Griffith	39,108	Hubert Robertson	24,115
J. D. Pennebaker	38,971	Virgil E. Redd	23,918
James O. Eastland	38,646	T. E. Cooper	23,716
W. D. Marlow III & Son	38,292	B. L. Kirk	23,608
L. E. Braswell	38,138	Buckshot Pltn. Co., Inc.	23,254
Ophelia Braswell	38,127	E. A. Stansel, Jr.	23,179
W. T. Timbs, Jr.	38,080	V. A. Johnson	22,941
Alleta B. Sanders	37,927	Charles E. Boyer, Jr.	22,051
G. C. Billups, Jr.	37,927	W. C. Hendon	22,023
Grace R. Billups	37,927	J. B. Sykes, Jr.	21,964
Irene Billups	37,927	Sheffield Farms	21,940
C. A. McGregor	37,916	H. I. Clark	21,907
Maxwell Murtagh Farms Inc.	37,876	Eldon Crow	21,905
Fletcher Clark	37,676	J. O. & H. C. Eastland, Inc.	21,465
J. W. Stowers & Co.	36,991	Stacy & Baughman	21,196
Hugh Medders	36,891	Albert R. Holeman	21,195
B & L Farm Inc.	36,838	Earl W. Pittman	21,187
Dar Bayou Pltg. Co.	36,260	James Simpson	21,057
V. E. Lester	36,052	William L. Ervin	20,988
C. F. McGraw	35,963	A. E. Moody	20,811
W. E. Coleman and Son	35,829	Odell Mustain	20,798
L. D. McCoy, Jr.	35,780	Ellwood S. Bright	20,620
Lakewood Inc.	35,693	W. J. Jones	20,611
Robert Doty Mallette	35,651	Robert C. Pratt	20,521
Louis Millen	35,596	Susan E. Terney	20,292
J. T. McGregor	35,483	Tommy Ellis	20,234
James Bradshaw	35,320	John Burrell	20,216
G. B. Hitt	35,050	Roy Boone	20,178
Roberts Brothers	34,758	J. R. Stinson	20,040
W. D. Patterson	34,718		
W. D. Patterson, Jr.	34,708	Total payees in county (221)	8,915,227
E. Leonard Patterson	34,708		
J. R. Dockery	34,679		
Goose Hollow Pltg. Co.	34,558		
Berryhill Bros. Pltg. Co., Inc.	34,433		
L. D. Booth	34,380		
McWilliams & Pylon	34,113		
Bobby Clark	34,000		
J. C. Haney	33,762		
Ciro Noble	33,585		
Lake O. Lindsey	33,429		
Glenn McCoy	33,364		
A. E. Schuyler	33,086		
L. A. Saffey	32,577		
David S. Allen, Jr.	32,478		
R. J. Allen, Jr.	32,478		
U. D. Parker, Jr.	31,865		
Roy Manning, Jr.	31,697		
Sterling Dugger	31,692		
C. T. Ellis	31,692		
Ruth B. Jefcoat	30,948		
Topanga Farms, Inc.	30,948		
George W. Bowles	30,939		
Allen Fox			
R. L. Shurden			
C. R. Skelton			
J. P. Barbour II			
Gorden Dement			
Powell Poe			
H. C. Eastland			
A. W. Shurden			
Howard L. Gritman, Jr.			
James E. Reed			
James L. Beckham			
P. C. Nichols			
Spann Robertson			
M. A. Tanksley, Jr.			
W. J. Toler			
Fred V. Jones			
W. E. Wright			
W. B. Lovett			
Carl M. Prewitt			
M. G. Walker			
W. E. Lamastus, Jr.			
Nannie S. Parks est.			
Ted Borodofsky			
Edward M. Lyon			
A. C. Tidmore, Sr.			
W. D. Baird			
Thomas B. Givens			
J. W. Baker			
David Woods			
J. R. Martin			
David E. Roberts			
C. B. Fisackerly			
Norman Pentecost			
D. R. Mallette			
J. B. Lee			
A. E. B. Britt			
R. J. Vanlandingham			
B. N. Marlow est.			
Hubert Robertson			
Virgil E. Redd			
T. E. Cooper			
B. L. Kirk			
Buckshot Pltn. Co., Inc.			
E. A. Stansel, Jr.			
V. A. Johnson			
Charles E. Boyer, Jr.			
W. C. Hendon			
J. B. Sykes, Jr.			
Sheffield Farms			
H. I. Clark			
Eldon Crow			
J. O. & H. C. Eastland, Inc.			
Stacy & Baughman			
Albert R. Holeman			
Earl W. Pittman			
James Simpson			
William L. Ervin			
A. E. Moody			
Odell Mustain			
Ellwood S. Bright			
W. J. Jones			
Robert C. Pratt			
Susan E. Terney			
Tommy Ellis			
John Burrell			
Roy Boone			
J. R. Stinson			
Mike P. Sturdivant Pltn., Inc.			
Martha B. Lowe			
S. M. Fewell & Co.			
Benford Brown			
Triple M Planting Co.			
E. D. Graham			
A. A. Mabus			
R. W. Mabry			
Murphey & Hardy, Inc.			
Friendship Road, Inc.			
Mitchener Farms, Inc.			
M. T. Hardy			
Twilight Plt. Co.			
Billy G. Flautt			
Jack G. Flautt			
Frierson, Inc.			
Frances, Inc.			
Marjorie, Inc.			

TALLAHATCHIE COUNTY

G. B. Williams	53,693
Billy Joe Waldrup	53,011
T. B. Abbey Jr. & Co.	52,950
R. Jones Fedric	52,769
E. C. Fedric	52,769
Phil Thornton, Jr.	52,323
Phil Thornton III	52,323
J. C. Wilbourn	51,880
J. B. Baker, Jr.	51,680
Dry Bayou Planting Co.	51,415
Elizabeth Falls Munro	50,603
Joann F. Schmeisser	50,603
Elizabeth G. Falls	50,603
William A. Falls	50,603
Frank & Dorothy Sturdivant	50,103
Gene T. Fleming	49,830
Shoestrong, Inc.	49,410
Richard E. Magee	49,393
James E. Magee	49,393
Hubert H. Magee	49,393
J. H. Magee	49,393
Boggy, Inc.	49,110
T. C. Buford	48,111
Mike Fortenberry	46,863
Bill James	46,503
M. S. Dale	45,695
Melton Brothers	44,874
W. D. Newton	44,835
Marion S. Dunn	44,663
W. W. Pearson	44,663
Ralph T. Hand, Jr.	43,956
John W. Sherman	43,791
J. L. Hill, Jr.	43,561
M. L. McMillan	43,209
D. A. Tubbs	42,234
Greenfield Pltg. Co.	41,030
Murphey Plantation	40,434
Paul Melton	38,105
William Tribble	37,848
C. S. Rankin	37,748
Glendora, Inc.	37,493
B. & S. Planting Co., Inc.	37,299
Wesley Wolfe	36,646
B. A. Marley	36,505
J. C. Hardy	36,378
Herbert Rice	35,266
Steve Worley	34,232
W. A. Worsham	34,103
R. E. Seawright	33,754
J. J. Webb, Jr.	33,604
Billy Heath	33,080
Bailey Brake Farm	33,043
Ray Roberson Farm, Inc.	32,407
Casburn Brothers	32,125
Don Allison	31,698
Margaret M. Norman	30,758
Sunset, Inc.	30,322
Bilbo Pennington	29,379
Joe T. Wolfe	28,107
Turner Brothers	26,803
G. C. Trout	26,398
Frank Sayle	26,052
Mikoma Farms, Inc.	25,942
J. A. Townes	25,786
Jim Pennington	25,691
David B. Sayle	25,452
Davis Bros	24,602
W. C. Vinson	24,436
Bend Plantation	24,412
Webb and Webb	23,903
Jerry James	23,896
William Cox	23,745
J. W. Fennell	23,260
Frank B. Swearingen	22,864
Maggie W. McLellan	22,845
Mikoma Grain, Inc.	22,324
Ernest Brasher, Jr.	21,856
J. L. Hill III	21,781
Linda P. Hill	21,781
Ellett Sandifer Farms	21,593
William H. Morrow	21,382
Tom Rice	21,263
James H. Morrow	20,652
A. O. Chatham	20,230
Strider Bros	20,028

Total payees in county
(103) 4,148,614

TATE COUNTY	
A. L. Brady	57,017
Jim Presley	49,273
M. P. Moore	46,165
J. C. Sides, Sr.	43,359
Harry B. House	41,713
E. E. Moore	41,507
J. V. Moore	32,340
Tom Wilson	28,602
R. G. Rosenborough, Sr., Est.	28,320
T. P. Veazey III	27,838
Thomas E. Smith, Jr.	27,088
James C. Rhodes	25,060
David B. Tyer	23,248
H. S. Mabry	21,678
William R. Moore	21,392
Robert P. Thompson	21,243
Louise M. McKellar	20,998
I. F. Hyde	20,625
Cecil Howell	20,299

Total payees in county (19) 597,765

TIPPAH COUNTY	
Marlin Childs	24,205
Hines Graves	24,029
Bonnie Mauney	22,577

Total payees in county (3) 70,811

TISHOMINGO COUNTY	
Scottie E. Dean	24,691
Charles Hammock	21,794

Total payees in county (2) 46,485

TUNICA COUNTY	
Arnold Farms, Inc.	64,683
S. A. Arnold, Jr.	62,152
D. C. Parker	62,067
Indian Creek Planting Co.	61,811
McClintock Farms, Inc.	59,783
Sterling W. Owen III	59,556
Will W. Owen	59,554
John W. Owen	59,537
Oaklawn Plantation, Inc.	59,471
S. C. Wilson & Son	58,121
C. H. Block & Co.	56,876
Bibb Inc.	56,436
M. L. Earnheart Co., Inc.	56,222
Abbey and Leatherman, Inc.	55,865
Irwin Company Inc.	55,411
Hood Farms Inc.	55,225
Robinsonville Seed Co., Inc.	55,210
Farmers & Pl. Gin Co., Inc.	55,210
Mhoon, Inc.	55,210
Hollywood Farms, Inc.	55,000
T. O. Earnheart Co., Inc.	53,079
Austin Brothers	50,373
James Byrd	50,146
B. R. Smith	49,427
Jerry Estopy	47,853
A. S. Perry & Sons, Inc.	46,539
Richard Hussey	46,400
Richard Watson	46,147
Youngblood Company	45,034
Whiteoak Farms, Inc.	44,020
Clinton P. Owen	43,496
S. R. Leatherman, Sr.	43,207
W. A. Leatherman	43,207
Pbl. Co., Inc.	43,026
Lloyd E. Ryals	42,867
C. Buck Graves	42,819
C. P. Owen, Jr.	42,771
Anthony Ray May	42,003
Harvey Richard Watson	39,571
R. I. Abbay	39,569
Alterra Planting Company	38,774
Clyde J. Perry	37,777
John Canon	37,130
Bonnie Blue Plant, Inc.	37,029
Johnson & Frank	35,157
James D. Boyd	34,703
Francis C. Boyd	34,703
M. H. Harris	33,073
A. C. Caperton	31,903
Jack W. Perry & Co., Inc.	31,896

Carl C. May	30,999
William Godbold	30,725
Wayne McDonald	28,985
A. T. Earnheart	28,714
Mary S. Leatherman	28,375
S. W. Seabrook	28,375
Hansom A. Myers	28,156
Milton Boyd	27,245
Ram Farms, Inc.	26,853
James Pegram	26,610
B. M. Martin, Jr.	26,168
Thomas E. Swindoll	26,076
R. C. Smith	25,719
E. J. Lake, Inc.	24,333
Edgar Hood, III	24,232
A. M. Dye	23,573
W. D. Garrett, Jr.	23,555
Iles Company	23,430
D. R. Houpt	22,915
Roger Johnson	22,764
J. E. Sides & Son, Inc.	22,311
Norfleet Land Corp.	22,233
Joe Watson	22,160
W. C. Bynum	21,861
Pea Patch Plantation, Inc.	21,559
Two Sisters Plant.	20,685
Walter D. Wills, Jr.	20,452
Billy Pegram	20,289
W. H. Houston, Jr.	20,278

Total payees in county
(79) 3,136,729

UNION COUNTY	
Hugh Stephens	31,078
Carl Stephens	27,894
Edgar J. Stephens, Jr.	27,264
Est. T. F. McAllister	22,320
B. W. Long	22,084
L. H. Pannell	20,333
Paul D. Kitchens	20,107

Total payees in county (7) 171,080

WARREN COUNTY	
Martin Lombard Burns	56,584
W. H. Johnson	54,394
Bernard Aden	54,254
Louis Aden	54,254
Jeryl T. Johnson	53,828
B. N. Simrall and Son, Inc.	43,917
H. A. Downey, Jr.	42,350
Ferris Farms, Inc.	26,699
Newell Simrall III	26,214
Crosby S. Simmons	24,822
E. R. McKnight	23,365

Total payees in county (11) 460,681

WASHINGTON COUNTY	
H. K. Hammett and Sons	60,998
Emmett T. Potter, Jr.	60,494
Neff Farms, Inc.	58,139
Torrey Wood and Son	57,625
Edward Shackelford	56,729
Walker Farms, Inc.	56,184
M. H. Rich, Jr.	56,062
Trall Lake Planting Co.	55,980
Klondike Plant Co.	55,844
Glen Crowe	55,617
F. R. Owens, Jr.	55,495
John C. and Donny Hendon	55,490
William A. Percy II	55,476
F. C. Crowe	55,463
Gordon Crowe	55,463
Donald Crowe	55,463
John Hendon	55,388
Harry M. Key	55,350
Ben Walker, Jr.	55,231
J. Pete Fisher, Jr.	55,133
Edward P. Vleh	55,093
Arcola Plantation, Inc.	55,011
Barton Ingram	55,000
R. A. Ingram	55,000
Stevens Brothers	55,000
Leota Farms, Inc.	54,957
Cope and Neff	54,917

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Mississippi—Continued

Oak Grove Farms, Inc.	54,912
Jimmy L. Marquis	54,790
Robert Word	54,790
F. L. Grede, Jr.	54,499
Randolph Smythe	54,328
Dan L. Smythe	54,058
Don O. Baker	53,787
E. J. Ganier	53,711
Reggie C. Kellems	53,361
Frank Rochelle	52,806
Alex Curtis	52,607
Dennis K. Potter	52,149
Jack A. Potter, Est.	52,149
Julian F. Potter	52,149
V. L. & L. A. Nunnery	51,689
James E. Mosley	51,451
Robert F. Percy	51,448
Leroy P. Percy, Jr.	51,442
E. A. Currey, Jr.	51,218
B. J. Sykes	51,023
Joseph Maurice Brown	50,717
J. P. Wilkerson	50,484
E. E. Cooper	50,473
Wright Planting Co., Inc.	50,472
Raymond Clark	50,118
Cameron Dean	50,065
Edward Blowers	49,868
William Johnston	49,868
Steve Brown	49,868
E. A. Lafoe, Jr.	49,520
W. E. Taylor	49,501
C. A. Tate, Jr.	49,332
James A. Petty	49,074
Rex Livingston	49,030
Ray F. Beckham	48,602
David B. Flanagan	48,498
A. G. Mahalite	47,216
Chester Kellems	46,791
D. K. Morrow	46,701
Keith Mitchell	46,634
C. D. Verner	45,422
John M. Dean	44,902
Elmo Gerald	44,863
Robbie Reed	44,559
John T. Dillard	44,559
Ross Underwood	44,464
Eli James Ganier, Jr.	44,386
G. B. Ganier	44,386
J. C. Reed	44,267
T. W. Hays	43,942
John W. Potter	43,804
Randy Journeay	43,454
Rodney D. Reed	43,454
Henry A. Reed	43,454
Gus Peralisi	43,009
Refuge Pltn	42,072
O. R. Horton	41,903
Deer Creek Frms	40,520
C. O. Dean, Jr.	39,700
Four C Land Co. Gordon Crowe	39,666
T. R. Pittman	39,623
D. and W. Jones Inc.	39,532
D. and S. Plant Co. Inc.	39,048
Harvey C. Watson	38,977
Henry Paris	38,977
W. G. Trotter and Son	38,891
W. W. Trotter	38,891
Southern Ornage & Const. Co.	38,785
Thomas A. Hollingsworth	38,722
Hampton Collier	38,580
David T. Cochran	38,408
H. T. Cochran	38,408
Richard W. Kellems	37,637
Stylon Proctor	37,628
Floyd Wayne Reed	37,345
Delta Experiment Station	37,255
Leo P. Williams, Sr.	37,211
Leo P. Williams, Jr.	37,199
Jane W. Simmons	37,199
James Middleton	37,155
Winston Walker	36,658
Deerfield Farms Co.	36,422
Murry M. Alexander	36,355
Leo E. Frankel	36,209
Fredrick J. Smythe	36,029
Max Phillips	35,594

Peggy Baker Cannada	35,238
Tony and Larry Fratesi	35,204
E. W. Stone	34,889
W. B. Andrews	34,859
A. L. Andrews	34,803
Percy L. Bell	34,594
Andrew W. Bell	34,594
J. R. Shaw	34,573
Hollywood Pltn	34,485
William J. Ireland	34,437
R. D. Fisher	33,448
George W. Stone	33,164
Henry Hemphill	32,755
Guido Palasini	32,143
Louis F. Fratesi	31,693
Fred Ballard	31,647
R. M. Pritchett	31,477
Edward Trotter	31,181
Laverne Hyer	30,432
William E. Avis	30,348
Kirk Pltn	30,262
R. A. Montgomery	30,135
Homer Jones	29,776
V. L. Sandifer	29,741
C. Allen Spragins	29,545
E. W. Nerren	29,230
G. G. & G. W. McCool	28,678
J. E. Bratton	28,657
Marlowe R. Park	28,505
Jessie McDonald	28,493
James Cornellus	28,327
John Stephens	27,891
Don R. Baker	27,591
Camille M. Baker	27,591
George F. Stock	27,444
Harley Metcalfe, Jr.	26,949
W. T. Weathers	26,949
W. O. Hester	26,752
Perrin Grissom	26,390
W. C. Skates, Sr.	25,434
W. C. Skates, Jr.	25,434
Howard New	25,348
Clyde V. Gault	25,074
Foch Barnes	24,783
Marvin Jennings	24,729
H. W. Branton	24,652
Dan T. Branton	24,652
W. A. Dunaway	24,159
Lawrence W. Dunaway	24,159
R. N. Aldridge, Jr.	24,009
John Adam Aldridge	24,009
Marguerite Aldridge	24,009
Collier Pltn	23,898
Chester P. Smith	23,862
James W. Kiker	23,811
Jerry B. Miller	23,731
Est. Mrs. Eloise W. Kretschmar	23,701
E. E. Griffith	23,547
Elizabeth Jeffreys	23,187
Cecil Wingfield	22,803
Bob Dennis	22,684
B. R. Harris	22,487
J. A. Harris	22,487
Malvina Pltn Inc.	22,317
Chalmers E. Hobart	22,308
Gene Clements	22,181
Marcus Treadway	22,071
Lando and Charlie E. Fratesi	21,664
J. A. Oglesby	21,516
Mike W. McLaurin	21,185
Joseph L. McLaurin	21,185
Mrs. R. S. Doolittle and Sons	21,080
Jack Middleton	20,996
Charlie L. Fratesi	20,798
John Allen Collier	20,700

Total payees in county
(188) 7,442,850

WEBSTER COUNTY

Carter K. Edmondson	39,400
C. C. Hemphill	33,120
Y. B. Gore	25,901
W. R. O'Neal	23,463
Harold Fennell Dorroh	22,892

Total payees in county
(5) 144,776

WINSTON COUNTY

James T. Estes	21,713
----------------	--------

YALOBUSHA COUNTY

J. R. Magee	47,014
S. C. & E. Corporation	45,741
John N. Covington, Jr.	43,279
W. C. Hall	39,814
Joe N. Bailey, Jr.	38,706
H. H. White	37,593
A. R. Ingram	22,950
Edward F. Wooten	22,698
Robert Hatchet Williams	21,126
Charlie M. Shaw	20,535

Total payees in county
(10) 339,456

YAZOO COUNTY

H. S. Swayze	58,485
Kinthead Plantation	56,749
E. T. Schaefer	55,772
D. H. Dew, Sr.	55,177
Sam E. Dixon, Jr.	54,993
Bulford Atkinson	54,857
John J. Peaster	54,654
R. E. Coker	54,291
W. T. Clark, Jr.	53,904
James E. Coleman, Inc.	53,533
Eldorado Planting Co.	52,116
R. B. Harris	52,003
J. J. Erickson, Jr.	50,778
David C. Erickson	50,778
Jerry B. Barrier	49,338
D. H. Dew, Jr.	46,976
John S. Howie	45,039
Barrier Farms, Inc.	42,211
Morrison Farms, Inc.	41,251
L. M. Phillips	39,752
H. T. Barrier, Jr.	39,720
Clayton Swayze II	39,715
S. C. Coleman	39,103
Delta Company	38,411
Quiet Shades Plantation, Inc.	37,786
R. E. Coleman	37,768
D. H. Shipp	37,216
J. N. Hart	36,841
H. T. Barrier	36,726
William Barbour	35,806
J. V. Whitaker	34,612
Johnson Farms, Inc.	34,164
E. R. Seward	33,579
A. S. Nichols	33,443
Thomas R. Stricklin	32,003
T. R. Coleman	31,883
W. T. Hegman, Jr.	31,568
Cedar Grove Plantation	31,489
Norway Plantation, Inc.	31,292
Ruby Walker	30,557
Sam S. Fisher, Jr.	30,031
E. E. Ables	29,729
Burdette Boyd	29,267
Mary Russell Seward	29,014
B. R. Seward	29,008
Martin Farms, Inc.	28,640
James L. Dixon	28,593
F. W. Sharbrough	28,288
Hogue & Hogue	28,185
Leon W. Rice	27,569
H. R. Crowder, Jr.	27,316
Jack F. Phillips	27,142
R. M. Bridgforth & Sons	26,921
Robert H. Cato	26,480
W. R. Coleman	26,180
R. D. Herren	26,097
Ray Scroggins	25,697
W. F. Cresswell	25,619
Barney Ray Scroggins	25,220
John Raymond Scroggins	25,220
H. D. Hicks	25,035
B. A. Jordan	24,778
E. T. Jordan, Jr.	24,778
Charles A. Jordan	24,778
E. T. Jordan, Sr.	24,778
John W. Jordan	24,778
Hamel Farms, Inc.	24,048
Travis Fouche	24,030
E. E. Nixon, Jr.	23,548

H. E. Watson	23,072
C. H. Vaughan	21,859
C. Q. Clark	21,647
H. C. Stricklin	21,612
James H. Moore	21,205
Louise B. Dixon	21,138
J. L. Dixon	20,962
Frank Carter	20,944
Charles Ables	20,546
Sam E. Dixon	20,504
H. R. Crowder, Sr.	20,363
Nolan H. O'Reilly	20,249
M. E. Kelly	20,196
Kirkland, Inc.	20,161
Roy L. Plunkett, Jr.	20,034

Total payees in county
(84) 2,811,688

Total payees in State
(1,835) 68,584,783

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Missouri

ATCHISON COUNTY	
Donald Wolf or Orville Wolf	27,981
Charles C. Martin	23,526
Scamman and Co.	20,533

Total payees in county (3) 72,040

BOONE COUNTY	
Dorsey M. Bass	23,098

BUCHANAN COUNTY	
Sonnenmoser Bros.	22,088

BUTLER COUNTY	
Roy Nail	21,620

CARROLL COUNTY	
Famuliner Brothers	28,408
D. N. M. Grain Co.	26,287
R. E. Wiese Farms, Inc.	23,602

Total payees in county (3) 78,297

CHARITON COUNTY	
Quinn Bros.	60,654

DUNKLIN COUNTY	
M. C. Collins	32,599
Harris Farms, Inc.	30,784
J. F. Baker	28,657
Albert Hall	28,056
V. M. Jones, Sr.	27,853
Bond Rouse	24,666
H. W. Droke	23,821
Hart Gin Co.	23,297
F. L. Bynum	22,532
Audie Grisham	22,427
Matthews Agency Account	22,141
Loyd Robertson	21,769
Charles Pelts	21,573
Thomas Wilkins	20,354

Total payees in county
(14) 350,529

HOLT COUNTY	
Patterson Farms, Inc.	55,000
Donald E. Morris	36,471
Welton Ideker	22,987
Jack Windle	22,230

Total payees in county (4) 136,688

HOWARD COUNTY	
Roy J. Davis	30,569

JACKSON COUNTY	
RLDS Church	50,148
Effertz Bros., Inc.	24,513

Total payees in county (2) 74,661

KNOX COUNTY	
Frances McSorley	21,082

LEWIS COUNTY	
Ben Casebier, Jr.	26,067

LINN COUNTY	
Roy B. Quinn	21,131

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY	
Marshall Lands, Inc.	61,513
Dearmont Oliver	53,545
Wolf Island Farms	43,769
Bryant Farms, Inc.	42,555
Burke Bros. & Giltz, Inc.	41,803
H. & D. Duenne Farms	38,251
Big Oak Farms	37,787
Choate Farms, Inc.	30,473
Sam G. Jones	26,439
Carl Simpkins	25,214
Babb & Deline	23,167
Moxley Farms	22,085
Stallings Bros.	21,480
Rowling Bros.	21,031
Thurmond Farms, Inc.	20,354
Sam E. Story	20,249
Viverette Lee	20,167
James C. Moreton	20,015

Total payees in county
(18) 569,897

NEW MADRID COUNTY	
E. B. Gee, Jr.	61,468
Charles Pikey & Son	59,119
Byars Orton	49,013
F. S. Hunter	44,482
Aubra Wrather	44,351
Ernest Carpenter	43,576
A. C. Riley	38,693
Collis Maltbia	37,535
Raymond Ashley	35,119
Nesselroot and Campbell	34,763
David Barton	32,781
Lorwood Plantation	32,294
Bert Latham	31,135
B & C Harvesting Co.	29,536
Barry Richardson	28,285
Max Holloman	28,134
James B. Crouthers	27,060
Donald Underwood	26,987
Fletchers Gin Inc.	26,748
Coy Fowler	26,469
Charles Barnett	25,150
Doyle Hicks	24,963
Clyde H. Swiney	24,359
Billy G. Swiney	24,344
James Overton Swiney	24,334
Paul Bradley	24,153
Oren Ross	23,900
Walter O. Swiney	23,594
W. V. Riley	23,440
Nolley Farms Inc.	22,725
Tommy Brannum	22,469
Lavalle Farms	22,382
Joe Robertson	22,306
James L. Doster	22,035
Robert McCoy	21,980
Reno Ashley	21,734
Russell Estes	21,447
R. A. Nesselroot	21,296
J. J. Bloomfield	20,970
C. J. Stancil	20,739
N. J. Nowell	20,633
Carmel Lacewell	20,352

Total payees in county
(42) 1,236,853

PEMISCOT COUNTY	
R. O. Pierce	59,666
O. H. Acom Farms Inc.	58,870
Howard Fike	44,232
James S. Bruton	42,044
Mehrie Farms	38,817
Dolphin Land Company	37,859
Coy Wilson	37,781
Watkins Farms Inc.	35,148
Cleo Brents	34,746
Sherley Lovins	32,243

James O. Taylor	31,506
Orton and Toton	31,188
Billy C. Palmer	31,017
Ansel Underwood	29,377
Gene Wingfield	29,347
Donald Rone	28,493
J. E. Ward	27,776
Lloyd Massey	27,367
T. R. Cole & Sons	26,915
S. Crews Reynolds	26,892
Lee Dorroh	26,639
John R. Franklin	25,973
L. A. Riddick	25,884
Gary Bruton	25,844
Ruby B. Monan	25,382
James T. Streete	24,171
Boyd McCrary	23,900
Sides Bros.	23,628
Kneibert Stillman	22,996
Stillman and Bean Fr.	22,458
George T. Killion	22,291
Talmadge Burgess	22,129
W. W. Burlison	22,038
W. E. Smith, Jr.	21,691
Lawrence W. Barnes	21,609
Clarence Gurley	21,338
Haggard Farms	21,205
John L. Atwill	21,044
Jeff Wade, Jr.	20,680
Don Medlin	20,494
Herbert Rone	20,367
Witt Smith	20,303
Royal Sanders	20,256
J. D. Long	20,223

Total payees in county (44) 1,253,827

PERRY COUNTY	
O. F. Gremaud	42,867
N. H. Bruckerhoff	32,363

Total payees in county (2) 75,230

PIKE COUNTY	
Pike Grain Co.	25,675

RAY COUNTY	
Green Top Farms, Inc.	36,587

SALINE COUNTY	
Eugene Elson	52,640
Jim Franklin	31,712

Total payees in county (2) 84,352

SCOTT COUNTY	
E. P. Coleman, Jr.	54,084
Wm. B. Moore Farm	32,241
J. Handy Moore	24,323
Wm. H. Deane III	24,111
Taylor Farms	20,618
United Ridge Co.	20,048

Total payees in county (6) 175,425

ST. CHARLES COUNTY	
Saale Bros. Farm & Grain Co.	35,918

STE. GENEVIEVE COUNTY	
Bartels Farms, Inc.	31,300
Loida Bros.	25,442
Alan W. Schaefer	22,800

Total payees in county (3) 79,542

STODDARD COUNTY	
W. P. Hunter	85,783
Mahan & Radcliffe	65,308
Samuel Alberson	47,603
Taylor Brothers	43,871
H. A. Recker	39,653
Claude Keasler	33,149
Gary Crump	32,192
Lane Brothers	23,535

Total payees in county (8) 371,094

Total payees in State (162) 4,882,924

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—excluding loans—Montana

BEAVERHEAD COUNTY

Matador Cattle Co.	29,511
Jones Ranches Inc.	27,760
Beaverdell Ranch, Inc.	24,436
Chaffin Livestock	23,114

Total payees in county (4) 104,821

BIG HORN COUNTY

Campbell Farming	56,346
Pryor Land Company	52,388
Floyd Warren, Inc.	39,489
Robert Formanack	33,203
Torske Farm, Inc.	21,130

Total payees in county (5) 202,556

BLAINE COUNTY

Rasmussen Farming Corp.	32,566
James R. Billmeyer	23,769

Total payees in county (2) 56,335

BROADWATER COUNTY

V. R. Cazier & Sons	42,235
Fred Kamp	21,755
Hunsaker Bros., Inc.	20,562

Total payees in county (3) 84,552

CARTER COUNTY

Adolph Fix	25,653
Ralph Bruski	25,169

Total payees in county (2) 50,822

CASCADE COUNTY

R. & C. Farming Co.	55,000
R. S. Odys	49,885
Walter Gruel & Sons, Inc.	34,027
Donald Bowman	32,569
Zoller Farms	27,685
Malvin Merja	25,318
J. Edwin Lassila	25,282
Everett Bumgarner	23,883
Andersen & Hovland	23,567
L. Johnson, Inc.	23,266
Clayton Sweeney	22,294
Carl J. Kantorowicz	21,598
McKamey Ranch	21,431

Total payees in county (13) 385,805

CHOUTEAU COUNTY

Onstad Grain Co.	53,536
Robertson Ranch Co.	41,451
Judeman Grain Co.	37,567
Melvin Batchelor	37,477
Phil F. Schafer	37,449
J. G. Robertson, Corp.	36,943
R 5 Ranch	36,672
Fred A. Booth	35,352
Oscar A. Kalgaard	34,217
Ronald M. Upham	31,189
Killion Farms	31,099
Wyley P. Good	29,960
Witt Ranch	29,698
Raymond Romain	28,554
Morris B. Stewart	28,508
Loran A. Perry	28,480
Forrest Charlson	27,830
Wharram Ranch Co., Inc.	27,521
Wishman Brothers	26,476
MacDonald Farms, Inc.	26,295
Birkeland & Son, Inc.	26,271
Donald S. Gray	26,264
Paul Onstad	26,180
Royce Applegate	25,314
Andrew Trunk	24,423
Helland Land Co.	24,417
Rossmiller Farms	24,324
Molinario Farms	23,824
Deeper Land Co.	23,663
Abn Ranch Inc.	23,190
Rettig Farms	22,918

Jack E. Lang	22,534
Harold & Charles Knudson	22,110
Lawrence Romain	21,963
Herman F. Mauer	20,624
Charles Banreuther	20,531
George A. Stevens	20,333
M. & K. Farm, Inc.	20,214

Total payees in county (38) 1,085,371

CUSTER COUNTY

W. M. Nefsy	31,570
L. J. Green & Sons, Inc.	25,792
N. N. Land & Livestock	21,636

Total payees in county (3) 78,998

DANIELS COUNTY

State of Montana	620,800
Frederick Brothers	26,810
Hellickson Brothers	23,524
Chas. L. J. & N. L. Pouhy	23,394
Dewayne Linder	22,464
Carl Jagiello	22,122
Oglesby Farms, Inc.	20,202
Stanton Danelson	20,158

Total payees in county (8) 779,474

DAWSON COUNTY

Kenneth Edwards	40,744
Wolf and Sons, Inc.	34,955
Frank Klempel	22,376
Marvin L. Spencer	22,019
D. W.-R. D. Tague	21,014

Total payees in county (5) 141,108

FALLON COUNTY

Darrell Johnson	24,001
Sikorski & Sons, Inc.	21,842
Mobile Pellet Co.	21,452
Schweigert Ranch	21,072

Total payees in county (4) 88,367

FERGUS COUNTY

Robert-Gerald Barber	25,054
Ralph Lee	28,057
Deerfield Ranch Col.	22,257

Total payees in county (3) 70,368

FLATHEAD COUNTY

Grosswiler Dairy, Inc.	30,822
------------------------	--------

GALLATIN COUNTY

Henry Dehaan	27,386
Wilbur Dyk Ranches, Inc.	21,170

Total payees in county (2) 48,556

GARFIELD COUNTY

Gerald Gibbs	31,713
Red Butte Ranch	20,257

Total payees in county (2) 51,970

GLACIER COUNTY

Warren Swenson	27,625
J. W. & Bob Smith	22,658
Glendale Colony	22,078
William McAlpine	20,917
E. O. Peterson	20,385

Total payees in county (5) 113,663

HILL COUNTY

Leo M. Kraft	43,047
Spicher Brothers	38,451
Ray W. Headrick	36,942
Bernard E. Hardy	34,718
Lineweaver Farms	34,101
Miller Brothers	31,580
Marlin Spicher & Sons	30,062

Leif W. Kapperud	29,745
Kraft & Martin	27,386
Dees Brothers	27,279
Hilldale Colony	26,166
Jack Swinney	25,194
D. O. Koefod, Agent	24,767
Borlaug Brothers	23,413
Dow Brothers	23,241
Kenneth G. Axvig	23,014
John McIntosh	22,486
Nick A. Rettinger	22,043
Lloyd W. Kaercher	21,482
Harold R. Wanke	21,251
Rodney Spicher & Sons	21,128
Herbert G. Bitz	20,881
Martin Schuster	20,519
Arvin Aageson	20,374

Total payees in county (24) 649,270

JUDITH JASIN COUNTY

Roger Petersen	21,694
Robert Wigen	21,546

Total payees in county (2) 43,240

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY

Milford Colony, Inc.	32,257
Diehl Ranch Co.	28,679

Total payees in county (2) 60,936

LIBERTY COUNTY

Allen C. Kolstad	52,003
Clarence Romain	41,319
Bill W. Fraser	35,548
A. C. Kammerzell	35,138
O. M. Skari & Sons, Inc.	34,919
John Wanken	34,195
Galen Kolstad	29,709
Carl Brown	27,994
Brown & Brown, Inc.	27,549
Leo Jensen	27,325
Oliver C. Morkrid	27,160
Skierka Brothers	26,220
Hi Line Farms	25,928
Violet Farms, Inc.	25,064
Meissner Ranches, Inc.	24,812
Gordon or John Kammerzell	24,234
Leonard Staudacher, Jr.	23,909
Clark Diemert	23,731
Ole Jensen	23,144
Semenza Farm	22,743
Raymond Fritz	22,341
William H. Earl, Jr.	22,295
Dayton Kolstad	21,649
McClellan Farms, Inc.	21,331
Bert W. Alley	21,146
William H. Skinner	21,042

Total payees in county (26) 722,448

MADISON COUNTY

Gilbert Lvstik Co.	30,015
R. C. Rice	29,562
Heart L Ranch	28,336

Total payees in county (3) 87,913

M'CONE COUNTY

Otis S. Waters	35,838
Haglund Ranch Inc.	23,609
Dreyer Bros Inc.	22,652
Wayne Pawlowski	22,576
Harley C. Berry	22,549
Kudrna & Witte, Inc.	22,291
Melvin P. Johnson	21,376
Bodray Hagestad	20,455

Total payees in county (8) 191,346

MEAGHER COUNTY

Springdale Colony	33,871
Wellington D. Rankin estate	32,637
Russell Manger	23,400

Total payees in county (3) 89,908

PHILLIPS COUNTY	
Matador Ranch, Inc.....	29,983
Roger Simonson.....	22,107
Stanford Boothe.....	20,681

Total payees in county (3) - 72,771

PONDERA COUNTY	
John Keil & Sons, Inc.....	48,237
Loren Warwick.....	44,925
Tom McCracken.....	35,087
New Miami Colony.....	32,642
Ralph Bouma.....	28,560
Birch Creek Colony.....	28,085
John Wood.....	24,560
Thomas W. Boucher.....	24,383
Russell Wikstrom.....	23,029
Anderson Lahr land and cattle.....	22,797
S. T. McFarland.....	21,756
Eliz Seifert.....	21,620
Kell Ranch, Inc.....	20,645
Bjelland & Robinson.....	20,260

Total payees in county (14) - 396,586

RICHLAND COUNTY	
J D Farms.....	35,829
Allen Verschoot.....	26,331
Floyd Williams.....	20,627
Henry Nollmeyer.....	20,451
Waldo Pust.....	20,086

Total payees in county (5) - 123,324

ROOSEVELT COUNTY	
Schnitzler Corp.....	43,867
Moe Farm Corporation.....	31,720
Wm. Harmon Farms.....	27,462
Willie P. Lockman.....	22,715
Swank & Son.....	22,571
A A Werner Est.....	22,281
Louis Toavs.....	21,115

Total payees in county (7) - 191,731

ROSEBUD COUNTY	
Cherry Creek Sheep Co Inc.....	45,884
Cliff Wright Ranch Inc.....	23,764
Dahlman Ranch Inc.....	20,508

Total payees in county (3) - 90,156

SHERIDAN COUNTY	
Nash Brothers.....	54,944
Richard McCarty.....	29,711

Total payees in county (2) - 84,655

STILLWATER COUNTY	
Yellowstone Grain Co.....	25,435
M E Davey.....	21,272

Total payees in county (2) - 46,707

SWEET GRASS COUNTY	
Donna J. Cremer.....	25,513
Leo J. Cremer, Jr.....	22,956
Huldekoper Vet Res. Sta.....	21,737

Total payees in county (3) - 70,206

TETON COUNTY	
Van Horn Ranch Co.....	31,447
Miller Colony, Inc.....	25,261
Robert Stephens.....	25,146
New Rockport Colony.....	23,768
Habel Bros.....	23,624
Rockport Colony.....	22,623
Eugene W. Johnson.....	20,836
Christman Ranch.....	20,643
James Stephens.....	20,440
Nels Hemstad.....	20,027

Total payees in county (10) - 233,815

TOOLE COUNTY	
S. A. Adaskavich.....	55,000
Bill McCarter.....	55,000
Kenneth Leck.....	34,699
Hellinger Bros.....	27,469
Westermarck Bros.....	26,120
David Ratzburg.....	25,925
Robert Sisk, Jr.....	24,796
Dale Kinyon.....	24,500
Wigen Bros.....	24,484
John McCarter.....	24,014
Miles Burd.....	23,344
Boxwell Farms.....	22,138
Lloyd McLean.....	21,877
Gary Aklestad.....	21,658
Charles Wiegand, Jr.....	21,197
Leo Flesch.....	21,062
Woodrow McCracken.....	20,524
Munson Bros.....	20,479
Doris Iverson.....	20,381

Total payees in county (19) - 514,667

TREASURE COUNTY	
Ted Kallen.....	25,129
Harold Zent.....	23,201

Total payees in county (2) - 48,330

VALLEY COUNTY	
Robert Westland.....	31,108
Morgan Ranch, Inc.....	22,664
S. Enkerud Pres. Witt Gr. Assn.....	22,506
Francis Tarum.....	21,660
F. L. Bailey.....	20,799

Total payees in county (5) - 118,737

WHEATLAND COUNTY	
Stone Gaugler Ranch Co.....	23,744
Martinsdale Colony.....	20,808

Total payees in county (2) - 44,552

YELLOWSTONE COUNTY	
Pearlie Lee & Co.....	27,133
Orville or Edith Lane.....	24,349
Lazy K T Ranch.....	22,729
Vale Creek Ranch.....	22,600

Total payees in county (4) - 96,811

Total payees in State (249) - 7,351,697

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Nebraska

ADAMS COUNTY	
Ruth Hunt.....	41,238
Mary Lanning Hosp TR.....	26,739

Total payees in county (2) - 67,977

BOONE COUNTY	
Dobson Brothers C/O R Dobson.....	21,055
Choat & Sons Inc.....	20,205

Total payees in county (2) - 41,260

BOX BUTTE COUNTY	
Lawrence R. Grabher.....	28,785
Harry Cullan.....	26,637
Robert R. Elliott.....	26,201
Garland Fisher.....	22,799

Total payees in county (4) - 104,422

BURT COUNTY	
Hundahl Farms.....	62,902
John Tobin & Sons.....	29,600
Mariane Tobin.....	23,755
Tobin Ranch.....	20,441

Total payees in county (4) - 136,698

BUTLER COUNTY	
Grass VA Farms Inc.....	20,595

CHASE COUNTY	
Leslie E. Smith & Sons Inc.....	51,552
Harold D. Hughes.....	27,540
Bernard Onell.....	25,440
Edwin Fuehrer.....	20,418
Hughes Farms Inc.....	20,194

Total payees in county (5) - 145,144

CHEYENNE COUNTY	
Raymond Jessen.....	31,246

CLAY COUNTY	
Woods Bros. & Ells.....	27,078
Ray Phelps.....	25,372
HJY Bros. Co.—A Hajny.....	23,345
Kiss, F. D. Lts.—R. Kissinger, A. G.....	21,186

Total payees in county (4) - 96,981

COLFAX COUNTY	
F. J. Higgins Farm Inc.....	67,893

CUMING COUNTY	
Albers Dehy Co.....	38,069

DAKOTA COUNTY	
Leo C. Andersen.....	32,279
Beermann Farms, Inc.....	22,392

Total payees in county (2) - 54,671

DAWES COUNTY	
Harold C. Bowen.....	25,636
Eugene Stewart.....	21,660
Donald Gorr.....	21,150
Pepper Creek Ranch, Inc.....	20,857

DAWSON COUNTY	
Total payees in county (4) -	89,303

Dawson County Feed Prod. Inc.....	21,377
W. M. Rickertsen.....	20,645
Central Alfalfa, Inc.....	20,528

Total payees in county (3) - 62,550

DEUEL COUNTY	
W. H. Palser Farms, Inc.....	40,709
Grace Land and Cattle Co.....	38,206
Kjeldgaard Farm, Inc.....	28,131
Bailey Partnership.....	26,495

Total payees in county (4) - 133,541

DODGE COUNTY	
Harland S. Milligan.....	37,144
Donald Flamme.....	20,093

Total payees in county (2) - 57,237

FILLMORE COUNTY	
Biegert Brothers.....	32,079
Alf's Imp. & Well Drig. Co.....	25,178
Schelkopf Enterprise.....	23,965
William K. Brinkman.....	22,928
Robert D. Lovegrove.....	22,546
Robert Bettger.....	21,801
Bruce Nedrow.....	21,793
Keith Burt.....	21,191

Total payees in county (8) - 191,481

FRANKLIN COUNTY	
W. J. Bach.....	26,258
Wayne Ziebarth.....	24,889
John Gardels.....	21,387

Total payees in county (3) - 72,534

FRONTIER COUNTY	
Kenneth Bellamy.....	22,152

FURNAS COUNTY	
Johnson Bros. & Jones.....	41,199
Ten Bensel & Sons.....	26,456
Lueking Farm & Ranch Corp.....	20,600

Total payees in county (3) - 88,255

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Nebraska—Continued

GAGE COUNTY	
Flo Wal Farms, Inc.	28,118
John Krause & Sons	21,370
Total payees in county (2)	49,488
GARDEN COUNTY	
Leo Jessen	42,009
GREELEY COUNTY	
James H. Dugan	24,892
HALL COUNTY	
Leo F. Thelen	21,618
Ralph Mettenbrink	21,590
Dobesh Farms Inc.	20,283
Total payees in county (3)	63,491
HAMILTON COUNTY	
Kreutz Bros., Inc.	45,331
Farm, Inc., W. Wilczynski, president	25,400
Archie Roberts	22,512
Harold Vogt	20,912
Total payees in county (4)	114,155
HARLAN COUNTY	
Bernard Lucking	29,481
HAYES COUNTY	
Earl Smith	24,202
HOLT COUNTY	
Fred Horne, Jr.	50,429
Wm. A. Curry	29,772
Total payees in county (2)	80,201
JEFFERSON COUNTY	
A. L. Rosener & Sons	46,431
Stanley A. Snyder	21,474
Total payees in county (2)	67,905
KEARNEY COUNTY	
Kermit Felzien	25,505
KEITH COUNTY	
McGinley Schilz Co.	55,478
Milford Krajewski	24,648
Palser & Palser	23,216
Rankin Prochaska Inc.	21,750
Walter Armstrong	21,696
Lester O. Rhodes	21,307
Total payees in county (6)	168,095
KIMBALL COUNTY	
Wayne Kennedy	24,013
LINCOLN COUNTY	
Miron Moore	31,561
Walter Hasenauer	22,226
Stewart H. Evans	21,436
Kenneth Brosius	20,976
Total payees in county (4)	96,199
MERRICK COUNTY	
Dinsdale Bros., Inc.	32,061
Lloyd Wagner	20,675
Total payees in county (2)	52,736
MORRILL COUNTY	
Edward Jelinek	37,770
Jessen Farms, Inc.	21,865
Abel Investment Co.	21,783
Total payees in county (3)	81,418

NEMAHIA COUNTY	
A. B. Ritchie, Jr.	25,125
OTOE COUNTY	
James Partnership	21,078
PERKINS COUNTY	
Svoboda & Hannah	51,509
Gerald Krajewski	31,297
Box 436	27,363
Total payees in county (3)	110,169
PHELPS COUNTY	
Roy W. Pearson	25,052
Sam T. Schrock, Jr.	24,521
Total payees in county (2)	49,573
POLK COUNTY	
K. D. Strong	21,386
RED WILLOW COUNTY	
Myers Bros.	26,111
Friehe Farms, Inc.	24,430
Driftwood Farms, Inc.	21,449
Total payees in county (3)	71,990
RICHARDSON COUNTY	
Stalder Cattle Co.	31,500
Nemaha Realty Co., Inc.	21,527
Total payees in county (2)	53,027
SALINE COUNTY	
Mahloch Farms, Inc.	32,914
SAUNDERS COUNTY	
Consolidated Blenders	44,706
Walter E. Adams	32,256
Foxley & Co.	25,324
Centennial Farms, Inc.	21,089
Total payees in county (4)	123,375
THAYER COUNTY	
Ted Currey	23,484
Verland Tietjen	20,708
Total payees in county (2)	44,192
THURSTON COUNTY	
Willis Leinart	21,060
WASHINGTON COUNTY	
Tyson Farms, Inc.	33,863
WEBSTER COUNTY	
Delbert Lewis	29,229
YORK COUNTY	
Broadwell, Inc.	30,445
Harrington Farms Co.	27,681
Wm. H. Otto	21,445
Otto Farms, Inc.	21,001
Total payees in county (4)	100,572
Total payees in State (116)	3,203,353
1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—excluding loans—Nevada	
HUMBOLDT COUNTY	
Orovada, Inc.	36,070
NYE COUNTY	
Mizpah Ranch	54,300
Tim Hafen Ranches, Inc.	51,072

Gordon Mason	21,388
Glenn C. Brady	20,976
Total payees in county (4)	147,736
PERSHING COUNTY	
Herman Dennler	59,333
Brinkerhoff Ranch, Inc.	56,715
Improved Beef Feeders	26,725
Total payees in county (3)	142,773
Total payees in State (8)	326,579
1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—New Mexico	
CATRON COUNTY	
Frank A. Hubbell Co.	44,156
CHAVES COUNTY	
Hal Bogle	59,868
Flying H Ranch	53,111
H. C. Berry	45,656
J. P. White, Jr.	43,402
Lincoln County Livestock Co.	42,541
Willard Watson	35,848
Bill Bogle	34,713
Jack Patterson	34,349
Bonham Farms, Inc.	34,090
Melvin Pearson	33,286
James Norris	32,974
Clardy Farms, Inc.	31,398
James Grassie	31,041
Rosendo Casarez	30,120
Fletcher Brothers	30,050
Herbert M. Corn	29,322
Jimmy Pack	28,107
Barney E. Green, Jr.	27,967
Jennings and Jennings	27,321
A. W. Langenegger	26,574
Inez F. Bogle	26,488
Kap D. Kelley	26,413
Delbert M. Robinson	25,599
James G. Langenegger	24,813
Ross R. Langenegger	24,813
Marley & Whitney	24,774
Malone Farms, Inc.	24,361
Poe W. Corn	24,049
O. F. Crawford	22,642
H. H. McGee	22,331
R. and B. Co., c/o Bronson Corn	21,778
Penasco River Ranch	21,698
Fred Corn and Sons	21,541
George Kimble Hibbard	21,346
Berry F. Heine, Jr.	20,887
Noling and Noling	20,851
Max Wiggins	20,658
B. F. Crawford	20,142
Total payees in county (38)	1,126,922
COLFAX COUNTY	
Roy M. Wood	20,729
CURRY COUNTY	
John Garrett, Jr.	88,892
Lockmiller and Son	76,977
Malcolm Garrett	74,623
Garrett Corporation	74,418
George Hammond	68,808
John H. Spearman	67,773
Michael Garrett	65,254
Lee Ross Hammond	61,351
James E. Garrett	60,861
C. Elton Green	56,626
O. H. Pattison	54,993
Dale Elliott	43,509
Leon Marks	41,260
Esther L. Van Soelen	40,966
The Hecht Company	40,241
Crest Agro, Inc., c/o D. Turner	40,069
Sid Pipkin	39,830
C. E. Cristian	39,321
Leslie Pattison	38,746
Virgie Harrison	38,174

L. R. Talley, Est.	36,833
R. Wayne Leonard	36,479
M. M. Snell, Est.	36,431
John W. Gunter, Jr.	35,378
John C. White	35,288
Frank Blackburn	35,234
J. L. Wall	35,084
Eldon Blackburn Farms, Inc.	33,709
Marlon Inman	33,629
Harold House	33,408
Archie Baker	33,160
J. W. Graham	32,889
D. D. Myrick	32,850
Haney Tate	32,550
J. R. Shumate, Jr.	31,869
Fern Castor	31,312
Frank Wicks	31,205
Elbert Mitchell	30,917
Eldon Blackburn	30,399
Francis L. Decker	30,047
Calvin Stout	29,537
Russell Downey	29,123
Edgar Campbell	28,065
Waymon Mitchell	27,956
Vernon S. Andrus	27,672
Jack D. Garrett	27,438
W. W. Bomar	27,331
Paul P. Harrison	27,182
Willie O. Wall	27,043
Bobby Wilhite	27,000
Hershel L. Hughes	26,818
J. G. Palmateer	26,567
Ronnie Mitchell	26,336
Max L. Kelso	26,148
Dudley Bailey	25,460
L. E. Davis	25,419
Oscar Fryar	24,633
W. R. Cloud	24,338
E. C. Fish	24,127
Otha Lockmiller	24,009
Fred Northcutt	23,966
Lester Merrill	23,782
Gibbs Rucker	23,747
A. Lloyd Grau	23,739
Wayne Burford	23,609
B. P. Davis	23,603
George H. Trimble	23,345
Edith A. Lewis	23,217
Richard Lee Miller	23,216
James C. Woods	23,027
E. L. Smith	22,786
N. E. Thompkins	22,657
Robert K. Goar	22,633
Ray E. Castieberry	22,525
Mark M. Liethen	22,503
Joe Byron Burford	22,466
John W. McIntosh	22,346
Joe Sealey	22,247
E. C. Murrell	22,068
Ronald Minyen	21,883
Gorman Hand	21,822
Gilbert Smith	21,667
John Fury	21,536
Frank R. Meier	21,313
Joe Paul Cobb	21,283
Phillip Tate	21,022
Clinton C. Burnett	20,912
Eldon Jones	20,894
J. C. Eshleman	20,721
Billy Meeks	20,633
Wayne Martin, Jr.	20,479
John Reid	20,194
L. Conrad Pippin	20,165
Jimmy J. Wallace	20,157

Total payees in county
(95) 3,085,826

DE BACA COUNTY	
Ramon Perez Ranch, Inc.	31,318

DONA ANA COUNTY	
O. L. Hilburn	55,000
John R. Tomlin	35,608
Ralph R. Hackey	34,802
J. K. Nakayama & Sons	32,004
Chelten Farms Op. Co. Inc.	30,185

Robert S. Hayner Est.	28,505
Enrique Acosta	25,802
Clyde Simpson	25,092
Will Holt	24,875
John L. Sykes	24,641
P. R. Kuykendall	24,536
C. C. Woodward	24,512
Manuel Morales	23,183
W. E. Esslinger	22,912
J. F. Apodaca Farms Co., Inc.	22,864
William F. Hayner	22,788
Tony Salopek	22,596
Carl Wiley	21,695
Thomas S. White	21,550
Juan V. Navarette	20,922
Fred L. Franzoy & Sons	20,597
Brady E. Porter	20,548
Ernest Harris	20,337

Total payees in county (23) 605,554

EDDY COUNTY	
Ray Howard	56,805
Bob Morgan	44,818
Roy Ingram Co., Inc.	44,253
Draper Brantley	38,364
W. I. Johnson	33,237
Carter Farms	31,337
S. G. Karr	31,119
W. D. Bounds & Son	30,725
Tom E. Vandiver	29,894
J. O. Bratcher	28,113
Bowman & Son	23,950
Henry H. Grandl	23,581
Frank Runyan	23,537
Quentin Rogers	23,322
James Thigpen	23,247
B. C. Aaron	22,796
Menefee Bros.	22,261
Floyd Howard	22,172
J. S. Waldrup	20,915
James C. Ogden	20,435

Total payees in county (20) 594,881

GUADALUPE COUNTY	
Eugenio Perez Ranch	26,960

HIDALGO COUNTY	
Bill Veck	59,260
Harry Turner	49,192
Richins Brothers, Inc.	43,429
Leo J. Ruzicka	40,338
R. H. Wamel	29,674
A. G. Ramos	24,016
Massey Farms	23,598
Sidney O. Wright	23,250

Total payees in county (8) 292,730

LEA COUNTY	
Emma Lawrence	78,371
Elvis Jones	56,632
J. V. Burdett	47,225
Hawthorne Bros.	36,701
Brady Lowe	36,262
John Richardson	33,604
Yarbros, Inc.	33,073
Taylor & Heidel, Inc.	31,126
Norman Thetford	27,883
W. G. Turnipseed	27,473
Joe C. McKown	25,197
McClish Farms	24,522
C. E. Alexander & Sons	22,234
G. Bradford Feed Pens	21,779
Berry Lee Hobbs	21,721
J. W. Spears	20,808

Total payees in county (16) 544,611

LINCOLN COUNTY	
X Bar Ranch, Inc.	40,327
Block Dot Sheep Company	22,867
George Clements	21,912
W. R. Lovelace Livestock Co.	21,842

Total payees in county (4) 106,948

LUNA COUNTY	
Jerry Lynn Hilburn	109,804
L. G. Guaderrama	65,898
Edward Ray Hooper	54,030
William B. Green	53,294
H. S. Jackson	49,097
Jerry Zachek	35,550
Keeler Bros.	34,360
Leo W. Koenig	31,218
Teddy Zachek	29,872
Hal B. Keeler	26,842
W. R. Johnson & Son	24,595
G. X. McSherry	23,852
James W. Donaldson	20,333

Total payees in county
(13) 558,745

OTERO COUNTY	
Valon W. Roach	20,712

QUAY COUNTY	
Odus Rush	42,977
Gunn & Sons, Inc.	39,523
Charles Roy Best	39,071
D. F. McCasland	34,601
Ivan Rush	32,283
J. V. Curtis	30,045
Akin & Akin Corp.	26,161
Jennings Bros.	26,109
H. J. Lee & Sons, Inc.	22,634
O. L. Yocom	21,364
Edward O. Sumrall	20,788
Bruce A. Runyan	20,535

Total payees in county
(12) 356,091

RIO ARRIBA COUNTY	
Clyde Cheek	21,463

ROOSEVELT COUNTY	
J. D. Terral	43,789
Howard Powers	33,944
Harvey L. and Ava L. Balko	30,369
Brown and Brown	27,067
Hadley H. Kern	26,156
Allen Chapman	25,220
C. H. Wall	24,795
Claudia W. Reeves	23,566
Glenn W. Thompson	22,800
Johnnie B. Gammill	20,649

Total payees in county
(10) 278,355

SIERRA COUNTY	
Price Black Farms, Inc.	26,426

SOCORRO COUNTY	
Brawley Bros.	29,262

UNION COUNTY	
Arthur Jernigan	22,670

Total payees in State
(248) 7,794,359

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or More—Excluding Loans—New York

GENESEE COUNTY	
My T Acres	26,762

MONROE COUNTY	
John Halpin Sons	22,095

NIAGARA COUNTY	
Holman O. Connor	22,246

Total payees in State (3) 71,103

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—North Carolina

ANSON COUNTY	
Edwin J. Wall.....	30,399
Norwood E. Teal.....	28,734
G. Manley Thomas.....	25,435
George P. Capel.....	23,683
John Robinson.....	22,180

Total payees in county (5)..... 130,431

BEAUFORT COUNTY	
J. B. Bell, est.....	27,601

CLEVELAND COUNTY	
Morgan & Co., Inc.....	56,897
A. M. Boggs & Sons.....	42,903
Edwin Y. Harrill, Jr.....	36,261
Roy Cochran.....	32,038
Billy Willson.....	31,834
Robert R. Hamrick.....	26,585
James A. Bialock.....	25,346
Glenn Sperling.....	25,208
Earl P. Eaker.....	21,134
Oras Biggerstaff.....	21,064

Total payees in county (10)..... 319,270

CURRITUCK COUNTY	
James H. Ferebee and Son.....	22,153

EDGEcombe COUNTY	
M. C. Braswell Farms.....	33,611
R. R. Brake, Jr.....	29,517
W. S. Clark & Sons, Inc.....	28,609
W. J. Eason, Jr.....	24,271
Wiley Bulluck.....	21,234

Total payees in county (5)..... 137,242

HALIFAX COUNTY	
Carolina Peanut Company.....	43,138
L. H. Kitchin.....	29,957
Benjamin B. Everett, Jr.....	29,557
Betty S. Whitehead.....	22,387
Bill Pickette.....	21,676
Cecil Moore.....	20,694
Jack Fleming.....	20,665
Charles H. Smith, Jr.....	20,539
Edison Smith.....	20,230
Charles L. Tillery.....	20,081

Total payees in county (10)..... 248,924

HARNETT COUNTY	
R. A. McLamb.....	26,066

HOKE COUNTY	
J. G. Balfour.....	35,665
John M. McLean.....	32,365
R. L. Gibson.....	26,713
Dundarrach Trading Co.....	24,339
James D. McGougan.....	23,372
Earl Hendrix.....	23,227
J. K. McNeill Farms.....	23,141
John E. McGougan.....	21,614
Edward Hayes.....	21,451
Agnes U. Johnson.....	20,469
Alfred K. Leach.....	20,401
W. S. Thomas.....	20,338

Total payees in county (12)..... 293,095

LEE COUNTY	
Jesse Thomas.....	30,575
R. W. Norman.....	30,162

Total payees in county (2)..... 60,737

LINCOLN COUNTY	
Joe Kiser.....	35,373
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	
Robert Chappell.....	39,093
Mack Chappell.....	20,773
Total payees in county (2).....	59,866
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY	
John G. Burgwyn.....	42,736
Reuben Turner.....	42,579
M. C. Dunlow.....	31,079
William R. Johnston.....	24,787
J. C. Edwards, Jr.....	24,369
Total payees in county (5).....	165,530
RICHMOND COUNTY	
Cecil Sikes.....	29,167
Myers Waddell.....	28,607
Total payees in county (2).....	57,774
ROBESON COUNTY	
Wakulla Farms, Inc.....	72,463
Midway Farms, Inc.....	66,768
Waccamaw Bank and Trust Co.....	61,129
Allen M. Shook.....	60,287
Maxton Supply Co.....	59,320
D. D. McColl.....	50,320
William A. Davis.....	49,098
Neil Watson.....	40,593
Arthur Norman Emanuel.....	39,073
Bassil Gentry.....	36,828
Tom McRimmon.....	35,954
B. E. Simpson.....	30,457
J. H. McArthur, Jr.....	29,789
K. M. Biggs, Inc.....	28,601
Bill Herndon.....	26,611
Sinclair Corp.....	26,461
Thompson Brokerage Co.....	25,100
D. M. Lytch.....	23,843
W. H. McIntyre.....	22,966
B. C. McIntyre.....	22,966
Lewis R. McNeill & Davis.....	22,124
W. B. Townsend Farms.....	20,883
David Dunn, Jr.....	20,444
Pates Supply Co., Inc.....	20,220
Total payees in county (24).....	892,298
SAMPSON COUNTY	
Bank of NCNA.....	35,126
SCOTLAND COUNTY	
Baker Enterprise, Inc.....	67,638
A. R. McMillan, Jr.....	59,349
J. T. John Co., Inc.....	56,585
John Carmichael.....	48,967
James R. McKenzie.....	48,924
Evans Brothers.....	45,857
J. N. Gibson, Jr.....	45,134
Edwin Snead.....	39,462
Z. V. Pate, Inc.....	38,921
R. M. Adams.....	37,347
William P. Carmichael.....	37,226
Willis T. Hancock.....	33,306
Harvey Z. Edge.....	32,585
McNair Farms.....	30,434
Alice J. McLeod.....	29,848
John M. McLaurin.....	29,348
Jesse Snead.....	29,248
Hansford Gentry.....	25,632
Blue Investment Co.....	25,357
P. B. and J. M. McGregor.....	22,719
Richard Tatum.....	22,225
Donald Morgan.....	22,122
Haynes Stone.....	21,707
Westwood Farm.....	21,408
Myrtle S. Snead.....	20,926
Sam R. McCormick.....	20,920
Total payees in county (26).....	913,195

UNION COUNTY	
D. L. Kimbrell.....	21,929
Wade H. Howey, Jr.....	20,915
Total payees in county (2).....	42,844
Total payees in State (110).....	3,467,545

1971 ASCS and Great Plains Program Payments of \$20,000 or More—Excluding Loans—North Dakota

ADAMS COUNTY	
Harold Arndorfer.....	22,576
Darrell Papka.....	22,082

Total payees in county (2)..... 44,658

BARNES COUNTY	
Paul Bjornson.....	25,155

BENSON COUNTY	
Leo Studness.....	24,302

BOTTINEAU COUNTY	
Ballantyne Brothers.....	43,611
The Wittenman Company.....	30,960
Willis Glinz.....	25,350
Norman Glinz.....	24,660
Pearson Bros.....	20,047

Total payees in county (5)..... 144,628

BOWMAN COUNTY	
Melvin Miller.....	26,847
Joe Bagley.....	21,104

Total payees in county (2)..... 47,951

BURKE COUNTY	
Earl Schwartz.....	20,631

BURLEIGH COUNTY	
Casey EST.....	22,116

CASS COUNTY	
Wm. & Geo. Sinner/E. Breshnahan.....	37,092
Geo. C. Howe, Jr.....	26,494
Orten Brodshaug.....	23,367

Total payees in county (3)..... 86,953

DIVIDE COUNTY	
Lawrence Hagen.....	29,663
David Jensen.....	24,744

Total payees in county (2)..... 54,407

FOSTER COUNTY	
Louis S. Reimers.....	30,274

GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY	
Lloyd Weinreis.....	27,200
Donald Kittelson.....	26,166
Floyd Bosserman.....	22,884

Total payees in county (3)..... 76,250

GRAND FORKS COUNTY	
Ryan Farms.....	32,053
Elk Valley Farms.....	31,729
J. A. Cronquist.....	31,173
Art Greenberg.....	30,536
John W. Scott.....	23,552
Don & Nordis Lindholm.....	20,281
Drees Farming Association.....	20,197
Jack A. Halverson.....	20,050

Total payees in county (8)..... 209,571

HETTINGER COUNTY	
Clyde L. Swindler.....	62,409
Benjamin Schaible.....	48,410
John F. Swindler.....	45,109

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—North Dakota

Milton Hertz	42,690
Marion Swindler	36,501
August C. Kirschmann	33,978
Richard Swindler	28,425
Fred J. Hoherz	22,917
Arthur Schable	22,720
Larry Stang	22,657
Jos. P. Grundhauser	21,782
Raymond K. Bieber	20,131

Total payees in county (12) - 407,709

KIDDER COUNTY

Ward Whitman	35,360
--------------	--------

M'KENZIE COUNTY

Harold Dahl	51,328
Peter A. Nygaard	29,796
Lester Wisness	26,217
Joe Gudbranson	26,097
Roger L. Sanders	20,898

Total payees in county (5) - 154,336

M'LEAN COUNTY

C. H. Stock Farm	21,822
------------------	--------

MORTON COUNTY

Wachter Ranch	31,741
---------------	--------

MOUNTRAIL COUNTY

Otto Engen	55,193
Abrahamson Bros	20,566

Total payees in county (2) - 75,759

PEMBINA COUNTY

J. G. Hall and Sons	35,090
Bert Johnson	29,066
Morrison Bros	28,583
Schulz Moquist Illing	26,160
Bert Olson and Sons	25,959
F. Kent Vosper	23,361
Warner Bros	23,103
Hector Walligheim	22,977
Tucker & Green	22,926
Leonard Schwartz	22,074
Gunderson Bros	20,500

Total payees in county (11) - 279,799

RAMSEY COUNTY

Herman Dimmler	26,362
----------------	--------

SARGENT COUNTY

Kenneth E. Nepstad	20,139
--------------------	--------

SIOUX COUNTY

Peter Sittner	27,396
---------------	--------

SLOPE COUNTY

Frank Dilse	55,142
Maurice O'Connell	31,340
Harold Brooks & Sons	26,157
Stuber Ranch	25,668
Thomas G. Powell	23,680
Nell Krinke	22,490
Leroy Sadler	20,501
Teddy Dale Dilse	20,422

Total payees in county (8) - 225,400

STARK COUNTY

Ray Reich	21,027
-----------	--------

STUTSMAN COUNTY

Eddy Farms	42,386
Hoggarth Brothers	41,314
Arvel Glinz	40,887
David Glinz	39,614
Freddie Mutschler	31,372
Kropp Farms	22,220
Carl Frey	21,360

Total payees in county (7) - 239,153

TOWNER COUNTY

W. A. Schmidt	28,666
---------------	--------

TRAILL COUNTY

John S. Dalrymple, Jr.	38,503
------------------------	--------

WALSH COUNTY

L. E. Tibert Co	38,661
Boone Farms	29,644
Dolan Bros	28,402
Harley Kingsbury Co	25,849
John D. Miller	25,602

Total payees in county (5) - 148,158

WARD COUNTY

Earl Schwartz Co	32,130
C. Morris Anderson	30,049
Henry Neshem, Jr.	23,297

Total payees in county (3) - 85,476

WELLS COUNTY

Weckerly Bros	27,687
---------------	--------

WILLIAMS COUNTY

Earl Bauste	25,028
George & Thomas Layon	23,786

Total payees in county (2) - 48,814

Total payees in State (95) - 2,733,203

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Ohio

CLINTON COUNTY

Midwest Farms John Golings	22,450
----------------------------	--------

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Darby Dan Farm Co	23,718
-------------------	--------

GREENE COUNTY

Trelawny South	20,822
----------------	--------

HARDIN COUNTY

Donnel L. Dangler	22,038
-------------------	--------

LICKING COUNTY

Lobdell Drainage Assn	29,056
-----------------------	--------

LUCAS COUNTY

Wolf Farms	34,308
Schaller Farms	23,435

Total payees in county (2) - 57,743

MADISON COUNTY

Orelton Farms Co	44,889
AG Lands C. E. Finney	37,423
Sawyer F. M. c/o Orelton F. M.	36,786

Total payees in county (3) - 119,098

MARION COUNTY

Ward Walton and Asso. Inc	59,766
Dekalb Agri Research Inc	46,677
W. S. Guthery & Sons Inc	27,326

Total payees in county (3) - 133,769

PICKAWAY COUNTY

William J. Richards	23,298
Jean Clow Crites	20,682

Total payees in county (2) - 43,980

PREBLE COUNTY

Artie Cain	20,812
------------	--------

Total payees in State (16) - 493,486

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—excluding loans—Oklahoma

BECKHAM COUNTY

A. W. Phillips	25,614
Bobby Ray Reeves	23,756
K. B. Stowers	21,979

Lee D. White	20,733
R. E. Jones	20,061

Total payees in county (5) - 112,143

BRYAN COUNTY

G. E. Kelly	25,837
Alvie Grossman, Jr.	23,324

Total payees in county (2) - 49,161

CADDO COUNTY

S. G. Stevens	30,953
Jewell Propps	30,503
O. M. Ulery	25,085
Forest Dolan	20,509
Louis W. Briscoe	20,081

Total payees in county (5) - 127,131

CANADIAN COUNTY

Margaret Petree	36,470
Nelson A. Davison	29,179
Everett Feddersen	24,046
Doyal Selvidge	20,658

Total payees in county (4) - 110,353

CIMARRON COUNTY

L. J. and Clovis Stafford	45,763
Billy R. Gowdy	37,099
Dayle M. Oyler	22,512
Clifford Hinds	21,144
H. E. Hammond	20,634
John D. Burrow	20,264

Total payees in county (6) - 167,416

COTTON COUNTY

Hertis Baber	31,170
C. B. Bowles	21,788
Howard Gover	21,217

Total payees in county (3) - 74,175

CUSTER COUNTY

J. G. Stratton, Sr.	49,243
George Fransen	36,063
J. R. Martin	35,870
Isaac Fransen	28,132
Lorenz Farms	23,708
Roy Shepherd	23,411
Strong Trust	22,817
Bob Carpenter	21,324
Gary Donley	20,439
Donald Carpenter	20,140

Total payees in county (10) - 281,147

DEWEY COUNTY

H. L. Christensen, Jr.	22,564
------------------------	--------

GARFIELD COUNTY

Ediger Farms	40,835
Eddie Zaloudek	34,619
H. C. Groendyke	22,443
Louis Zaloudek	22,353
F. W. Zaloudek	20,147

Total payees in county (5) - 140,397

GRADY COUNTY

Barnes Farms, Inc.	35,612
Virgil Voigt	32,270
Harold Barrington	30,064
Earl Campbell	29,162
Ralph Jacobs	24,686

Total payees in county (5) - 151,794

GRANT COUNTY

C. W. Leforce and Son	40,295
-----------------------	--------

GREER COUNTY

Clinton Nesmith	35,095
State of Okla.	30,305
Milton Vaughan	29,170

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Oklahoma—Continued

Frankie Johnson	26,267
Leo Fite	23,125
Jimmie Heatly	22,866

Total payees in county (6)	166,328
----------------------------	---------

HARMON COUNTY

F. E. Motley	45,776
Paul & Chas. Horton	45,257
Shelby & Kirby	35,188
Elmo Jones	34,161
David Rath	30,755
Harold Nichols	28,199
Carrick Brothers	28,165
G. D. Payne	25,320
Paul Lee	25,127
Regie Lewis	25,041
Beanland & Sons	24,432
Clay Whorton	23,551
Lee Roy Crawford	22,487
Arlis Motley	21,263
W. D. Stewart, Jr.	20,971
G. W. Strawn	20,912

Total payees in county (16)	456,555
-----------------------------	---------

HARPER COUNTY

R. A. Lotspeich	21,215
-----------------	--------

HASKELL COUNTY

John L. Horn	21,229
--------------	--------

JACKSON COUNTY

Robert Robbins	54,677
Murray R. Williams	51,949
Harold Worrell	49,713
Glenn Southall	42,188
Monroe B. Karcher	42,284
Brewer Bros	40,161
William C. Southall	39,217
Chris Columbus	37,152
Carthal F. Mock & Son	35,651
Wayne Q. Winsett	35,074
Gordon Thomas	34,743
Roy A. Holsey	31,572
Gary W. Winsett	29,787
Ann Winsett Hawkins	29,787
Travis Walls	29,528
Clayton Tinney	29,052
Rodney Hughes	28,102
Harvey R. Petzold	27,880
Samuel C. Schultz	27,449
Mock Brothers	26,326
Pill Hulett	25,192
Joseph C. Talbot	24,817
Earl E. Abernathy	24,312
Laverne A. Fessenden	23,862
John McLeod	23,828
Hopson E. Pickett	23,787
J. M. Bailey	23,660
Charles D. Felty	23,535
Sam & Harold Vinyard	23,363
E. E. & J. P. Weber	23,268
Thurman Gregg	22,200
Harlan Tabb	21,694
B. L. Dean & Son PTR	21,304
Robert M. Kerr	20,704

Total payees in county (33)	1,011,466
-----------------------------	-----------

KAY COUNTY

Jack Lane	36,433
Bill Carmichael	23,207

Total payees in county (2)	59,640
----------------------------	--------

KINGFISHER COUNTY

B. A. Conley	24,969
Frank Schulte	20,130

Total payees in county (2)	45,099
----------------------------	--------

KIOWA COUNTY

Glenn and Sam Pfennig Ptnrs	35,786
Charles & Gayl Portwood Ptnrs	32,300
W. C. Pfennig	29,307
E. F. Bunch	28,934
J. C. Hill	28,005
Paul Edge	26,291
Darrell Allard	21,154
Truman Jones, Jr.	20,600

Total payees in county (8)	222,377
----------------------------	---------

M'CLAIN COUNTY

Freeny Hopkins	24,915
Harry S. Phillips	23,185
Billy P. Adkins	21,766

Total payees in county (3)	69,866
----------------------------	--------

M'CURTAIN COUNTY

Mike Columbus	35,748
Barney Ward, Jr.	29,467
Cloverdale Planting Co.	24,300

Total payees in county (4)	126,667
----------------------------	---------

MUSKOGEE COUNTY

Charles R. Sheffield	45,497
Pearson Bros	42,290

Total payees in county (2)	87,787
----------------------------	--------

NOBLE COUNTY

Burdette Garvie	22,538
-----------------	--------

SEQUOYAH COUNTY

Sloan Farms	41,989
-------------	--------

TEXAS COUNTY

H. C. Hitch, Jr.	95,371
Irvin Clark	47,930
Long Brothers	42,954
Worth Jeffus	41,572
Gustav Dencker	37,062
R. Lee, Jr. & R. Lee, Sr.	32,358
G. G. Freeman	29,571
Dillon Caddell	26,735
Walter Anderson Estate	26,720
Fred R. Sweet	26,459
Fischer Brothers	26,300
Jimmie L. Draper	22,303
C. F. Webb	21,603
Joyce H. Gray	20,611
Roy Mitchell	20,346

Total payees in county (15)	517,895
-----------------------------	---------

TILLMAN COUNTY

Dewayne Stout	58,726
John Wade Kent	44,420
Harvey Farm and Ranch	43,433
H. W. Campbell	37,661
Galen P. Briggs	36,597
John M. Kinder	35,317
Charles Hill	33,250
Kenneth Kimmel	33,055
Lester Dickey	32,054
H. L. Akin	29,419
Bill Eddleman	27,525
Clarence Adams	26,821
R. L. Lindsey	26,743
T. G. Jennings, Jr.	25,815
Bruce Burke	24,398
Archie W. Gottschall	24,300
Roy N. Laney	23,948
Rodney Fillmore	22,633
Ralph Keith	22,388
W. W. Purdy	22,128
Smith Land Co.	21,542
J. W. Dysart	21,536
Max L. Waldrop	21,410
William Perry Spraggins	21,264
Johnny R. McElroy	21,242

Edwin Slack	21,137
Leonard Stout	21,065
Leroy D. Lett	20,632
Edd Kinder	20,370

Total payees in county (29)	820,829
-----------------------------	---------

WAGONER COUNTY

Fred Metzger	21,732
Francis M. Chesbro	21,483

Total payees in county (2)	43,215
----------------------------	--------

Ridling Brothers	39,036
Othall L. Bond	28,546

WASHITA COUNTY

J. L. Celsor	23,979
Total payees in county (3)	91,561

WOODS COUNTY

Bouziden Brothers	59,522
-------------------	--------

Total payees in State (177)	5,162,354
1971 ASCS and Great Plains Program Payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Oregon	

GILLIAM COUNTY

Floyd Anderson	29,462
Sidney Seale, Jr.	28,161
R. W. Potter & Sons Est.	24,670
Vernon Mikkalo	23,186
Chester W. Dyer	22,459
Roy Phillipi, Jr.	22,182
Anderson Farms, Inc.	21,457
Harrison M. Weatherford	21,139

Total payees in county (8)	192,716
----------------------------	---------

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Haycreek Range and Cattle	40,521
Kenneth Binder	24,035

Total payees in county (2)	64,556
----------------------------	--------

KLAMATH COUNTY

O'Connor Livestock Co.	51,142
------------------------	--------

MALHEUR COUNTY

Hyline Farms Co.	50,743
Fine Sheep Co.	50,570
Skyline Farms	34,619
Murakami Farms, Inc.	21,666

Total payees in county (4)	157,598
----------------------------	---------

MORROW COUNTY

Ralph S. Crum	40,125
Shirley Rugg	35,148
Frank Anderson	34,308
Krebs Bros., Inc.	33,655
Jack Sumner	33,426
Marquardt Ranch	27,862
Harvey Smith	25,239
Amanda S. Duvall	24,943
Porter Peringer, Inc.	22,094
Patrick Cutsforth	21,993
Fairview Ranch, Inc.	21,343
Nelson & Tucker	20,495

Total payees in county (12)	340,631
-----------------------------	---------

POLK COUNTY

R. L. Walker Farms, Inc.	24,496
--------------------------	--------

SHERMAN COUNTY

Powell Goodin Farms	27,923
W. F. Wallace	25,311
F. L. Watkins	21,657
Richelderfer Ranch	20,498

Total payees in county (4)	95,394
----------------------------	--------

UMATILLA COUNTY

Cunningham Sheep Co.	62,862
B. L. Davis Ranch, Inc.	56,152
Robert G. Bafus	55,237
Hill Ranches, Inc.	40,940
Johns Smith & Beamer	40,877
Glenn Thorne	40,668
Barnett Rugg, Inc.	33,429
McCormach Bros.	33,414
Hawkins Co., Inc.	30,333
Martin H. Buchanan	30,068
Joe P. Doherty Sheep Ranch, Inc.	29,384
Copplinger & Son Ranches	28,156
H. T. Rea, Inc.	26,758
Don A. Woodward Farms, Inc.	26,233
O. L. Straughan & Sons	25,689
Hoelt Ranches, Inc.	24,313
T. M. Campbell	24,063
Raymond & Son, Inc.	23,728
Purchase Ranches	23,472
David Casper Ranch	23,310
John P. Weidert	22,611
Engdahl Ranches	22,488
R. & T. Ranches	22,484
V. R. Ranch	22,296
Harold G. Kleinbach	22,005
Richard Hampton	21,856
Price & Ledbetter	21,649
S. E. Brogotti	21,495
Lieullen Ranch Inc.	21,459
Tubbs Ranch	21,269
G. M. Ransier	20,632
Robert Rothrock	20,200
Faye Mann	20,051

Total payees in county (33) 959,581

UNION COUNTY

Sylvan Rasmussen	22,533
Acala Storage Co.	20,381
Stanley Weishaar	20,087

Total payees in county (3) 63,001

WASCO COUNTY

The Miller Ranch Co.	36,758
Underhill Ranch	24,566

Total payees in county (2) 61,324

Total payees in State (70) 2,010,439

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—excluding loans—Pennsylvania

LEHIGH COUNTY

James DeLong	32,832
--------------	--------

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

Schoeneck Farms, Inc.	41,807
Howard Seiple	32,166

Total payees in county (2) 73,973

Total payees in State (3) 106,805

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—South Carolina

ABBEVILLE COUNTY

S. F. Sherard, Sr.	30,447
Howard Powell	21,112

Total payees in county (2) 51,559

AIKEN COUNTY

Milton Stack	41,167
H. O. Coward & Son	34,724
Robert E. Scott	32,227
M. R. Warner & Son, Inc.	31,573
McElmurray Farm, Inc.	29,158
K. L. Flanders	26,265
Garvin Brothers	24,998
Mackey Scott & Sons	24,298
John Anderson	23,482
Carl E. Brown	22,233

Mackey Scott, Jr.	22,049
W. J. Dunbar	21,722
Weeks Farm, Inc.	21,401
Fred W. Plunkett	20,300

Total payees in county (14) 375,597

ALLENDALE COUNTY

J. E. Kirkland, Jr.	50,589
W. M. Terry	54,839
J. V. Spigener	33,408
W. R. Johns, Jr.	32,514
Cecil L. Dunbar	29,473
J. S. McMillan	26,485
J. D. Rouse	24,771
W. Ben Oswald	23,333
N. B. Loadholt	22,930
G. L. Rouse	22,538
John S. Oswald	21,451
B. H. Loadholt	21,332
C. O. Handberry	21,135
H. A. Kears	20,657

Total payees in county (14) 414,455

ANDERSON COUNTY

Lee Dobbins	62,716
W. M. Bolt	28,368

Total payees in county (2) 91,084

BAMBERG COUNTY

H. W. Herndon	58,075
H. D. Free	49,471
George Cogburn	44,373
Henry F. Bamberg III	44,020
H. L. Free	30,767
Francis M. Kears	25,948
Otto Boltin	23,809

Total payees in county (7) 276,463

BARNWELL COUNTY

Harold R. Lott	51,771
J. B. Weeks, Jr.	36,553
J. David Bodiford	34,957
W. H. Hutto, Jr.	31,880
Birt and Keel	29,434
Ted W. Craig	25,031
Hagood and Richardson	21,028
Bruce O. Bates	20,650
Thomas E. Greene	20,650
M. N. Bates	20,338
Joe J. Bates	20,180
H. D. Still, Jr.	20,122

Total payees in county (12) 332,594

BERKELEY COUNTY

Robert F. Marlon	33,291
R. M. and R. C. Dennis, Ex.	27,875

Total payees in county (2) 61,166

CALHOUN COUNTY

W. W. Wannamaker Seed Farms	54,975
Wiles Farm	53,497
Ralph Troutman	49,680
Felkel and Hungerpiller	48,593
F. M. Wannamaker, Jr.	39,818
F. M. Wannamaker, Sr.	39,818
W. Wesley Stabler	38,576
Blackwoods Farm	37,754
Raymond B. Ayers	37,305
L. B. Wannamaker Seed Co.	36,476
D. S. Davis	35,794
John C. Bickley	34,878
J. Hubert Robinson	34,669
G. C. Bull	33,155
James D. Rast, Jr.	31,897

Edward M. Rast	31,897
Lang Syne Farm	26,985
Halgler Bros.	26,207
J. L. Wannamaker	25,640
A. F. Brown, Jr.	24,637
J. P. Felkel	21,649
Moss H. Perrow	20,520
W. J. Houck	20,346

Total payees in county (23) 804,766

CHEROKEE COUNTY

Robert G. Scruggs	35,334
-------------------	--------

CHESTER COUNTY

H. H. Robinson	55,203
John H. Neely, Jr.	36,940
J. H. Chappell	28,947
Robert W. Lee	25,134
John H. Neely	20,826
James C. Wilson	20,392

Total payees in county (6) 187,442

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY

Benjamin L. Norwood	52,987
King Farms, Inc.	42,990
Burr Farms	41,851
James C. Phillips	26,245
J. Calvin Rivers Farms, Inc.	25,729
Frank E. Ousley	23,964
Vonelm Crawford	23,172
James Chappell Hurst	22,586
J. Calvin Rivers, Jr., partner	22,411
Hector R. McLeod	21,434
Thomas R. King	21,389
Hazel Z. Mills	21,300
G. E. King, Jr.	20,368

Total payees in county (13) 366,426

CLARENDON COUNTY

H. Fox Tindal	62,873
Samuel E. Durant	59,464
James B. Tidwell	51,299
Tarheel Coals, Inc.	46,592
Charles N. Plowden	43,833
Durant Brothers	43,330
D. Leslie Tindal	41,710
Paul Burke	38,638
D. C. Elliott	37,127
Ralph Bell, Jr.	32,926
Jack Witherspoon Farms, Inc.	32,608
R. V. Elliott	31,157
Felder Farms, Inc.	30,796
Rickenbaker and Sconyers	30,348
J. R. Briggs	28,891
R. N. Johnson	28,648
C. D. Smith, Jr.	26,912
John K. Brogdon	26,195
W. D. Harrington	25,970
Bob Finney	25,738
G. H. Hardy	25,182
E. A. Lewis	24,983
Rickenbaker Gin, Inc.	22,503
M. E. Dubose	22,469
R. L. Gayle	22,329
S. Bethea Floyd	21,760
W. J. Rawlinson	20,935
W. W. Rowe	20,667
L. E. Elmore	20,591
W. J. Jackson, Jr.	20,513

Total payees in county (30) 966,987

DARLINGTON COUNTY

Cokers Ped Seed Co.	64,671
William Howard, Jr.	56,025
Gary E. Byrd, Jr.	53,732
Rollins Culpepper	50,223
A. R. Mims	37,699
Laurie C. Lawson	34,438
Posey D. Kelley	33,845
Olin B. Kirven, Sr. & Jr.	33,808
Raymond Amerson	33,600
J. T. Ross	26,352
G. Graham Segars	25,029
Henry Grady	23,507

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—South Carolina—Continued

L. L. Gandy	22,925
A. F. Woodard, Jr.	22,573
Dewitt Farms, Inc.	21,473
J. O. Huggins	21,422
Winston L. Cooley	21,118
Milton H. Anderson, Jr.	20,339

Total payees in county (18) 602,779

R. L. McLaurin & Sons	58,017
Brown & Marion R. McCallum	53,147
L. S. McColl, Jr.	51,614
Henry C. Quick, Jr.	46,099
H. F. Price & Sons	35,896
Nell D. McLaurin	34,550
Bruce Price	33,506
Pee Dee Growers Inc.	32,097
D. L. Coleman & Sons	31,339
Lloyd Page & Sons	30,677

DILLON COUNTY

A. M. McDonald	25,603
Myrtle G. Howell	25,156
Nell J. McCrimmon	23,776
Grady Jones	20,543

Total payees in county (14) 502,020

DORCHESTER COUNTY

W. S. and J. D. Canaday	28,721
-------------------------	--------

EDGEFIELD COUNTY

Cecil Yonce, Jr.	43,144
Bennie H. Willing	28,660
J. M. Smith, Jr.	27,080
C. L. Clark	25,243
R. W. & Rembert C. Dubose	23,220
G. C. Holmes & Sons	22,457

Total payees in county (6) 169,804

FLORENCE COUNTY

E. S. Willis, Jr.	67,376
Billy E. Graham	56,196
Roger D. Prince	54,919
C. Allan Young, Jr.	44,960
Harlee Brothers	25,122

Total payees in county (5) 248,573

GREENVILLE COUNTY

Allen M. Knight	22,727
-----------------	--------

GREENWOOD COUNTY

Calvin W. Kinard	39,600
L. B. Adams	21,898

Total payees in county (2) 61,498

HAMPTON COUNTY

Hugh T. Lightsey	61,118
C. P. Barnes	44,602
Corrin Bowers	41,905
Jimmie McMillan	30,873
David McKenzie	23,091
Carol Dobson	21,273
E. H. Hanna, Jr.	20,032

Total payees in county (7) 242,894

KERSHAW COUNTY

Lugoff Farms, Inc.	58,983
Robert M. Marsh	38,158

Total payees in county (2) 92,141

LAURENS COUNTY

Billy Deshields	46,796
J. T. Hollingsworth	35,554
John M. Simmons	23,381

Total payees in county (3) 105,731

LEE COUNTY

W. A. Berry	61,527
R. V. Segars, Sr.	59,341
C. B. Player, Jr.	58,226
Marion J. Barnes	58,204
Mayesville Farms, Inc.	58,165
C. E. Atkinson	57,874
James T. Smith III	56,970
B. J. Barnett	56,832
Richard and Julia Hearon	56,259
E. Brad McCutchen	56,192
McCutchen, F. M., Trading Co., Inc.	56,065
Clyburn Bros. & Son	56,064
Lee County Farms	56,012
E. B. McCutchen	55,815
John Wesley Woodham, Jr.	54,994
H. B. Turner	53,651
Jack Woodham	51,509
M. N. White	50,045
James Thomas Woodham	48,003
S. McBride Rhodes, Jr.	47,238
J. E. Atkinson	45,404
Manning Richardson	44,974
H. W. Shaw & Son	43,690
James W. Scott, Jr.	41,927
Don R. McDaniel	40,969
Willis Woodham	39,503
H. W. Shaw, Sr.	39,004
W. A. Dabbs	38,755
B. K. Phillips	37,845
Calvin Joyner	37,591
Annette C. Tiller	36,608
Hamilton Corbett	35,538
L. M. Chewning	35,111
Katherine P. Stokes	31,521
Wyman O. McDaniel	29,212
E. Henry Goza	28,336
Mason R. Mathis	27,882
D. D. Grant & Son	26,606
Don D. Grant	25,288
James K. Alexander	23,805
R. V. Segars, Jr.	23,777
Dale W. Player	21,780
H. L. Johnson	21,165
C. F. Reames	20,844
D. L. Reames	20,844
Wallace Deschamps	20,663
H. R. Colclough	20,141

Total payees in county (47) 1,967,269

John H. Dowd 30,024

LEXINGTON COUNTY

Don. W. Jeffcoat	29,319
Fogle Bros.	27,352

Total payees in county (3) 86,695

MARION COUNTY

E. J. Wiggins, Jr., Estate	31,887
----------------------------	--------

MARLBORO COUNTY

Claude P. Polston, Jr.	64,075
J. Frank McLaurin, Jr.	60,544
Hubbard W. McDonald	57,639
Pence, Inc.	55,629
Lawrence E. Pence	54,870
Jackie M. Polston	54,417
Ernest C. McInnis Estate	53,146
Brooks Odum	52,649
E. M. O'Tuel	52,414
Thomas A. O'Neal, Jr.	51,217
David K. Lynch	47,011
Charles E. Lynch	47,011
A. L. Calhoun, Jr., Co.	44,968
Maxie H. Kinard	44,740
Marlboro Farms, Inc.	44,036
B. Gilbert Floyd	42,628
Charles A. O'Neal	41,747
Marion F. Wright	41,239
D. H. McQuage, Jr.	39,175
Frank B. Rogers, Jr.	39,015
Frank R. Quick	38,766
John W. Liles	37,148
John F. Everett	36,600

J. G. Hubbard	36,448
Hugh Driggers	35,011
Noah A. Usher, Jr.	34,356
Leon Driggers	34,249
George B. Kerr, Inc.	34,238
W. Alex Hinson	33,629
F. M. Hinson	32,566
William P. Wallace	32,400
Jimmie C. Baker	31,722
Julian M. Drake	30,305
William C. Covington	29,989
Ralph Usher	28,242
Jimmy P. Wallace	27,501
D. M. Cottingham, Jr.	25,791
Robert Stillwell	25,078
Jimmy B. Hinson, Jr.	24,866
W. Lee Carabo	24,542
E. Roy Newton	24,492
Dorris W. Floyd	24,029
Lawrence S. Norton	23,167
John McInnis	22,779
Joseph P. Hodges	22,689
Leroy M. Stanton	22,419
Angus G. Newton	22,416
Clemon Kimrey	20,537

Total payees in county (48) 1,804,145

M'CORMICK COUNTY

James Tate	24,059
------------	--------

OCONEE COUNTY

Fred E. Anderson	20,214
------------------	--------

ORANGEBURG COUNTY

J. W. Williamson Co.	48,064
Vallentines	46,867
John David Clark	46,823
J. M. Russell, Jr.	46,806
Rowesville Farmers Gin Inc.	41,637
Thomas B. Jackson, Jr.	39,507
C. & S. Farms Inc.	39,433
E. S. Bonnett, Jr.	36,424
Woodford Gin Co., Inc.	35,820
W. B. Bookhart	35,759
Magnolia Lane Farm	34,162
Mattie Mae P. Gasque	31,475
E. E. Gasque, Jr.	31,475
Julian C. Crum	30,322
T. J. Wiggins & Son	29,933
W. G. & F. H. Irick	28,623
J. Walter Whisenhunt	28,057
Earl J. Smoak	28,339
Norman V. Hughes	26,948
M. L. McIver	25,692
Robert L. Polin	24,536
Jimmie Ott	24,422
Vance Farm Center	24,332
R. L. Zeigler, Jr.	23,720
W. D. Culler	23,244
Harvey M. Bates	23,002
Robert B. Shuler	22,296
Fred Lawton Irick	22,295
Hugo L. Felkel	21,618
Kenneth W. Bickley	21,229
L. M. Ott	20,479
Johnny Fogle	20,469
Garrick Bros., A Part	20,336

Total payees in county (33) 1,004,594

RICHLAND COUNTY

R. A. Page	50,671
Willis M. Clarkson	37,099
Robert Lee Scarborough	26,437

Total payees in county (3) 114,207

SALUDA COUNTY

Harold E. Frick	35,416
R. M. Watsons Sons	35,192
O. T. Price, Jr.	30,812

Total payees in county (3) 101,420

SPARTANBURG COUNTY	
James W. Cox	50,848
Edward Antley	28,278
Gary Brockman	23,142
Donald L. Dillard	20,560

Total payees in county (4) - 122,828

SUMTER COUNTY	
J. F. Bland, Jr.	61,136
Scape Ore Farms, Inc.	60,028
J. E. Mayes	59,353
William Rhodes Mayes, Jr.	59,317
W. R. Mayes	59,317
James F. Bland III	55,000
T. D. Keels	45,922
Marvell W. Goza	44,472
B. J. Barnett, Inc.	43,452
Booth Farms, Inc.	40,944
H. D. Barnett Etal	37,345
J. M. Edens and Son	33,626
Charles A. Segars	33,603
J. M. Edens	32,488
H. C. & H. C. Edens, Jr.	30,840
Sammie L. Yarborough, Jr.	29,843
Riverdale Farms, Inc.	26,816
Clayton Lowder	25,948
John M. Shiver	24,331
Frances I. Davis	24,016
J. H. Montgomery, Jr.	23,763
E. S. Godbold	23,500
Ralph W. Bleasdale	22,663
S. A. Harvin	21,954
E. L. Evans	20,835

Total payees in county (25) - 940,512

WILLIAMSBURG COUNTY	
S. Wayne Gamble	55,697
Roy J. McFadden	48,073
Joe Daves	36,792
Gene Daves	29,645
D. Dean Boyd	24,417
Ronald L. Boyd	23,963
Eva P. Chappell	21,856

Total payees in county (7) - 184,746

Total payees in State (361) - 12,499,034

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—South Dakota

BENNETT COUNTY	
Elkhorn Farm	37,945
John Hippen	23,417
John F. Knecht	20,280

Total payees in county (3) - 81,642

BROWN COUNTY	
Clark Bros. Inc.	40,997

BUFFALO COUNTY	
James S. Brown	20,366

BUTTE COUNTY	
McLeod Smith Ranches & Farms	54,478
Goeringer Farm	27,081
Earl W. Clarkson Co., Inc.	25,932

Total payees in county (3) - 107,491

CORSON COUNTY	
Young Inc.	20,779

DAY COUNTY	
Hansmeier & Son, Inc.	30,094
Peterson, Inc.	20,926

Total payees in county (2) - 51,020

DEWEY COUNTY	
Almond D. Hunt	25,801

EDMUNDS COUNTY	
Plainview Hutterian Assn.	26,274
Petersen Farms, Inc.	22,597

Total payees in county (2) - 48,871

FAULK COUNTY	
State of S. Dak.	26,814
Lloyd Harmon	22,375
Fred G. Boysen	21,074

Total payees in county (3) - 70,263

HAAKON COUNTY	
W. R. Lee	23,868
J. Tipps Hamilton	25,309
W. A. Hickman	24,317

Total payees in county (3) - 78,494

HUGHES COUNTY	
Leon Crain	37,592
Clyde Colson	26,700
Guy F. Barnes, Inc.	23,529
A. L. Jones	20,475

Total payees in county (4) - 108,296

JONES COUNTY	
Daum Brothers	28,833

LYMAN COUNTY	
Leo J. Terca	24,686
Alfred Ehlers	24,660
Rex C. Brown	23,117
Gary Halvorson	20,415

Total payees in county (4) - 92,878

MARSHALL COUNTY	
Ray S. Jarrett	37,331
Dalton Docter	21,049

Total payees in county (2) - 58,380

MEADE COUNTY	
William Simons	28,853

PENNINGTON COUNTY	
Leonel M. Jensen	21,194

PERKINS COUNTY	
O. Theo Beckman	26,621
Christman Bros.	24,362
Ham Bros., Inc.	21,850

Total payees in county (3) - 72,833

POTTER COUNTY	
James L. Taylor	28,090
Eldon Smith	25,735
Don Kunstle	24,043
Dakota Cattle Co.	23,868
Sherman Neal Jesse Rausch P.	22,413
Daniel Cronin	22,311
Robert Houck	21,950

Total payees in county (7) - 168,410

SANBORN COUNTY	
Vernon Amick	30,368

SHANNON COUNTY	
Orville Schwarting	27,184
R. W. Will	23,346

Total payees in county (2) - 50,530

SPINK COUNTY	
Glendale Colony	41,080
Hammer Bros.	23,823
Hudson Farms	22,121

Total payees in county (3) - 87,024

STANLEY COUNTY	
E. Vernon Sivage	26,371

SULLY COUNTY	
W. J. Asmussen	68,784
C. A. Cannon III	53,154
Kinkler Farms, Inc.	47,995
Dean Nelson	47,857
D. L. Anderson Corp.	46,749
Stanley Asmussen	46,662
Jerome J. Weinheimer	38,080
Ken R. Huse	36,741
Minder Brothers	29,835
Elton Eller	28,876
Robert E. Duncan	24,226
John W. McSpadden	24,136
Lyle W. Ebert	20,998

Total payees in county (13) - 514,093

TRIPLIFF COUNTY	
Bartley Mills	26,902
Van Collins	21,886

Total payees in county (2) - 48,288

TURNER COUNTY	
Bones Hereford Ranch, Inc.	26,676

Total payees in State (66) - 1,908,781

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Tennessee

CARROLL COUNTY	
John A. Shoaf	32,295
Larry D. Townsend	26,393

Total payees in county (2) - 58,688

CHESTER COUNTY	
Talley & Talley	28,081

CROCKETT COUNTY	
James F. Jordan	56,074
Steve Harper	55,536
C. D. Cooke	52,923
Donny Cooke	50,629
John East	42,200
H. H. & F. W. Raines	32,385
Donald Prescott	31,557
Joe H. Carter	26,955
J. M. Cherry	24,392
Billy D. Brown	22,725
Eli Young	22,086
Max Cates	21,363
J. B. Beard	20,620
Billy Spence	20,411
Farrow Knox	20,275

Total payees in county (15) - 500,131

DYER COUNTY	
Charles & Elvin Miller	27,914
Carlos Johns	20,933

Total payees in county (2) - 48,847

FAYETTE COUNTY	
Jerry Skelton	55,958
Cowan Bros.	51,150
Fowler Moore Moore Fowler	42,355

FAYETTE COUNTY	
Ames Plantation	40,065
B. L. Davis	37,209
L. J. & J. A. Williams	36,804
H. H. Farley	35,767
Gordon Tomlin	35,259
Allien M. Dunn	32,573
Jimmy Kilby, Jr.	31,610
J. W. Owen	30,453
J. M. Caudle	25,722
Davis Bros.	24,892
Howard Carpenter	24,469
Rhea V. Taylor, Jr.	23,648
Cooper Skelton	23,550

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Tennessee—Continued

William B. Cowan, Jr.	22,975
C. F. Redfearn	21,497
William M. Tomlin	21,254
Thomas H. McNeill	21,017
J. M. Sullivan, Jr.	20,838
Longtown Supply Co., Inc.	20,200

Total payees in county (22) 679,265

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Emmett Owens	56,516
David R. Owens	56,422
O. R. Collins, Jr.	41,081

Total payees in county (3) 154,019

GIBSON COUNTY

Bobby Harper	45,095
Kermit Cates	32,645
Billy Woods	30,377
James T. Graves	22,542
Will Jere Pillow	21,540
Willie T. Crocker	20,830
H. L. Tracy	20,519

Total payees in county (7) 193,548

GILES COUNTY

White & Witt	25,718
--------------	--------

HARDEMAN COUNTY

J. L. Chambers	58,469
Jimmie Ervin	27,257
J. W. Bishop	27,097
G. B. Ervin	25,719
Harlan Wooten	25,676
O. E. Harris, Jr.	25,119

Total payees in county (6) 189,337

HARDIN COUNTY

T. J. White	26,670
-------------	--------

HAYWOOD COUNTY

Tommy B. Willis	40,901
Charles Haynes	39,511
Glenn Lonon	37,737
Billy Frank Morris	35,234
Caudell Coburn	33,515
James Coffman	32,693
M. Carter, Jr.	24,954
C. A. Porch	22,698
John W. Moses III	22,324
Allen King	22,084
Robert A. Mann, Jr.	21,631
Floyd Qualls	21,064
Billy Solomon	20,867
Foncie Morris	20,309

Total payees in county (14) 395,522

LAKE COUNTY

W. T. Jamison, Jr.	67,851
Tipton Bros. and Sullivan	41,544
Bruce D. Wyatt	41,047
William E. Lindamood	40,594
Charles R. Patterson	38,798
W. E. & Bruce Dunlap	36,044
George Dial	34,738
Leonard Fisher	33,750
Nard Shull	28,535
Joe Dale Barker	26,338
Frank T. Markham	26,061
Margaret Jackson	24,488
Wm. E. Paschall	23,705
John W. Paschall	23,406
Lymon Barker	22,568
Joe Schenk	21,445
Fred A. Wortman	20,984
G. F. Parker	20,753
Jack Haynes	20,699

Jack Fields	20,461
Wade Lannom	20,142

Total payees in county (21) 633,951

LAUDERDALE COUNTY

George Lawson, Elder	58,615
Ft. Pillow State Farm	45,070
William H. Moore	38,938
Jimmy Fullen	34,711
Stephen M. Pullen	34,711
Tendel Farms	34,621
Clyde Younger	27,899
Dunrovin Farms	26,423
Fullen Farm Inc.	25,293
Albert Leland Jennings	24,197
Robert J. Reviere	22,872
Jammie P. Elder	21,222
Henderson Bros	20,655

Total payees in county (13) 415,227

LAWRENCE COUNTY

Gordon Barksdale	56,081
Olan Brazier	22,932
Clyde Gillespie	20,737

Total payees in county (3) 99,750

LINCOLN COUNTY

M. M. Delap and Sons	41,768
James R. Turman	23,464
Gilbert Bradley	22,064

Total payees in county (3) 87,296

MADISON COUNTY

Jessie Collins	44,811
Neely Robley	40,643
James Shellabarger	26,638
James Sharp	23,315
P. J. Haynes	22,227
Roy Haynes, Jr.	20,627

Total payees in county (6) 178,261

M'NAIRY COUNTY

James E. Smith	29,493
A. J. Mitchell	20,387

Total payees in county (2) 49,880

OBION COUNTY

Floyd Yarbrow	23,307
---------------	--------

RUTHERFORD COUNTY

James R. Donnell	25,440
------------------	--------

SHELBY COUNTY

Belz Investment Co., Inc.	58,727
Horne Bros	54,029
Douglas L. Walker	53,274
H. S. Mitchell	53,245
John O. Moore	45,611
Robert January	41,846
Thurman Chapman	37,611
Cedar Hill Farms	31,597
T. A. Densford, Sr.	29,536
T. A. Densford, Jr.	29,536
J. H. Densford	29,534
James L. Mann	29,110
James E. Cowles	28,590
Hardy Johnson	28,513
Aubrey Howell	28,153
Paw Paw Block Farm	27,889
Harold Ticer	26,664
William K. Bolton	25,589
D. Herbert Sigler	23,239
E. F. Crenshaw	22,365

Total payees in county (20) 704,658

TIPTON COUNTY

Charles L. Walker	51,775
Horace E. Moore & Sons	50,414
R. W. Anderson	48,895
John A. McIntyre	38,719
Bill Trantham	38,514
Marvin Johnson	38,314

William D. Ray	35,551
Johnson Brothers	35,514
John C. Balton	30,850
Marcless Sneed	29,345
Herbert Parr	27,751
L. E. W. F. & M. B. Davis	25,852
Austin E. Anderson	25,648
Hugh Wilbur Hill	24,501
Dewey Pinner	24,044
Sammy Smith	22,770
J. M. McCalla, Jr.	22,356
Troy E. Hopkins	20,824
Joe Christmas	20,497

Total payees in county (19) 612,134

Total payees in State (163) 5,129,730

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas

ANDREWS COUNTY

Gene Irin	56,310
D. G. Chiles	54,630
C. C. Shortes	44,952
W. H. Vanlandingham	42,211
T. A. Wartes	38,272
Marvin Hays	36,783
C. W. Callaway	34,931
R. D. Russell	26,240
70 Ranch	24,549
Leslie Emfinger	21,236
Flying N Ranch	20,119

Total payees in county (11) 400,233

ARKANSAS COUNTY

B. E. S. Co.	24,504
--------------	--------

ARMSTRONG COUNTY

Delmar Durrett	61,890
Parker Cattle Co.	28,062
James Bible	25,928

Total payees in county (3) 115,880

AUSTIN COUNTY

Max J. Zapalac	24,812
----------------	--------

BAILEY COUNTY

J. Bert Williams	74,384
Carl Bamert	70,201
Horace Hutton	64,497
W. T. Millen	56,032
Randy Johnson	55,431
J. G. Arnn	52,290
James Adolph Greener	47,552
B. J. Gable	44,522
John R. Young	42,932
W. B. Little	40,799
Homer Richardson	37,981
O. A. Jones	37,167
Buffalo Farms, Inc.	36,513
Charles L. Lucy	36,176
J. F. Furgeson	35,856
J. L. Thomas	35,671
T. D. Davis	35,500
Jim Claunch	35,394
J. P. Tarlton	35,093
W. M. Pool	34,943
Jesse Carter	33,825
Jack Schuster	31,870
Wilbert Kalbas	29,941
Finis Verley Kimbrough	29,383
Bernard Phelps	28,972
Lester Howard	28,764
C. J. Feagley	28,033
Elmer L. Hargrove	27,898
A. R. McGuire	27,787
C. K. Corbell	27,120
John W. Gunter	27,057
Weldon Avery	26,232
Jim Pat Claunch	26,155
Lewis Brothers	25,865
Marvin May	25,378
Bennie Claunch	25,368
J. R. Austin, Jr.	25,059
D. E. Benham	24,804
W. Lewis Scoggin	24,766

Freddie Parkman	24,534
James Gore	23,869
Ben Roming	23,514
Jim Johnson	23,235
Snider Farms, Inc.	23,174
Jimmy Harris	23,152
Don Lowe	23,100
Johnnie Prater	22,995
Robert Claunch	22,821
Joe L. Smallwood	22,805
Ed Pete Caswell Trst	22,456
Richard E. Black	22,244
C. L. Saylor	22,006
Robert Nunnally	21,990
Billie Marlow	21,821
Howard J. Hale	21,803
A. P. Fred	21,549
Byron Gwyn	21,450
Billy D. Bell	21,369
Aubrey Heathington	21,264
Lewis Wayne Shafer	21,070
W. T. Watson	20,810
W. L. Welch	20,713
Austin Bros.	20,686
Doyce Turner	20,521
W. D. Lackey	20,484
W. E. Latimer	20,446
Leldon Phillips	20,439
Gene Bartley	20,390
Van Rogers	20,159

Total payees in county (69) - 2,090,080

BAYLOR COUNTY	
Bobby G. Brock	37,458
Megargel Drilling Co.	24,211
Emitt Golden & Co.	23,303

Total payees in county (3) - 84,972

BEE COUNTY	
Beasley Farms Inc.	38,365
Amko Farming Inc.	24,152

Total payees in county (2) - 62,517

BELL COUNTY	
C. B. Hodge	42,474
William A. Hudgens	42,021
Lewis Farms	35,672
Gary Hudgens	28,533
Zed C. Lancaster, Jr.	26,297

Total payees in county (5) - 174,997

BORDEN COUNTY	
John Springer Stephens	62,339
H. D. & Kent Holmes	35,373
John S. Stephens, Jr.	33,794
Harold William Ludecke	28,574
C. C. Nunnally	25,643
J. E. Nance, Jr.	24,332
Pat N. Hensley	23,931
Harold Wade	23,387
Harlin D. Williams	23,152
Kenneth D. Williams	22,363
Kenneth Wayne Smith	22,224
Hubert W. Walker	21,028
Garland Doyle	20,659
Robert C. Daugherty	20,198
Jackie Dean Wolf	20,105

Total payees in county (15) - 407,102

BOWIE COUNTY	
Mary Ann Wilson	64,448
James R. Killion	64,168
H. L. Vance	63,543
Elwood Elkins	59,824
George H. Vance	54,960
Eddie Blackmon, Jr.	52,559
D. P. T. Farris, Inc.	47,314
William H. Farris	42,961
Bentley Johnson Farms, Inc.	38,815
Guy W. Farris	33,456
Norman Moser	24,495
Gordon Martin	20,667

Total payees in county (12) - 568,210

BRAZOS COUNTY	
Tom J. Moore	93,668
Harry H. Moore	70,047
Robert T. Moore	65,142
L. C. Frede	57,082
Sam Morello	56,230
Tony Varisco, Jr.	53,139
J. P. Terrell Est.	42,180
W. J. Terrell	41,452
Don Angonia	40,749
Vince Court	25,613
Joseph Cecil McCoury	25,327
Martin Meridian	22,136

Total payees in county (12) - 592,765

BREWSTER COUNTY	
McMullan and Sims	37,144
G. A. Morris	23,746
Jack Shely	23,307

Total payees in county (3) - 84,197

BRISCOE COUNTY	
L. O. Weak	52,459
Joe B. Mercer	48,791
Fred W. Mercer	43,292
G. W. Lee	41,041
Alva C. Jasper	32,865
Clyde Mercer	31,313
P. R. Sissney	29,254
J. D. McGavock	28,825
Harold Storie	25,808
Roy Montague	25,803
Ray Teesle	25,073
Cook & Cook	24,506
Allen Kellum	23,246
Gordon Montague	22,823
George Long	22,700
Theron Culwell	21,836
L. D. Griffin	20,590

Total payees in county (17) - 520,225

BROOKS COUNTY	
Robert Allen May	31,436

BROWN COUNTY	
Lillie E. Stevens	21,379

BURLESON COUNTY	
Est. Geo. C. Chance	69,399
Holland Porter	63,646
Pete J. Scamardo	49,846
Marion J. Malazzo	49,210
Luke Restivo	45,991
Mitt A. Bush	41,888
Marvin M. Porter Est.	40,950
H. H. and Edgar Baker	38,813
Phil Scamardo	36,432
Steve A. Scarmardo	34,561
Sandyr Scarmardo	34,466
G. R. Hutson	33,519
A. C. Sebesta and Sons	30,521
John W. Giesenschlag	24,062
Joe S. Campise	23,578
Henry Wagner	21,982

Total payees in county (16) - 638,864

CALDWELL COUNTY	
Terrell T. McGee	32,706
William H. Schroeder, Sr.	22,728
C. Fleetwood Richards, Jr.	22,620
Terrell E. Clark	21,515

Total payees in county (4) - 99,569

CALHOUN COUNTY	
Roy Smith	79,041
A. R. Vincik	35,959
Sanders Farms, Inc.	21,616
Alvin A. Hahn	20,986

Total payees in county (4) - 157,602

CAMERON COUNTY	
Billie Joe Simpson	59,952
Marel H. Wilson	59,419
James A. McCarthy	58,733
Carl Otsucl	57,613
Rio Grande Equip. Co.	56,848
John A. Abbott	56,500
Milton E. Wentz Jr.	55,706
Milton E. Wentz	55,701
Herbert W. Bode	52,514
Editha Bode	52,512
Oba D. L. Smith Farms	50,770
James D. Russell	50,193
Henry V. Macomb	50,185
Russell Farms	50,179
Joe S. Wolf	48,830
Martha M. Russell	48,679
Robert F. Ashley	48,482
Hollie C. Lewis	48,296
Robert L. Shuckman	48,119
Oscar Mayfield	47,911
Tommy Mayfield	47,909
Charles Mayfield	47,906
George Nixon	47,650
S. M. & W. M. Halbert	45,529
Bigham & Duncan	44,518
Island Farms, Inc.	44,418
Douglas S. Cantwell	43,230
L. R. Cherrington	43,191
Bauer Brothers	42,985
Melvin R. Davis	42,579
Rodolfo B. Samano	42,205
Herman Lynch	42,197
J. L. & Bill Gray	41,758
Ashley D. Youngblood	41,524
Oval A. Martin	41,415
Lewis A. Oakes	40,099
G. D. Morrow	40,054
Harvey L. Johnson	40,046
Est. J. Kelly Cain	39,768
Joe T. Maurin	39,006
E. Harvey Adams	38,595
James P. Labar	38,544
Howard B. Girault	37,355
Rex L. McGarr	37,192
Elward M. Smith	35,836
S. R. & C. D. Stone Trs	35,731
McHayden Dillard	35,347
Lamon & Lamon	34,912
Est. William J. Bryan	34,700
Thomas Schmitt	33,883
Dennis Schmitt	33,874
M. D. Bush	38,508
Charles J. Buchen	33,465
F. H. Cherrington	33,366
Elvin P. Pederson, Sr., Est.	32,382
Taylor Grain Co., Inc.	32,163
Charles L. Shofner	31,623
George L. Labar, Sr.	31,507
Joe W. Lane	31,361
J. G. Wreden	31,334
Ramona J. Wolf	31,323
Robert B. Ballenger	30,764
Charles E. Cherrington	30,611
Clifford L. Smith	30,470
W. B. Mack	30,288
Adolph Thomae, Jr.	30,207
Lester Nixon	29,414
Elijah B. Adams	28,781
Bob F. Morrow	28,748
Elliott Roberts Rch, Inc.	28,431
Hygeia Dairy Co.	28,382
Edward E. Billings	28,364
Robert Mathers	28,098
Charles Eubanks	27,841
James H. Eubanks	27,829
Oscar Eubanks	27,828
J. E. Bruce	27,732
Dean Cole	27,490
Lloyd G. Payne, Jr.	27,025
Eugene A. Eubanks	26,923
Quinton S. Kincannon et. ux	26,794
Martha D. Mercer, Jr.	26,307
Johnny J. Canville	26,231
Jerry Tanamachi	25,330
Sams Porter Corp.	25,292
Crowe & Crowe	25,060
Harry H. Shimotsu	25,057
Ross D. Waters	24,841
Crockett Groves, Inc.	24,684
Loop Farms	24,574
Kenneth Shimotsu	24,455

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program pay-
ments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding
loans—Texas—Continued

Pilar Cabrera	24, 387
Joe E. McCain	24, 253
Premier Farms, Inc.	24, 236
George & Sam Taylor	24, 229
Reynaldo Ramirez	24, 193
Kitamura Brothers	24, 132
Edwin W. Caughfield	24, 017
Lois C. Bourne	23, 806
Billy N. Cantwell	23, 304
Harry J. Garrett	23, 280
Clement T. Cholic	23, 245
Joe G. Ballenger	23, 074
Walter L. Clore	22, 909
Jackson Est & D. E. Jackson, Jr.	22, 841
James S. Norris	22, 825
777 Ranch	22, 638
Roy W. Renfrow	22, 610
W. H. Thompson	22, 491
Francis L. Phillipp	22, 110
John P. Cholic	22, 103
Leonard P. Simmons, Jr.	21, 881
Garvin B. Macomb	21, 632
Peters Brothers	21, 624
Ronald E. Waters	21, 456
Dba Taubert Bros.	21, 418
Jan H. Heaton	21, 331
George L. Labar, Jr.	21, 214
Jack N. Sutter	20, 884
Lawrence J. Phillipp	20, 639
Graham B. Smith, Jr.	20, 561
Horace Wells	20, 251
Lloyd G. Brotzman	20, 219
Carl L. Bauer	20, 190
Walt O. Waters	20, 176
Jess and Warren Willard	20, 121
Dos Lagunas, Inc.	20, 031

Total payees in county
(127) ----- 4, 257, 297

CARSON COUNTY

Texas Tech Research Farm	57, 384
Frank Robinson	55, 033
Roman J. Friemel	46, 186
Sam Kotara	33, 569
John D. Kelly, Jr.	32, 745
Clinton Williams	30, 345
J. B. McCray	27, 534
Raymond Blodgett	26, 277
A. L. Stovall	25, 535
Albert Weinheimer	24, 438
G. A. Mahler, Jr.	24, 261
E. T. Ross	24, 081
H. L. Beddingfield	22, 660
Leonard Olson	22, 630
B. F. Urbanczyk	22, 478
R. J. Kuehler	22, 336
Frank Simms	21, 410
John Kotara, Jr.	21, 067
Jack Martin	21, 064
Fowler Bros. Pen	20, 144

Total payees in county	
(20) -----	581,177

CASTRO COUNTY

Jerry Cluck	95, 465
Hill Farms	92, 947
Homer Hill	90, 466
Carl Bruegei	87, 616
G. L. Willis, Jr.	79, 632
George Gabel	64, 972
J. F. Martin	59, 187
David Smith	57, 307
Clements Corp.	53, 360
Bill Rich	50, 390
Kenneth Heard	49, 558
Bob Dulaney	49, 283
Frank Wise	48, 694
Floyd Cole	47, 788
Donald J. Wright	47, 536
Geo. & Kenneth Frye	46, 918
Dan J. Heard	45, 600
Tom Miller	45, 563
Chas. E. Armstrong	44, 498

Jay Lee Touchstone	43, 781
Homer A. Hill	43, 609
Chas. Heck, Jr.	43, 497
B. L. Moore	42, 014
Gilbreath Farm Co.	41, 623
Shirley L. Garrison	41, 114
Jack Miller	40, 827
J. M. Young	40, 177
Clint B. McFarland	39, 770
Truman Touchstone	39, 475
Fred Bruegel, Jr.	39, 196
Milburn and Eddie Haydon	39, 155
Melvin Barton	38, 515
George C. Heard	38, 069
J. M. Wright	37, 488
Lloyd Farris	37, 361
Lorenzo Lee	37, 151
Allan Webb	37, 006
Margaret Ware Est.	35, 743
Truvis Campbell	35, 566
George Sides	35, 291
W. W. Lemons	35, 084
Ray Robertson	34, 884
Dick Ellis	33, 399
E. L. Howard	33, 337
H. C. Nelson	33, 033
Glenn Odom	32, 980
Woodrow Nelson & Sons	32, 775
Henry W. Golden	32, 437
Earl Harkins	32, 365
Paul T. Brooks	32, 292
Rodney Smith	31, 798
Lamar Found.	31, 250
Kent Gabel	30, 726
Harlan L. Barber	30, 597
Carl L. Kemp	29, 851
L. L. Shultz	29, 343
S. A. Hodges, Jr.	29, 183
Ivan L. Block	28, 378
W. B. Hammonds	28, 303
H. M. Boozer	28, 298
R. E. McDaniel	28, 219
Don Carpenter	28, 137
Lonnie Bell	28, 006
Carl King	27, 994
H. D. Smith	27, 601
Jess Willard	27, 528
E. Herring, Est.	27, 518
Jack George	27, 410
Pat Robbins	27, 378
Charles Rickard	27, 328
Odus Hastings	27, 260
Harvey C. Davis & Sons	26, 890
James Bradford	26, 851
Roger E. Haberer	26, 783
Tommy Stanton	25, 920
Clayton Graef	25, 806
Kenneth Christie Farm, Inc.	25, 572
James H. Bradley	25, 511
M. L. McFarland	25, 360
Clyde H. Damron	25, 290
Charles T. Noland	25, 081
Otto Steinberg	24, 828
Charles Nutt	24, 268
Jim Elder	24, 133
Joe Nelson	24, 121
H. J. Clark	24, 011
George Heck	23, 761
Andy Nelson	23, 576
Walter H. Schilling	23, 263
J. M. Snyder	23, 146
Calvin Petty	22, 976
Kenneth P. Hamilton	22, 708
Luke McGuire	22, 176
Paul W. Armstrong, Jr.	22, 152
R. R. Rule	21, 634
Roland Stevens	21, 604
Dale Winders	21, 583
Clyde Hancock	21, 336
J. D. Myrick	21, 218
Cleo I. Connell	21, 200
J. R. Matthews	21, 173
Ed Wilson	21, 134
T. G. McKinney	21, 011
Rayphard Smithson	20, 951
E. W. Foster	20, 851
Jerry Watts	20, 808
Geo. Ed Bennett	20, 790
David Nelson	20, 769
D. L. Thomason	20, 738

Ray Joe Riley	20,657
Bob Kay	20,559
Tom Lewis	20,451
George Bennett II	20,413
Frye Associates	20,389
Floyd Copeland	20,013

Total payees in county
(115) ----- 3,921,310

CHILDRESS COUNTY

Luther C. Hill	44, 334
Walter I. Lambert	38, 821
Vera Renfro	32, 869
Clinton B. Halford	32, 758
B. P. Henderson	31, 600
Derrill Nippert	26, 485
Arthur Kane	26, 436
Carroll Seal	25, 638
L. H. Felton	24, 773
Dean Decker	24, 509
Delbert Seal	24, 240
Douglas Seal	24, 220
Troy Boykin	23, 698
Ralph Sides	21, 820
Lilburn F. Cox	21, 101
Leeman Weir	20, 980
Fletcher Carter	20, 396

Total payees in county	
(17) -----	464,678

CLAY COUNTY

Herman Scheer-----	25,391
P. P. Langford, Jr-----	24,737
Parker & Mayo, Inc-----	20,793

Total payees in county	
(3) -----	70.921

COCHRAN COUNTY

F. O. Masten	79, 809
J. K. Griffith	77, 752
E. L. Polvado	62, 177
J. E. Polvado	61, 063
Mrs. Dona Doughty	60, 795
Jimmy Millar	58, 922
Bobby Smith	57, 518
J. G. Millar	55, 761
R. L. Polvado	55, 167
T. K. Williamson	54, 032
Ronald Coleman	50, 165
H. B. Barker	48, 111
Slaughter Hill Co.	47, 568
J. & M. Farm, Inc.	45, 623
Jim David and Sue Ratliff	45, 616
W. B. Merritt	44, 392
Clayton Stokes	44, 352
R. Hugh McKelvy	42, 783
Anella S. Bauer	40, 351
E. E. Silhan	38, 818
Dan Valentine	34, 966
J. D. Merritt	33, 841
J. M. Silhan	31, 135
Ike Williams	30, 722
Leonard O. Coleman	28, 945
B. H. Tucker	28, 029
C. E. Ratliff & Sons	26, 823
Leo P. Cunningham	26, 675
Emmett E. Thomas	25, 852
Hub Baggett	25, 285
Ernest Trull	24, 174
J. L. Schooler	24, 145
Dalton Redman	23, 682
C. C. Harvey	23, 176
W. L. Foust	22, 976
Lewis Sims	22, 553
Hub Cadenhead	22, 513
Danny Key	22, 496
Joe H. Bowers	22, 485
H. A. Lamb, Jr.	22, 404
Jack French	22, 395
Larry Edwin Baldwin	22, 014
Tom Silhan	21, 975
George G. Williams	21, 888
Raymon Hall	21, 748
Gaylon Baldwin	21, 201
Ira Brown	21, 162
Ken Wesley	21, 131

Charles Cumpton	21,090
W. D. Christian	20,997
Robert Yeary	20,695
Felix Silhan	20,567
Roy B. Davis	20,329
J. B. Nicewarner	20,322
A. R. Lamb	20,265
Owen Egger	20,100

Total payees in county (56) - 1,931,548

COKE COUNTY

J. O. Rudd	27,695
Gladys Clark	22,049

Total payees in county (2) - 49,744

COLLINGSWORTH COUNTY

Carthel G. Lewis	34,227
James Doneghy	26,968
Louis E. Allred	25,517
J. B. Killian	25,224
Wood & Wood	24,586
William R. Ward	24,467
John E. Forbis	23,054
Tommy Lewis	22,816
P. P. Fielding	22,030
Fred Covey	21,825
Olan Farris	21,707
Earl L. Bartlett	21,568
Bill James	20,867
Drury C. Lacy	20,841

Total payees in county (14) - 335,697

COLLIN COUNTY

Glynn Dodson	61,784
Welborn & Welborn	38,087
Eugene W. Settle	27,215
Warren H. Rousey	25,850
Edward R. Donihoo	24,023
Billy Joe Donihoo	22,702
Dwight D. Crigger	21,306
Charles E. Bell	21,251

Total payees in county (8) - 242,218

COLORADO COUNTY

T. Cattle Co.	43,711
Kenneth Mahalite	23,226

Total payees in county (2) - 66,937

CONCHO COUNTY

Jess Stephens Son	50,248
Arle E. Davis & Son	38,359
Adrian L. Fivash	36,094
Walter L. Pfluger	29,770
Monroe P. Dierschke	25,377
Emmett Pfluger	24,495
Jack V. Williams	21,173
Norman W. Krieg	20,895
Canning Wales	20,200

Total payees in county (9) - 266,611

CORYELL COUNTY

Bobby Latham	34,606
Robert J. Hunt	28,492

Total payees in county (2) - 63,098

COTTLE COUNTY

Donald D. Love	32,292
R. D. Wall, Jr.	31,165
Jack Tippen	28,294
Welton Fields	26,091
Don Brothers	26,087
Maggie B. and Irless Brooks	25,075
Lloyd Mayes	24,012
Lester Moss	23,535
J. T. Martin	23,028
H. W. Matney	22,183
R. C. Martin	21,788
James Sweeney	20,977

Woodrow D. Tucker	20,476
Suttle W. Majors	20,123

Total payees in county (14) - 345,126

CROCKETT COUNTY

TU Ranch Co.	48,256
W. W. West	43,481
John W. Childress	28,962
Joe Bean	26,441
Victor I. Pierce	25,976
Joe Tom Davidson	23,369
A. Millsbaugh	23,233
Mrs. Bill Hoover and Sons	21,837

Total payees in county (8) - 241,555

CROSBY COUNTY

John A. Wheeler	90,245
Donald Aycock	63,271
Delton Caddell	61,059
Bob Kimbrough	57,764
Lynn E. Campbell	55,803
Cleve Cypert	52,382
H. N. Watson, Jr.	51,894
W. O. Lockwood	51,531
G. J. Parkhill, Jr.	47,797
Luis Garcia/Sons, Inc.	47,361
Jesse L. Reese	45,582
Clyde Crausbay	44,293
D. J. Moses	44,255
Marvin O. Greer	42,888
J. P. Beck	42,255
W. T. Leon	41,751
Compton Cornelius	40,669
Lynn T. Smith	39,684
Elvis O. Martin	38,282
Darrell J. Dunn	38,050
C. L. Cowley, Jr.	37,839
Gene Fullingim	37,392
Marvin T. Heinrich	37,330
Bill N. Gilbreath	37,284
Elton Ellison	36,821
Kenneth Summerford	36,542
Tom F. Oats	36,123
David Prewitt	35,610
Robert Fullingim	35,578
R. H. Farris, Jr.	34,941
Clyde Crump	34,749
O. D. Moore	34,342
Rex Wheeler	34,172
Harold Hodges	34,131
L. Don Anderson	33,526
Carroll Himmel	33,371
Max Johnson	33,339
Wilson & Gray, Inc.	32,893
I. B. Davis	32,768
Mack Harmon	32,758
Claude Adams	32,486
J. B. Prewitt	32,292
Harvey Hancock	32,072
Craig McDonald	31,756
Jimmie W. Thornton	31,537
R. P. Kirkendall	31,529
John L. Haynes	31,420
James Caddell	30,907
Wright L. Carlisle	30,085
Lloyd Gambrel	29,739
Kenneth Gray	29,688
A. W. Marshall	29,620
Ray Marsh	29,310
Buster E. Smith	28,993
Joe Appling	28,704
Billy Crump	28,302
W. Clayton Sellers	28,250
George Cunningham	27,903
James K. Edinburgh	27,759
J. J. Griffin	27,438
J. W. Jackson	27,074
L. M. Powell	26,893
Anthony Latta	26,855
Dick Snodgrass	26,475
Jack E. Robertson	26,344
Roy Lee Ellis	26,297
Mitco, Inc.	26,201
Will D. Griffin	26,147
Ernest L. Harris	25,583

James W. Sales	25,522
Charles B. Gray	25,468
Alvin C. Morrison	25,426
Amon W. Proctor	25,270
Earl Edwards, Jr.	25,229
Thomas A. Poulson	25,040
Bobby H. Kendrick	24,959
T. W. Stockton, Jr.	24,927
Lloyd B. Parkhill	24,889
John H. Moore	24,871
Curtis M. Wheeler	24,540
James A. Boydston	24,450
John R. Green	24,084
SAE Inc.	24,014
J. R. Terrell	23,918
Billy Kirk	23,593
Donald Wooten	23,488
Neilton Chote	23,389
Dewey E. Wells, Jr.	23,363
F. Eugene Woodard	23,331
Wayne J. Parker	23,299
Harold Verett	23,246
Roy J. Warren	23,142
Byron E. Powell	23,130
Roy Schluter	22,963
Arnold Ratheal	22,813
Arnold Hodges	22,720
Arvis E. Moore	22,704
Howell L. Martin	22,591
Herschel A. Roye	22,558
Donnie Powell	22,219
Arvil L. Campbell	22,076
James M. Chote	22,069
Jimmy R. Fullingim	21,973
Vernon D. Wheelless	21,824
Robert H. Perkins	21,511
Edmond C. Crump	21,491
George W. Poulson	21,375
Julius Blair	21,167
C. L. Martin	20,899
Harold Moore	20,705
Robin L. Anderson	20,635
Howard Harris	20,534
W. C. McDuff	20,518
Noble Hunsucker, Jr.	20,481
Harold Trull	20,434
Billy Joe Boyd	20,283
Boney Winkler	20,268
Charles E. Sanders	20,182
Eldred L. Mize	20,168

Total payees in county (119) - 3,675,733

CULBERTSON COUNTY

Wildhorse Valley Farms, Inc.	45,509
D. H. Brewster	45,168
Lee Talley	40,260
J. J. Taber	39,699
Dick Guest	27,692

Total payees in county (6) - 225,651

DALLAM COUNTY

Elmer Heiskell	59,343
James E. Crabtree	49,959
Alex Stafford	46,810
Hugh L. Gordon	43,976
Kerrick Land & Cattle Corp.	34,564
George H. Noble	33,056
Charles Grice	31,237
Horace D. Estes	30,660
H. F. Beyer	30,397
Leo H. Moore	29,880
Raman L. Chandler	29,786
Oscar O. Przillas	29,152
John Hancock Life Ins.	28,946
Billy Chestnut	28,767
Jimmie O. Brewster	28,290
Tim E. Field	27,069
J. T. McAdams	26,677
Winrock Farms	26,259
Melvin Przillas	26,226
Summerour Brothers Ptnp	25,938
Shelby L. Baker	25,662
William W. Allen	25,379
Curtis G. Chisum	24,675
James M. Higgins	24,517
Ell Dee Field	24,249

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas—Continued

David P. McBryde.....	24, 009
Tommy Lovett.....	22, 399
Roy Nall.....	22, 151
Raymond Garner.....	21, 767
Frank C. McDaniel.....	21, 364
Billy G. Moore.....	20, 913
Kenneth Knight.....	20, 539

Total payees in county	
(32) -----	944,616

DALLAS COUNTY

Billy C. Beach.....	41, 269
Roddy Brothers.....	36, 589
Max Daniel.....	34, 525
Olin B. Curry.....	23, 329
R. V. Luther.....	22, 158

Total payees in county (5) - 157,870

DAWSON COUNTY

Weaver Farming Corp.	60, 220
E. Bar Cattle Co.	58, 296
Bill Weaver	58, 092
Marshall F. Cohorn	57, 904
E. E. Sumrow	57, 876
Sam Jenkins	57, 775
Charles Warren	56, 949
Bill Treadaway	56, 926
Bobby Warren	55, 606
C. R. Taylor	55, 068
Woodward Farms, Inc.	54, 500
Landon Peters, Jr.	51, 966
Robert F. Hardberger	51, 958
Billy Miers	51, 448
Eiland Crawley Palmore	51, 111
David Hughes	51, 104
Raymond G. Roberts	50, 400
B. L. Middleton	50, 235
W. L. Gilliam	50, 206
Don H. Peterson	49, 370
E. D. Adcock	49, 024
V. W. McGee	48, 745
R. M. Middleton	47, 534
Fred Henderson	45, 701
Bob Henderson	45, 701
J. E. Airhart	44, 952
George Eiland	44, 496
Carson Echols	44, 211
James H. Addison	44, 087
Lyndall Sharp	43, 815
Donald Airhart	43, 274
John D. Banta	43, 154
Floyd Oliver	41, 906
Lowell T. Warren	41, 746
Arthur Nolen	41, 064
Layton Oliver	40, 507
Lloyd Cline Farms, Inc.	39, 890
Arthur J. Cohorn	39, 678
Donald Wayne Merrill	39, 462
Okyleen Addison	39, 100
Jeff D. Raney	38, 629
Doyle Terry	38, 375
Frank Doyle Deatherage	38, 310
W. G. White	37, 900
Troy Howard	37, 675
C. M. Pearce	37, 580
Norman Wayne Brown	37, 463
Billy J. Lambright	36, 700
Henry F. Vogler	36, 401
Ela Morris	36, 400
Jones Farms	36, 145
Donovan V. Phipps	36, 018
Carroll Bennett	35, 395
Adcock Farming Co., Inc.	34, 976
L. E. Griffin	34, 557
Robert C. Koger	34, 337
V. D. Barron	33, 904
L. D. Freeman, Jr.	32, 884
Louie Drennan	32, 828
David Franklin	32, 537
Arlis Cline	32, 369
Ben Gilliam	32, 351
W. R. Cox	32, 317
Bill R. Hambrick	31, 985
Ewell K. Scott	31, 708

E. L. Hendon	31, 494	Bill Barnes	21, 321
Edwin Rinewalt	31, 443	Rex Zant	21, 299
F. and E. Farms, Inc.	31, 405	Freddie J. Vogler	21, 281
Sharecropper, Inc.	31, 400	Larry Turner	21, 237
Bill Meares	31, 364	A. E. Hale	21, 19
Joe O'Brien	31, 231	Vernon Berdel' Bratcher	21, 153
N. B. Leatherwood	31, 129	Ray Campbell	21, 047
Richard Orson	30, 850	Vernon Miller	20, 961
Cecil O'Brien	30, 644	Carl Garrett	20, 955
Alvin Harris	30, 314	Hershell Edwin Raines	20, 921
Blaine Middleton	30, 124	Lum J. Holder	20, 906
Donald Holt	30, 097	E. E. Rodgers	20, 892
Gonzell Hogg	29, 674	E. C. T. Farms	20, 864
Don Archer	29, 528	Dopson Farms	20, 775
Leroy Holladay	29, 515	Gordon V. Waldrop	20, 764
N. B. Shaw	29, 470	Herbert Green	20, 736
J. F. Ferguson	29, 430	O. H. Preston, Jr.	20, 710
Dennis Lamphere	29, 332	Lloyd Mears	20, 688
D. O. Huddleston	29, 327	Jerry Adams	20, 681
John Middleton, Jr.	29, 163	Shoestring Cattle Co., Inc.	20, 635
Willard H. Free	29, 151	Ira Jeter Jr.	20, 410
R. C. Anderson	29, 026	L. O. Deatherage	20, 372
Jack Warren	28, 820	V. H. Matthews	20, 275
Jimmy Napper	28, 563	D. C. Rodgers	20, 262
J. T. O'Brien	28, 530	Jesse E. Stephens	20, 244
Leland Harold Bartlett	28, 459	Garland Maxwell	20, 133
L. D. Echols	28, 402	Jack Grigg	20, 04

Total payees in county
(183) ----- 5,778,278

DEAF SMITH COUNTY

Bob Archer	27,880	Taft McGee	117,012
Moody Neeley	27,754	Virgil F. Marsh	68,981
J. E. Neeley, Jr.	27,754	J. R. Durrett Trusts	58,734
Boyd Echols	27,615	John & Ray Brorman	58,498
C. W. Henderson	27,435	B. T. Spear	58,427
W. T. Pomroy	27,205	Hosea Foster Est.	52,279
W. W. Miers	27,149	W. H. Gentry	51,152
Conley Esmond	27,108	Carl S. Perrin	47,528
Carl Barrow	26,694	Billy Wayne Sisson	47,188
Ramon V. Hernandez	26,655	A. R. Dillard	46,969
Ronald Raney	26,623	Herbert Friemel	46,610
Wilton Bartlett	26,616	Vernon Denson	46,186
Alton Barkowsky	26,569	West AC Farms, Inc.	45,698
Earl Fancher	26,503	Wm. J. Schulte	45,656
Eddie Carpenter	25,606	Lester B. Godwin	44,499
Leroy Chapman	25,468	Brorman Bros., Inc.	44,118
G. C. Clift, Jr.	25,464	Reinauer Bros.	43,719
Roy E. Bearden	25,226	O. D. Bingham Est	43,532
Kent Youngblood	25,161	Forrester Ranch, Inc.	42,456
Snmm Farm Corp.	25,150	Clarence D. Carnahan	41,827
W. C. Taylor	25,104	Anthony Paschel	40,202
Harvie L. Kemper	24,748	McCathern & Heck Farms	39,281
I. R. Jeter	24,642	Harry Brorman	38,640
Kenneth Miers	24,339	Sherman Nelson	38,573
Thomas H. Horton	24,385	O. E. Williamson	37,813
Alvin G. Limmer	24,344	Morris W. Blankenship	37,213
A. C. Hodges	24,297	Donald Kimball	35,619
Homer Etheredge	24,261	W. F. Ponder	35,531
Ray Allen Noret	24,235	Richardson Seed Farm	35,382
Olen Norris	24,033	Solomon Bros	35,046
Gus Burkett	24,026	Marvin May	34,625
Beachy Barron	23,988	Billy J. Cleavinger	34,419
Fred W. Bell	23,867	Montgomery Farms	34,408
Ted Turner	23,812	D. T. Reed	34,336
Clyde L. Qualls	23,622	Oneway Farms	33,426
Billy D. Roberts	23,507	D. Neumayer	33,328
Jack R. Felts	23,441	R. K. Brooks	33,126
Jerry Napper	23,328	A. C. Hays Jr.	33,009
Frank Harris	23,148	Edwin Axe Farms Inc.	32,732
James David McGrew	23,131	Higgins & London	32,552
Jack Wolford	23,091	Joe Lyons & Lyons	32,551
Richard Woodward	22,878	Robert Lloyd	32,240
Darus Sumrow	22,747	L. J. Jones, Jr.	31,724
Allen Vandivere	22,720	James A. Bullard	31,518
R. D. Kilgore	22,642	James Fangman	31,311
Broyles Lamesa Farms, Inc.	22,641	B. C. Hodges	30,833
Jack McCown	22,412	John A. & Raymond Smith	30,476
R. D. Gibson	22,315	H. L. Fitzgerald	30,185
Harvey Hanson	22,188	Schlabs Farms, Inc.	29,865
Oscar Vogler	22,181	Gary McQuigg	29,797
Miers Farms, Inc.	22,173	El B Ranch	29,524
J. P. Senter	22,110	E. C. R. Corporation	29,348
Dan Harp	22,075	Bernard Hartman	29,327
K. F. Campbell Est.	21,832	Jim Monroe	28,743
Gus Junis	21,656	Jimmy Brown	28,633
John Middleton	21,463	Hickman Farms, Inc.	28,559
J. L. Billingsley	21,443	Norman Hodges	28,389
Floyd Davis	21,405	Jimmy Brown, Inc.	28,133
Jerry Kelley	21,401		

A. G. Flippin	28,107
J. D. White	27,507
J. M. White	27,073
James Gentry	26,781
Pitman Easley Industries	26,757
Herbert E. Bippus	26,260
Jimmy Brown	26,206
Mrs. N. A. Brown & Sons	26,206
Beetex Supply Co.	25,720
R. M. Mason	25,622
J. E. Warrick	25,584
Samie West Est.	25,521
Bertran Jack	25,225
A. L. Hollingsworth	24,888
Iverson Leake	24,874
Douglas Nix	24,745
Johnny Jesko	24,454
Donald Hicks	24,443
Carnahan Bros.	24,379
W. A. Carter	24,214
Josef C. Grotegut	23,945
Dave H. Perrin	23,764
Martha Ollie Freeman	23,764
Maurice D. Dorward	23,714
Bruce W. Burney	23,482
Carl Kleuskens	23,311
Robert R. Lindsey	23,273
Edward Allison	23,164
Luther Ellis	23,020
Tom Robinson	22,765
Ernest Walden, Jr.	23,653
S. A. Fangman	22,607
Norton, Inc.	22,425
Royce Cretsinger	22,394
Don Brooks	22,375
Curtis Deason	21,959
Paul Wilson	21,879
Glenn B. Allred	21,726
Bridwell Ranch West	21,423
Joseph A. Meyer	21,061
Harris & Thrush Sales Co.	20,941
R. A. Crist	20,800
O. D. Jackson	20,761
George L. Olson	20,735
Joseph J. Friemel	20,486
Gerald McCathern	20,396
George Turrentine	20,198
Total payees in county (105)	3,415,076

DENTON COUNTY

Donald Shifflett	25,949
Bobby George	22,316
Elmo Chesney	20,017

Total payees in county (3) - 68,282

DICKENS COUNTY

Paul Dale Hagins	66,320
Raymon Harris	33,429
D. W. Edinburgh	31,080
Raymond Eldredge	29,132
Felix Ramirez	29,123
G. H. Ragland	27,981
Rex Carlisle	27,481
David Y. Hughes	25,522
Larry Morris	24,708
W. E. Robertson	24,184
Earl Van Meter	22,958
G. B. Morris	22,207
Dumont Bridge	21,566
John L. Green	20,970

Total payees in county (15) - 432,577

DIMMIT COUNTY

Reynolds & Wilson Farms	36,209
-------------------------	--------

DONLEY COUNTY

Wm. O. Mooring	28,248
Hall S. Hardin	25,022
Warren Hardin	23,478

Total payees in county (3) - 76,748

EDWARDS COUNTY

Alvin L. Connell	81,142
Loyd Mitchell, Jr.	35,390
Carson Bros.	30,954

Charles R. Pfluger	23,354
James Leo Greer, Jr.	22,996
W. B. McMillan	21,086
Ned Dunbar	20,042

Total payees in county (7) - 234,964

EL PASO COUNTY

R. T. Hoover Farms	80,205
Lee Moor Farms	60,856
Lee & Beulah Moor Chs Home	47,120
H. D. Hilley	45,222
Mike Marcos	44,270
George B. Spence	37,360
Ralphs Farms, Inc.	35,801
Jerry Rogers	35,218
Brandes Ramsey, Inc.	31,595
Deerman Farms, Inc.	30,993
Billis & Ellis Farms	30,472
Hiram Whitaker	30,440
C P. Brown	28,833
K. W. Rushing	27,687
James Strachan	26,346
Schuster Farms, Inc.	23,180
Jim Surratt Farms	23,094
Jack H. Stallings	22,916
Gulbant S. Gil & Sons, Inc.	22,637
George Eads	22,432
Kriegel & Kriegel	21,744
Mary Segulla Trust	21,422
L. R. Jacobs	20,578
W. T. Henderson Est.	20,370

Total payees in county (24) - 790,791

ELLIS COUNTY

Jack B. Eastham	52,262
Phillip N. Jeffers	51,540
J. B. & Jas. Underwood	48,774
H. R. Burden	45,107
Ramon Armstrong	44,863
B. D. Wakeland	40,305
Ted Almand	40,118
Nash Bros	36,583
Feedland Farm, Inc.	27,929
C. C. Witherspoon	26,960
H. L. Southard	26,203
F. M. Roberts	24,087
G. W. James	23,813
Marvin Borders	23,713
Jerry R. Glaspy	23,542
Leland Calvert	22,347
T. M. Harper	22,253
John F. Davis	22,194
C. H. Shrader, Jr.	22,113
Bozek Farm	20,759
Ocie Ray Gerron	20,673
Bob Crittenden	20,581
Roger Harper	20,575
Carey Hitt	20,137

Total payees in county (24) - 727,731

ERATH COUNTY

Otey Shadden c/o J. A. Shadden	20,100
--------------------------------	--------

FALLS COUNTY

Basll Abate	58,589
Falsone Brothers	35,132
Tony Abate	31,153
Morris Scamardo	29,629
Jack Falco	28,845
H. H. Perkins	25,149
Werner Fuchs	23,351
Billy Pat Bostick	21,458
H. G. Barganier	20,934

Total payees in county (9) - 274,240

FANNIN COUNTY

Riverby Plan	53,678
B. W. Mathews	21,028
Ralph Howell	20,495
Robert Shelton, Jr.	20,138

Total payees in county (4) - 115,339

FAYETTE COUNTY

John E. Morgan	22,922
Milton Joost	22,006

Total payees in county (2) - 44,928

FISHER COUNTY

J. E. McCoy, Jr.	45,401
John D. Ferguson	39,137
Kermit L. Terry	32,701
Dono Terry	31,531
Max Carriker	30,548
Willingham Land Cattle	28,009
Ben Martinez	27,110
R. E. McKimmey	26,968
Afra Eugene Hudnall	25,786
Allan Eugene Terry	25,699
Odell Rains	25,315
Vernon Terry	25,227
Bennie C. Kidd	24,074
J. P. Moore	23,831
Lewis Johnson	23,651
Richard Stuart	23,166
Bryant Farm, Inc.	22,958
Mike Terry	22,883
Thurman Terry	22,306
B. S. Wright	22,256
Max O. Stuart	22,221
Stanley Nowlin	21,043
Preston Morrow	21,011
Jack Morton	20,801
V. C. Murphree	20,611

Total payees in county (25) - 654,244

FLOYD COUNTY

Dorris Jones	75,140
Malvin A. Jarboe	54,255
Watson Jones	52,886
Craig Silverthorne	51,496
J. S. Hale, Jr.	50,873
Don Marble	50,582
Chester Carthel	50,151
John C. Aiford	49,397
Fred L. Marble	47,229
P. Keith Marble	47,229
Walter E. Bloys	43,580
H. B. Robertson	40,878
C.C. Whittle	40,154
J. E. Franklin	39,804
Bill Sherman	38,871
L. N. Johnson	37,953
R. I. Bennett	37,115
J. A. Miller	36,846
Wayne Bramlet	36,556
Marvin Shurbet	36,139
Floyd J. Ellison	35,909
Ralph Johnston	35,641
H. L. Porter, Jr.	35,049
Kinder Farris	34,499
Lane Decker	34,180
Johnney West	33,686
Kenneth Bean	33,660
Louis Pyle	32,717
R. G. Dunlap	32,602
Reed Lawson	32,426
Weldon Hammonds	31,604
Harold Woodson	31,234
Adrain Helms	30,919
J. A. Welch	30,498
Lewis Reddy	30,365
Travis Jones	30,060
Fred Zimmerman, Jr.	29,894
Robert L. Smith	29,839
J. R. Belt	29,015
Keith Reeves	28,469
Roy H. Tinsley	28,286
C. L. Henderson	28,170
Everett Miller	27,887
K. E. Probasco	27,844
Dejuan Strickland	27,795
W. R. Ware	27,687
Lon Davis, Jr.	27,024
Luther B. Brandes	26,582
Fred Jackson	26,336
Austin B. Meriwether	26,251
J. R. Turner	26,212

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas—Continued

Bundy Hal Campbell	26,211	Tony Mann	36,771	E. J. Kelly	42,228
Barney Manning	25,970	Eulan Cox	36,060	Donald Floyd	42,225
R. Fred Brown	25,793	John Barkley Farming Co., Inc.	32,778	Lyle Dugan	42,122
Boyce Mosley	25,530	A. E. Schletze Farms	32,351	Robert Sneed	41,823
Billy Don Bigham	25,435	H. & B. Farms	24,738	Robert L. Fleming	41,441
Eldon Fortenberry	25,409			Travis Crossland	41,290
Mack Hickerson	25,397	Total payees in county (7)	250,372	Rinehard Vogler	41,271
Elmer M. Jackson	25,238			Newson Gins, Inc.	41,247
Leighton Teeple	25,213			Earnest Spradlin	41,083
Louis Lloyd	24,994			Charles Gay	40,915
Thomas H. Chatham	24,924			Royce Harvey	40,912
Early P. Pritchett	24,519			D. L. Tate	40,725
Hubert E. Frizzel	24,169			N. M. Saunders	40,721
John A. Dorman	24,097			Henry Cheuvront	40,651
Kent Covington	23,779			P. L. Childress	40,257
W. M. Staniforth	23,752			B. R. Truitt	40,101
Tate Jones	23,689			Harry A. Childers	39,348
J. W. Day, Jr.	23,555			Jesse L. Smith	39,166
Connie Bearden	23,515			Clyde Haynes	38,481
B. J. Terrell	23,302			Kay Teaff	38,381
Doyle Moore	23,128			Vernon Goodwin	37,819
Harry Reeves	23,047			C. E. Farms, Inc.	37,818
Lloyd Widener	23,016			Farrell Herring	37,424
Walter W. Taack	22,952			John Henry Jones	37,391
Bruce W. Davis	22,948			E. C. Harvey	36,973
Mary Beth Kropp	22,667			Ray Garrett	36,956
Edward J. Foster, Jr.	22,608			J. A. Smith	36,855
Eugene Gilly	22,485			Kenneth Young	36,813
Wilfred H. Stoerner	22,338			William Alfred Condit	36,501
Donal Akin	22,144			A. W. Byrd	36,432
E. J. Kinslow	22,063			Noah Lemley	36,036
William F. Bertrand	22,022			Charles Medlin	35,470
Delmas McCormack	21,995			Morgan Farms	35,397
Billy W. Fulton	21,843			J. C. Chaffin	34,993
Milton Harrison	21,787			Billy J. Evans	34,760
Buren C. and Lucy Cates	21,779			Roy Apple	34,587
Frank D. Brown	21,698			Eddie Jameson	34,488
Bobby McCormick	21,697			W. G. and G. R. White	34,404
Loyse A. Bradshaw	21,649			Henry Patton	34,347
Richard F. Stovall	21,559			Daniel Walter Davis	34,337
Kay Crabtree	21,549			Weyland R. Mullins	34,240
Larry Jarrett	21,438			Alvin Ray Riley	34,151
Frank A. Weigel	21,285			Jerry Harris	34,000
J. W. Taylor, Est., Ptnsp.	21,240			T. E. Gafford	33,265
Dan Hagood	21,175			Karl Cayton	33,165
R. C. Mitchell	21,127			Newell Bowen	32,599
Carl W. Turner	21,109			James Troy Green	32,028
Charlie Boedeker	21,085			Roy D. Spradlin	31,824
Ray Lloyd	21,020			Kenneth Hancock	31,450
Travis Young	20,929			W. V. Lasiter	31,287
George D. Probasco	20,928			L. E. Williams	31,230
Roger Dawdy	20,882			Rex Sumrow	31,147
Johnnie Cates	20,869			Thomas W. McKinzie	31,105
L. L. Rhodes	20,768			Raymond William Orson	30,994
Gail Wilson	20,617			Jeff and Ronald Raney	30,824
L. D. Smith, Jr.	20,554			K. K. Whitaker Estate	30,769
Jakey Younger	20,467			D. J. Forbis	30,683
A. V. Bethel	20,374			Bill G. Spears	30,494
S. C. Burleson	20,317			Glenn Hillman	30,034
Olen C. Harris	20,267			Allen Strickland	29,778
Oscar Golden	20,177			T. J. Redman, Jr.	29,196
L. T. Wood	20,119			Donald Ward	29,011
Klyce Ooley	20,113			E. F. Foshee	28,981
				Glen Fleming	28,440
				Raymond Anderson	28,068
				D. D. Darby	27,808
				W. D. Mills	27,159
				Norris Sneed	27,029
				Lubbock Production Credit	26,977
				Leonard H. Kelley	26,955
				J. A. Pebsworth	26,906
				O. T. Barron	26,788
				David C. Jones	26,732
				D. Ross and Perry L. Jones	26,663
				J. P. Bingham	26,497
				Basil Smith	26,358
				C. T. Thames	26,344
				B. J. Smith	26,320
				Alvin Ward	26,229
				Jay Fikes	25,994
				J. D. Head	25,994
				Nelson Cayton	25,994
				Glynn Chandler	25,895
				Nix and Norman	25,808
				Hanson & Moseley	25,639
				Hilburn Briscoe	25,541
				Earl Layman	25,294
				Harmon Mills	25,031
				Jack Welch	24,869
				James Laverne Jones	24,806
				Joe Faulkenberry	24,765

Total payees in county (114) 3,277,799

FOARD COUNTY

James G. Johnson 25,894
Jesse Whitfield 21,976

Total payees in county (2) 47,870

FORT BEND COUNTY

Tx. Dept. of Corr 391,380
Julius M. Ruffeno 42,323
Arno G. Schultz, Sr. & Sons 34,353
Otto H. Schulz 30,120
John J. Kramr 28,644
Joe S. Kramr 28,542
Sugarland Ind., Inc. 24,201
Tilford G. Sulak 22,843

Total payees in county (8) 602,406

FRIO COUNTY

Bennett Bros., Inc. 46,556
Clyde Cox 41,118

GAINES COUNTY

W. E. Berry, Jr. 76,284
Verlon Hilburn 67,774
Shamrock Farms 67,729
C. E. Hilburn 67,222
Norman Hicks 65,795
J. A. Grammer 64,461
Jennie Lee Lands 63,858
Roy W. Wicker, Jr. 62,835
Frank Ratliff, Jr. 62,538
Herbert Hicks 62,492
H. L. Hill 62,344
Troy Martin 61,997
Delmon Ellison 61,660
A. P. McGuire 61,329
Paul J. Condit 61,256
Roadrunner Farms 60,745
Keith Young 60,722
Joe Tarbet 60,695
M. H. Nance 60,462
Vester Smith 60,452
Howard Huddle 58,983
L. D. Smith 58,466
Mesa Farms, Inc. 57,876
Kenneth Bass 57,572
Dean Faulkenberry 57,503
G. D. Boldin 57,201
Oliver Bros., Corp. 57,132
Alvin Keith Forbis 57,109
Paul Morgan 56,838
Thomas Michael Jenkins 56,682
Darrell Miller 56,604
R. L. Crowder 56,604
Ray Anderson 56,603
Dale Wiley 56,566
W. D. Wilson 56,565
A. Earl Jones 56,565
E. M. Weddle 56,364
W. H. Rhoades 56,113
Sam Teague 56,113
J. D. Nix 55,976
Melvin H. McKinney 55,877
E Bar S Ranch 55,669
Robert Scott 55,449
Bill Ellyson 55,419
Glynn Batson 55,345
Wayne Greaves 55,291
Douglas Floyd 55,122
Marcus Crow 55,116
M. & G. Farms 55,095
Bob Moffatt 54,847
Thearl Creech 54,754
Lewis D. Terry 54,618
Tony Greaves 53,869
R. I. Oliver 53,778
D. D. McClatchey 53,595
Earnest Hunt 53,595
Roy L. Strong 53,595
L. D. Jones, Jr. 53,563
Ferguson and Schneider 53,519
J. W. Archer 53,352
Kent Denson 53,258
J. A. Benthall 53,037
Floyd McGee 52,970
Don Sanders 52,465
Tommy Lacy 52,198
Joe B. Pate, Jr. 51,766
J. T. Carlile, Jr. 51,590
Finley Moore 51,314
Ronnie W. Huddle 50,973
Bob Harlan 49,900
Vahlsing, Inc. 48,838
Leon Foote 48,531
Alton Faulkenberry 47,736
S. M. Hanson, Jr. 46,844
M. J. Farms 46,039
Four J Farms, Inc. 44,959
William Charlie Faulkenberry 44,957
Robert Jameson 43,577
Brownfield Tractor Co., Inc. 43,405
M. T. McIlwain 43,324
George D. Vaughn 42,918

Ratliff Farms, Inc.	24,389
Earl D. Owens	24,334
Alvin Herron	24,275
Larry A. Parker	24,166
J. T. Tucker	23,691
A. A. Wuensche	23,621
W. A. Freeman, Sr.	23,566
Dennis Nix	23,390
Tom Hunt	23,338
Jerry Hill	23,313
Graham Addison	23,250
H. Dale Cope	23,086
William James Cox	23,039
H. C. Thomas	22,983
David Oates	22,968
R. T. Bedwell, Jr.	22,899
James R. Dunn	22,883
E. N. Thomason	22,835
W. D. Fortenberry	22,675
Charles H. Gibson	22,547
E. D. Marlon	22,530
Trice Lee	22,173
Robert Luther Kirk	22,070
Boles Brothers	22,052
Luther Lee	22,047
J. C. Futch, Jr.	21,944
D. N. Todd	21,930
Richard Jones	21,930
Joe W. Crawford	21,916
Stanley Ancinac	21,916
Hoyt McCullough	21,836
J. H. Flippo	21,710
N. B. Fields	21,618
Mrs. Dell Small Howard	21,597
Ross Goodwin	21,456
Maurice Hearne	21,275
Marvin H. Williams	21,206
A. Ray Russell	20,991
Eagle Land and Cattle Co.	20,849
H. E. Hancock	20,770
Benny Nichols	20,725
Johnny Gooding	20,519
A. K. Hancock	20,380
N. F. McCullough	20,178
Lonnie Dean Clark	20,160
Kenneth Freeman	20,116
H. R. Cope	20,030
M. R. Newman	20,012

Total payees in county
(220) 8,580,713

GARZA COUNTY

H. V. Wheeler	51,903
Avery Moore, Jr.	37,578
James W. Stone	28,814
Clarence E. Basinger	26,951
S. C. Storie, Sr., EST.	24,940
Double T Farms	24,541
Weldon R. McGeehee	23,288
S. C. Storie, Jr.	22,980
Jim Bob Porterfield	22,006
U Lazy S Farms	21,687

Total payees in county
(10) 284,688

GLASSCOCK COUNTY

Bednar Bros.	39,984
August M. Frysak	39,245
Edwards and Edwards	36,316
Eugene E. Hirt	32,354
Daniel A. Hirt	31,854
Lawrence A. Jost	31,378
Alfred E. Perry	29,183
Charlie A. Smith	26,623
Ralph A. Halfmann	26,311
Walter H. Halfmann	26,289
Sidney F. Hirt	25,852
Hall Bar H Ranch	25,308
Delbert R. Halfmann	24,093
Clifford W. Hoelscher	23,896
Leon A. Halfmann	23,754
Fred J. Hoelscher	23,009
Arthur Hoelscher	22,953
Joseph C. Schwartz	22,031
Schraeder & Sons	21,901

James C. Johnson	20,266
Arnold D. Lange	20,191

Total payees in county
(21) 572,791

GRAY COUNTY

Ray G. Burger E Son	23,274
Moody Farms	21,694

Total payees in county (2) 44,968

GRAYSON COUNTY

Bob Light	26,772
Leland Strawn	24,580

Total payees in county (2) 51,352

GUADALUPE COUNTY

Frank P. Watson, Jr.	26,315
Clarence Krackau	20,837

Total payees in county (2) 47,152

HALE COUNTY

J. C. Mills	91,729
E. A. Houston	69,563
Grady Shepard	69,482
Frank Moore	68,784
Ercell Givens	67,815
Fred D. Bradshaw	65,457
James Cannon	62,960
Doug Ellison	61,443
Joe B. Lovelace	58,995
Warren Mathis	58,259
Jason H. Allen	56,885
Irvin F. Lee	54,477
Lonnie Cannon	53,879
Leo Mathis	51,564
Winston T. Jones	51,329
A. R. Meador, Jr.	49,241
Jerry Givens	48,668
Horne Brothers	48,663
C. P. Smith	48,425
W. D. Scarborough, Jr.	47,894
A. W. Hardin	45,806
O. A. Stout, Jr.	44,700
J. H. Kirby and Sons	44,186
Joe Sherrod	43,677
T. R. Joines	43,100
Elmo Stephens	42,469
Swann Pettit	42,334
C. E. Carter and Son	41,549
Ralph E. Davis	41,444
Lee C. O'Neil	39,679
John C. Carter	39,640
Clayton Terrell	37,415
Charles Noel	37,126
Dennis Zachary	36,898
O. D. Rhodes	36,748
W. C. Harper	36,667
Frank Stanton, Jr.	36,151
John A. Bell	36,081
E. J. Pope, Jr.	36,078
Stephen Smith	35,746
J. L. Browning	35,632
J. D. James	35,482
Jones Masters Farms, Inc.	35,447
Jimmy McLaughlin	35,422
Joe Barton	35,259
Bob Riley	35,243
Leon Griffin	34,874
Henry C. Griffin	34,873
John Joe Kirchoff	34,716
Joe H. McWilliams	34,617
S. J. Young	34,473
T. C. Clanton	34,308
G. O. King	34,275
Wallace Cannon	34,221
R. Bruce Walker	33,393
James E. Laney	33,242
O. A. & C. E. Webb	33,211
Larry F. Walter	33,071
R. G. Russ, Jr.	32,872
A. E. Lewellen	32,860
Carl Phillips	32,696
Arthur W. Sorelle	32,677

Marcus Breland	32,596
Burgess Farm Account	32,588
Harold W. Thomas	32,535
Dee W. Martin	32,480
Howard Hurt	32,353
C. R. Kay	32,330
Donald Lee Terrell	32,285
J. W. Davis	32,223
C. T. Minchew and Miller Trust	32,115
Weldon Ferguson	32,022
S. R. Heard	31,776
Bill Riley	31,321
Mary Megna	31,170
Ralph Wheeler	30,933
Irvan Rhodes	30,788
Gene Boyd	30,786
Davis Cannon	30,573
D. T. Graham	30,373
Ross and Thompson	30,164
Owen E. Jones	30,129
Harold V. Davis	30,111
Heath Brothers	30,043
Steve Lee	30,040
Walter Gilliam	29,781
A. J. Givens	29,498
Loren J. West	29,458
Benson Farms, Inc.	29,399
Delbert Howell	29,171
Harvey Lutrick	29,072
Alton Leach	28,825
Jim Bob Curry	28,805
Jake Q. Finney	28,756
Mac Houston	28,685
Max Sageser	28,595
Raymond Akin	28,551
L. D. Ballard	28,450
Millard J. Hancock	28,297
Austin O'Neil, Jr.	27,779
Don Cannon	27,329
Royce Carthel	27,321
John Trimmer, Jr.	27,235
The Waters Trust	26,856
R. L. Tullis	26,819
Luke M. Miller	26,699
Herschel Blankenship	26,634
Joe Oswalt	26,578
James K. Sageser	26,563
Daniel J. Fondy	26,555
L. K. Gregory	26,536
J. E. Helm	26,490
Charles L. King	26,350
Jack Gonzales	26,267
Jack Robertson	26,261
Earl M. James	26,068
J. T. Terrell	26,056
L. L. Ray	25,983
Donald C. Ebeling	25,964
Doug G. Sopher	25,941
Jerry W. Shadden	25,781
Kenneth R. Wiese	25,737
Elmer Koenning	25,690
Dempsey D. Skipper	25,588
Joe Sharp	25,501
Robert Schoppa	25,406
Willie V. Dunn	25,312
Jerry K. Oswalt	25,259
Jerrell Cate	25,197
W. E. Terrell	24,681
Weldon Reed	24,574
Quetin Redinger	24,549
John M. Norfleet	24,540
Ersel W. Johnson	24,520
William H. Pinkner	24,510
J. D. Bass, Jr.	24,468
Gordon H. Branham	24,341
Herman S. Tennell	24,273
Richard L. Howard	24,187
Welkin Farms No. 2	24,155
Neal and W. E. Burnett	24,109
Warren Thomas	24,067
Wesley A. Schumacher	24,064
Laura Faye McDougal	23,843
Rex Jordan	23,796
B. R. Bennett	23,767
Rae Groce	23,732
Witten Farms	23,557
J. E. Sullivan	23,262
Billy F. Sylvester	23,262

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas—Continued

Ralph Miller	23,260
Thomas Johnston	23,251
B. L. Griffith	23,144
J. Weldon Blount	23,124
C. W. Spann	23,034
J. L. Miller, Jr.	22,966
Floyd Terrell	22,737
Robert E. Wilson	22,733
Jerry V. Young	22,541
W. E. McPherson	22,537
Alex Reeves	22,497
Wesley Davis	22,483
Don McCullough	22,471
Alfred Garibay	22,407
J. B. Holland	22,346
James McDaniel	22,273
M. D. Evans	22,254
U. D. Hobgood	22,142
Clyde Benn	22,110
Paul Robertson	22,107
Paul Stukey	21,987
Royce Hillman	21,967
Mrs. J. S. McBeth	21,926
Lewis Lutrick	21,811
Owen Benn	21,732
C. E. Hobgood Est.	21,675
Clyde W. Harrell	21,623
Elmer Lee Criswell, Jr.	21,477
Elbert Harp	21,418
Earl C. McClain	21,363
Wayne Bankston	21,284
H. D. Hays	21,238
Willis James	21,101
A. L. Stone, Jr.	21,071
Ronnie McBeth	20,982
Henry Ahrens	20,958
R. J. Harrell	20,925
True H. Rosser, Jr.	20,913
Orval Boyd	20,860
Kenneth W. Ashby	20,846
Ernest Lancaster	20,798
Don McKenzie	20,764
Paul Toliver	20,764
Virgil Pierson	20,677
Horace N. Wardlow	20,675
Carl J. Marshall	20,627
Herman Gregg	20,527
Lafont Farms	20,521
J. W. Pope	20,462
S. M. True, Jr.	20,447
Jack K. Stephens	20,426
Gaylord Groce	20,363
Walker Bros. Produce	20,351
Ray R. Copeland	20,317
Rupert L. Allen	20,263
W. W. McCoy & Son	20,217
Robert Pope	20,176
E. J. McAnalley	20,108
R. D. Barrett	20,104
Oliver Harmel	20,085
Lester B. Cox	20,030

Total payees in county
(211) 6,465,235

HALL COUNTY

Mack D. Richards	36,581
Billy J. Rothwell	35,971
W. H. Reed	33,275
Allen L. Monzingo	33,207
J. A. McAnear	32,840
Carroll Fowler	32,489
Henry S. Foster	31,617
Jim Hutchins	29,741
Mel Roy Cofer	29,671
Lonnie F. Widener	29,117
Jack Montgomery	28,539
Joe C. Montgomery	27,176
Frank Hedrick	26,955
Lloyd J. Becker	26,810
Rayford E. Hutcherson	25,659
Clark Bros	23,718
Turner Farms	23,556
F. G. Monzingo	23,429
J. Robert Hanvey, Jr.	23,231
R. S. Wansley, Jr.	22,885

James Alvin McAnear, Jr.	22,792
Robert R. Hutcherson	22,737
Ted Bruce	22,682
Hawkins & Lane	22,353
C. L. Benson	22,077
M. P. Smith	22,074
Eudy Farms	21,899
James S. Guest	20,916
Harold Burk	20,647
S. D. Posey & Son	20,242
John C. Johnson	20,041

Total payees in county
(31) 814,927

HANSFORD COUNTY

Collier Bros., Inc.	72,738
C. H. Clawson	66,506
Jack Hart	56,617
R. E. and Rue Sanders	48,117
Don Hart	46,625
Roy Roper	42,091
Gus O. Birdwell	41,317
Donnie Thoreson	40,027
Lynn & Jon Hart	39,051
D. C. Dille Est.	37,516
Willard McCloy	37,500
Lloyd Buzzard	36,493
J. L. Whitaker	33,395
Eva Holt	32,564
Carl Archer	32,364
Fletcher Bros., Inc.	31,258
J. P. Armes	30,458
A. R. Bort	29,084
Dan E. Archer	28,371
Ward V. Nolder	27,903
Bill Logsdon	26,926
Archie Nelson	26,646
John C. Harris	26,574
Hez M. Frazier	26,516
Charles R. Ball	26,411
Jack Henson	26,406
Robert H. Novak	26,357
L. H. Gruver	26,262
T. C. Harvey, Jr.	25,506
Pittman & Sons, Inc.	25,302
Glen O. Hiller	24,965
Wm. F. D. Etling	24,893
Ernest Wilmeth	24,755
Clarence Zabel	24,462
R. C. Porter	24,416
M. D. McLaughlin	24,383
W. R. Murrell	24,321
Joel D. Stavlo	23,962
Taylor & Gee	23,580
Henry Grotegut	23,553
C. Ralph Blodgett	22,895
F. W. Thomas	22,702
Vance B. Morris	22,369
Wesley Garnett	22,164
E. David Knutson	21,669

Total payees in county
(45) 1,427,985

HARDEMAN COUNTY

M. E. Watson, Jr.	50,908
Robert Nippert	49,313
Edward L. Turner	36,431
Roy Hines	32,981
W. L. Wilson	31,027
1st Natl. Bk. Trus. C. G. Conley	30,834
James W. Tabor	30,411
Carl Vestal	28,568
Nuckles & Gerald	28,424
Quentin Wilson	26,514
Weldon Tabor	25,652
Harry C. Becknell	23,105
Aron W. Phillips	22,785
Billy R. Nowell	21,349
Jack Hurst	21,123

Total payees in county
(15) 459,425

HARTLEY COUNTY

Carl J. Kuper	89,251
Harold H. Hogue	87,337
Framack Farms	57,304
Bookout & Son	48,620

Frantz & Frantz	40,234
Green Farms	36,193
Hartley Moore Farms	35,537
Chain C. Inc.	35,138
Verlin D. Lasley	34,532
Herring Cattle Co.	30,386
McCleskey Cattle Co., Inc.	30,117
Joe D. Keast	24,366
Wilbur L. Bryant	23,284
Gary K. George	23,187
Alfred R. Ford	22,928
J. Y. McAdams	22,927
Exum Ranch	22,275
Edward J. Wieck	22,124
G. Malcolm Bryant	21,679
Paul G. Daniel & Son	21,152
G. Ivory Edlin	20,399

Total payees in county (21) 749,030

HASKELL COUNTY

Johnny D. Reid	49,741
Burson and Burson	43,194
John L. Grindstaff, Jr.	42,439
Melvin C. Josselet	34,141
Arlos W. Weaver	34,141
Wallace L. Dudensing	32,664
Ray Carter	32,500
Jalea R. Glover	32,087
Willard L. Mullins	31,349
Amos D. May	29,122
Robert G. Walton	28,298
E. H. Tankersley, Jr.	28,298
Ellis L. Tankersley	27,736
William G. Ellis	25,825
R. W. Raynes	24,173
L. Weldon Norman	24,111
Thomas J. Bevel	24,011
Albert R. Hannsz	22,980
Sammy L. Grindstaff	22,929
Robert W. Herren	22,662
Joel Bevel	22,485
Donald Griffs	22,188
George A. Mullino	21,961
Allen Strickland	21,700
Thurmond Bynum	21,441
Virgil E. Sonnamaker	21,137
Henry and Melvin Vojkufka	21,098
Willie Z. Bettis Est.	20,540
Pace Bros.	20,512
William M. Reid	20,220
Vernon P. Terrell	20,156

Total payees in county
(31) 847,053

HIDALGO COUNTY

Valley Acres	75,572
Engleman Farms	67,512
J. W. Wallace & Sons	62,307
Geo. T. Helle	62,132
M. W. Nelson	59,831
Edgar R. Smith	58,520
Bill Burns	58,175
Frank Schuster	56,469
Las Palmas Farms	56,152
Samuel R. Sparks	55,998
Robert Gandy	55,549
Rio Farms, Inc.	55,000
Albert M. Brinkley	54,269
Holcomb & Black	54,087
Therman Eoff	53,777
Luther E. Bradford	53,777
J. R. Stump	53,485
C. B. Shields, Jr.	53,369
C. B. Shields, Sr.	52,862
Ben Estes Bearden	52,098
M. D. & N. J. Moore, Jr.	50,761
J. R. Russell	49,183
George R. Beridon	47,182
Wm. E. May	46,186
Jack Harbison	45,493
Bobby McDaniel	43,853
J. B. Pollock	43,564
Fuller Farms	42,753
Ardean McDaniel	42,574
M. F. Frost	42,252
Bert Forthuber	41,834
Mrs. Fred Krenmueller	41,821
M. Krenmueller	41,821

Clarence Johnstone	41,806
Shary Farms, Inc.	41,374
Carl Schuster	40,716
N. H. Kitayama	40,687
Evergreen Farms, Inc.	40,617
Turberville Farms	39,928
Bryan Hanks	39,226
John B. Hardwicke, Sr.	38,429
James Dyer	37,602
El Ramon Development Co., Inc.	36,440
Geo. V. Harren	36,339
American Farm, Inc.	35,930
Kirk Schwarz	35,642
L. J. Krska	35,615
Anthony Keller	35,164
Franklin Dusek	35,079
Tom Sekula	34,558
J. R. Wade Farms, Inc.	34,475
Everett Bell	34,398
W. G. Bell	34,173
Conly Bell	34,173
Lloyd Schwarz	33,524
Edith Tyner	33,432
Wyatt & Ware	33,255
Dan Bearden	33,242
W. A. Odom, Jr.	33,217
Marvin A. Schwarz	32,938
Dudley Farms	32,574
D. J. Schwarz	31,462
F. E. Knapp	30,612
J. A. Knapp	30,612
E. J. Blake	30,502
L. H. Freeman	30,181
Steven Bearden	30,114
Boyce Farms, Inc.	30,058
Kenneth Hood	29,622
Paul D. Moore, Jr.	29,127
R. C. Jones	29,125
Victor Russell	28,762
Dudley J. Stetzer	28,565
J. S. & Quinn McManus	28,511
Utah Dickerson	28,347
Woody Cellum	27,839
Barr Ewing	27,787
Wm. T. Dudley	27,486
Tommy Richards	27,380
Verner Gustafson	27,371
Jack & Roy W. Barnes	27,303
Holmes Farms, Inc.	27,212
C. E. Duncan Farms No. 2	26,929
Ostrowski & Son	26,596
Leon McDaniel	25,906
Wilburn Malm	25,781
H. M. Pitts	25,762
Stacy S. Malone	25,565
Ray C. Jones, Jr.	25,500
E. L. Tyner	25,228
Mervin Headley	25,115
Mitsuru Sakai	24,935
Deck Produce Co.	23,991
Jack Drawe	23,425
Clifford Bros.	23,082
Mike & Joe Chapa	22,871
Billy H. Drawe	22,450
B. W. Carlson	21,939
Juan Villanueva, Sr.	21,889
Edward Willis	21,693
Theser Bros.	21,561
Billy P. Green	21,548
M. A. Drewry	21,187
Weldon Blackwell	21,138
Arthur E. Schwarz	20,894
Greg Pinkston	20,860
Billy Pemetton	20,599
Lewis Fry	20,537
Earl F. Cohrs	20,383
E. O. Houts	20,352
Florence M. Anderson	20,119
E. M. Frerking	20,014

Total payees in county
(112) 4,040,582

HILL COUNTY

Daniel Pustejovsky	43,890
Gerik Bros., Ptnrs.	35,900
Ellison Bros	35,201
G. Ray Sawyer	30,593
Cecil & Delmer Sullins, Ptnrs.	30,494

Wallace Lavender	27,835
Seth Orr	27,514
Claud D. Watson	24,039
Clyde F. Nowlin	22,189
Alton Cordell	20,866
Girault and Son	20,755
Raymond Allen	20,184
Edmund Marek	20,166

Total payees in county
(13) 359,626

HOCKLEY COUNTY

White Face Farms	76,207
Spade Ranch, Inc.	70,657
Marvin E. Green	64,560
Erlan D. Gresham	63,013
Neal Caswell	62,021
Lockett Seed Co.	60,716
W. N. Halliburton	60,512
Don Brazil	60,127
Lloyd Hood	58,456
W. L. Harris	56,945
A. B. Enloe, Jr.	55,904
J. Walter Hobgood	55,773
L. E. Mitchell	55,561
William M. Cain	52,032
William E. Carr, Jr.	51,705
Billy Ray McInroe	50,846
Preston L. Lyda	50,361
Palmer & Dowell	48,097
Selmer H. Schoenrock	47,838
Joe W. Cook, Jr.	46,658
Paul W. Christian	46,356
Whitharral Gin	44,931
Jack Sherrod	44,690
Marjorie Post	44,377
James T. Rackler	43,434
Joe Conatser	43,334
Gordon McMillan	42,474
Bobbie F. Veretto	41,663
Calvin W. Neal	41,348
Fred G. Owens	40,254
Nelson L. Reinsch	40,071
Raymond Gunn	39,722
Cecil B. Helms	39,341
H. Joe Schwartz	39,163
Pat A. Dunavant	38,252
Mallet Ranch	37,204
Bill Graf	36,718
Billy Arnwine	36,067
Bill Gerik	36,027
Chester Borders	35,891
Howard Venable	34,604
Hub Butler	33,838
Troy M. Overman	33,730
Harley Stanley	33,464
Buck Gossett	33,280
Louie Ray Carter	32,811
Douglas Kauffman	32,240
Elbert C. White, Jr.	32,022
Melvin L. Hale	31,935
R. M. Marrow	31,865
George Wade, Jr.	31,669
Carl E. Ratliff	31,629
Donald Ray Gresham	31,374
William Clements	31,239
Walter S. Carter	31,224
Carl & Everette Butler	30,837
Ronnie Ayers	30,608
James Buford Chambers	30,416
J. J. Rister	30,346
L. E. Mitchell, Jr.	30,333
Sam Hoover	30,122
Don Reding	30,103
Sam S. Rush	30,093
Elwood Patterson	29,982
Ronnie M. Brown	29,832
Donald E. Caddell	29,618
Chesley G. Hobgood	28,165
Dale Newsom	28,079
Jim J. Hobgood	28,029
Earl D. Lewis	28,000
Jack McMillan	27,914
Larry R. Chaney	27,911
Gordon Crouch	27,614
Glenn Thrash	27,318
Roger K. White	27,308
Murl M. Orman	27,283
Buddy L. Miller	27,151

J. E. Wisdom	26,955
Kenneth Spradley	26,754
Roy Johnson	26,540
Raymond H. Belew	26,535
H. J. Steinfath	26,240
Tom Burrus	26,186
Catharine C. Whittenburg	26,018
Melvin R. Glenn	25,913
Van E. Alderson	25,906
Aubrey L. Lockett	25,650
B. W. Grant	25,440
Earl D. Patterson	25,376
Donal Hamill	25,308
Martin Lawson	25,252
M. G. Moore	25,168
Cecil C. Cookston	24,642
L. L. Alderson	24,553
Acuff Farms	24,488
H. E. Mowry	24,407
Jewel D. Melton	24,348
Carroll E. Bradshaw	24,300
Henry J. Schmidly	24,263
Robert & Jeff Kauffman	24,254
L. C. Vance	24,225
H. T. Crenshaw	24,202
Harold K. Alderson	24,086
J. B. Hoskins, Jr.	24,055
George T. Forbus	24,000
J. E. Wade	23,915
Ford A. Carter	23,900
James Lee Waldrop	23,869
Ben M. McWhorter	23,810
D. C. Reed Est.	23,737
Billy Thetford	23,712
E. W. Sanford Est.	23,599
Glenn R. Price	23,403
George R. Martin	23,383
James G. Marrow, Jr.	23,281
Jerry Biffle	23,277
Walter Schmalstieg	23,265
Wallace D. Thrash	23,252
Harvey Demel	23,230
Frank Karvas, Jr.	23,201
Clarence E. Myatt	23,116
James Blackwell	23,113
Danny Grant	23,109
Joe Bowman	23,024
Bobby D. Jackson	22,896
Robert E. Avery	22,786
Ray Anderson	22,736
Edward Pinkert	22,479
Richard Lawson	22,400
Everette Simpson	22,381
Lella Mathers	22,186
Owens Farms, Inc.	22,061
Dene R. Headstream	21,837
Ralph F. Wade	21,826
Joab Alexander	21,824
Roy N. Whittenburg	21,651
Jerry W. Myatt	21,507
Bill Price	21,431
Ray Gerik	21,202
Hollis F. Borland	21,188
Ervin Gilliam	21,173
Ed R. Reynolds	21,125
S. J. Clevenger	21,080
Tommie E. Stracener	21,078
H. R. Phillips	21,066
C. A. Jackson	21,040
James Stroepe	21,037
J. T. Hall, Jr.	20,870
Ernest T. Price	20,747
Marvin W. Menzel	20,730
Kenneth Montgomery	20,560
W. J. Shockley	20,523
Rayford Bynum	20,336
Bobby Buchanan	20,325
Jack Ballow	20,275
B. D. Whitley	20,225
Jack Ayers	20,211
Norvel V. Fred	20,157
Albert M. Storey	20,147
Maple Wilson c/o L N B Build.	20,137
E. B. Burelsmith	20,130
W. D. Terry	20,066
H. Dan Johnston	20,059

Total payees in county
(163) 5,059,040

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas—Continued

HOUSTON COUNTY	
Dawn Rials.....	40,230
George Murray.....	30,817
Wade Minter, Sr.....	28,082
J & B Farm.....	25,348
Wade Minter, Jr.....	21,992
Arnold Cotton Co.....	20,900

Total payees in county (6)..... 167,469

HOWARD COUNTY	
Edgar Phillips.....	48,008
Paul Adams.....	44,409
Delbert Stanley.....	42,912
James C. Barr.....	42,805
Robert V. Fryar.....	41,848
G. C. Broughton, Jr.....	40,723
Broughton/Sackett Farms, Inc.....	39,894
Robert Nichols.....	37,229
Horace E. Tubbs.....	34,938
Robert E. Beall.....	31,124
Robert C. Wegner, Jr.....	30,917
Roy Phillips.....	30,436
Jack E. Hopper.....	28,440
Shirley W. Fryar.....	28,164
David Barr.....	27,508
Elbert Long.....	27,347
S. M. Haney.....	26,961
Martin Fryar.....	26,849
Harvey L. Adams.....	26,723
Rodney & Stella Brooks.....	26,612
Oliver Nichols.....	26,364
Melvin Smith.....	26,310
Harvey Fryar.....	26,209
Johnny R. Stanley.....	25,447
Leslie R. Walker.....	25,369
Jerry Iden.....	25,337
E. W. Lomax.....	24,989
J. W. Shive.....	23,960
Melvin Gibbs.....	23,318
J. W. Fryar.....	22,417
Morris Patterson.....	22,018
Aubrey Lankford.....	21,635
Marion Clyde Denton.....	21,600
William C. Fryar.....	21,314
Bigony Farms.....	21,261
Lawrence G. Adkins.....	21,081
Neil Fryar.....	20,946
Arnold J. Lloyd.....	20,330
Calvin Hughes.....	20,255
Landon Burchell.....	20,148
Johnnie Walker.....	20,041

Total payees in county (41)..... 1,164,196

HUDSPETH COUNTY	
Kay Maynard, Inc.....	47,613
Michael Lynch.....	27,397
J. Lynch.....	26,418
Dell View Farms.....	25,341
C. L. Machinery.....	23,483
Condido Holguin.....	22,303
Robert L. Chambers.....	21,257
O. A. Thorp.....	20,257

Total payees in county (8)..... 214,069

HUNT COUNTY	
William E. Myre.....	59,040
David Dodson.....	36,999
Marion F. Dodson.....	35,178
Harold W. Burt.....	34,778
Harold W. Anderson.....	33,739
Bobby D. Williams.....	27,047
Maurice M. Clack.....	23,569
Guy W. Ray.....	21,353

Total payees in county (8)..... 271,703

HUTCHINSON COUNTY	
Claude Higley.....	64,837
Noble Watson.....	37,096
Coble Cattle Corp.....	35,219
Henderson & Parks.....	34,610

Jack Johnson, Jr.....	23,454
O. O. Smith.....	23,087
F. B. Early.....	22,835
R. E. Womble.....	22,158
Ray Moore.....	21,971
Raymond Jarvis.....	21,645
Charles Johnson.....	21,324
Gene Taylor.....	20,931
Carson McCloy.....	20,759
Wilson McCloy.....	20,759
Thane McCloy.....	20,647

Total payees in county (15)..... 411,332

JACK COUNTY	
T. L. C. Livestock Co.....	54,232
Henderson & Durham.....	27,268

Total payees in county (2)..... 81,500

JACKSON COUNTY	
Emil Bures, Jr.....	33,055
Reuben Kramer.....	21,028

Total payees in county (2)..... 54,083

JEFF DAVIS COUNTY	
James P. Espy.....	33,768
E. & E. Livestock Co., Inc.....	27,822
Olen Lane.....	21,857
McElroy and McElroy.....	21,056

Total payees in county (4)..... 104,503

JIM WELLS COUNTY	
R. W. Miller.....	40,518
Leon Eschberger.....	32,551
Frank J. Hoelscher.....	28,462
Don Boggan.....	27,786
Ernest L. Hoelscher.....	25,024
H. H. Presnall.....	24,769
J. M. Dellinger, Jr.....	24,558
Max Richter.....	22,996
W. M. Laughlin.....	21,135

Total payees in county (9)..... 247,799

JOHNSON COUNTY	
James E. Kemp.....	31,250
Jack Davis.....	25,731
Roy L. & M. L. Plunkett P/S.....	23,210
Albert Anthony.....	21,032

Total payees in county (4)..... 101,223

JONES COUNTY	
Hoke Propst.....	71,348
W. C. Matchett.....	67,236
Herman A. Propst.....	50,457
Bill Pritchard.....	45,205
Chas M. Herndon.....	36,776
Vernon Lovvorn.....	34,439
Willie L. Byrd.....	34,113
James D. Lovvorn.....	32,810
Clinton C. Moss.....	31,643
Herman T. Steel.....	31,088
Hollis W. Madden.....	31,053
H. L. Ford.....	30,206
Frank Vasek.....	29,143
William W. Cook.....	28,505
Thomas G. Nix.....	27,414
Pied Piper Farms.....	26,952
Raymond Scifres.....	26,689
Weldon F. Walker.....	26,095
Elbert D. Apperson.....	25,658
Schoonmaker Bros.....	25,530
Stenholm Farms.....	25,310
Oddie Jones.....	24,625
Oran Brigham.....	24,513
W. D. Smith.....	24,137
Herman B. Propst.....	23,796
C. O. Richards.....	23,318
Eva T. Amerson.....	23,082
H. H. McLeod.....	22,781
F. A. Lollar.....	22,358
B. J. Wilson.....	22,042

John E. Scarborough.....	20,733
John A. Carnes.....	20,462

Total payees in county (32)..... 989,517

KAUFMAN COUNTY	
Monty Clayton.....	36,809
Robert J. Wortham.....	35,971
J. L. Helm.....	34,185
Jerry R. Maloney.....	33,703
Jack Glenn.....	21,785
Trinity Valley Ranch.....	20,859

Total payees in county (6)..... 183,312

KENT COUNTY	
Garth Gregory.....	23,437

KERR COUNTY	
Y. O. Ranch.....	61,174
J. M. Auld.....	29,745

Total payees in county (2)..... 90,919

KING COUNTY	
C. M. Sossaman.....	43,036
Ruth Starr Blake Trust.....	22,822
J. P. Ratliff Jr.....	22,774
T. C. Havins.....	22,658
Raymond King.....	21,806

Total payees in county (5)..... 133,096

KINNEY COUNTY	
Clay Hunt.....	62,449
Myrtle H. Hunt.....	31,057
Silver Lake Ranches Co. Inc.....	30,440
George W. Herndon.....	29,731
George Bunker.....	27,302
P. H. Coates III.....	25,435
West Pinto Ranch Co.....	23,420
Abb Rose.....	21,222

Total payees in county (8)..... 251,056

KLEBERG COUNTY	
Huff Uros.....	36,149
Clarence E. May.....	28,358
Clarence C. May.....	21,929

Total payees in county (3)..... 86,436

KNOX COUNTY	
William J. Goode.....	40,968
League Ranch.....	39,066
Eugene L. Thompson.....	38,832
Elvis Blake.....	35,788
James Albus.....	32,302
Donald Johnson.....	31,778
Wilfred Bellinghausen.....	29,713
B. M. Farmer.....	28,432
Vernal Zeissel.....	27,400
Marvin Zeissel.....	26,838
Floyd L. Reed.....	26,079
J. C. Elliott.....	25,239
Philip F. Homer.....	24,400
Sam E. Clonts.....	23,923
Lonnie D. Offutt.....	22,941
Chalmer E. Hobert.....	22,311
Herbert Bellinghausen.....	22,195
J. C. Moorhouse.....	22,134
George L. Floyd.....	21,800
C. B. Ray.....	21,123
J. G. Hawkins.....	20,883
B. M. Brown.....	20,424
Gerald A. Brown.....	20,424
C. H. Cornett.....	20,125
U. J. Bellinghausen.....	20,011

Total payees in county (25)..... 665,129

LAMAR COUNTY	
Hicks Graves.....	60,320
Billy Mashburn.....	42,049
Creed Bros. Ptrs.....	24,388
Johnnie W. Musgrove.....	23,361
John L. Coplin.....	23,179
J. D. Campbell.....	21,519
Ben Laird.....	21,427

Joe D. Mashburn..... 20,316
 Joe Donald Mashburn..... 20,307

Total payees in county (9)..... 256,866

LAMB COUNTY

Lonnie R. Smith..... 59,842
 Billy W. Clayton..... 54,375
 M. P. Thedford..... 53,356
 D. R. Hopkins..... 50,805
 J. D. Smith..... 50,571
 Reginal Stephens..... 49,886
 L. C. Hewitt..... 47,061
 Gene Templeton..... 46,879
 B. G. Free..... 45,969
 V. O. Busby..... 45,226
 Thomas Harris..... 44,152
 Barry Arnes..... 42,734
 T. A. King, Jr..... 42,624
 Ross Lumsden..... 40,995
 L. J. Welch..... 40,640
 Parish Farms..... 40,046
 H. M. Sheats..... 39,617
 Royce Collins..... 39,007
 F. M. Smith..... 37,773
 T. V. Murrell..... 36,933
 James H. Busby..... 36,708
 Gordon B. Timms..... 35,845
 Eddie Wallace..... 35,788
 Ray Wood..... 35,628
 Wesley Nelinst..... 35,606
 J. B./Jearl James..... 35,294
 John Bridges..... 34,752
 Barton Bros..... 34,648
 Donnie Cowart..... 34,382
 H. M. Gable..... 33,611
 Charles W. Wiseman..... 33,484
 D. W. Bawcom..... 33,385
 Royce McFadden..... 33,145
 Donald Street..... 32,716
 Fred Welch..... 32,523
 Calvin Wood..... 30,979
 B. D. Nelson..... 30,370
 J. T. Gibson..... 29,653
 Elmer Lewis..... 28,960
 R. L. Masten..... 28,880
 Donald J. Bryant..... 28,705
 Leo V. Smith..... 28,535
 L. B. Montgomery..... 28,210
 Kenneth Hinson..... 27,892
 Dan Wood..... 27,840
 Royce Turner..... 27,785
 J. L. Snider..... 27,584
 Philip Haberer..... 27,130
 W. C. Stout Est..... 26,341
 Harley D. Jones..... 26,145
 Joe F. Miller..... 26,006
 Dan Quigley..... 25,868
 Johnny Hodges..... 25,722
 Glenn E. Robertson..... 25,710
 George E. Brown, Jr..... 25,703
 Matt Nix, Jr..... 25,628
 J. M. Farmer..... 25,436
 W. B. Jones..... 25,283
 Neil Wood..... 25,234
 Harvey Patterson..... 25,233
 Larry Lockwood..... 25,103
 E. O. Feagley..... 25,064
 Jack Allcorn..... 24,683
 W. W. Thompson..... 24,666
 S. K. Flatt..... 24,260
 Edd Haley..... 24,143
 Elmer McGill..... 24,020
 Dewitt Tiller..... 23,866
 Ernest E. Jones..... 23,822
 L. H. Carson..... 23,769
 Don Joyner..... 23,763
 Emert J. Rose..... 23,609
 A. B. Roberts..... 23,594
 R. D. Nix..... 23,211
 Bennie Harmon..... 22,856
 L. G. Watson..... 22,839
 Raymond Durham..... 22,537
 Wallace O. Jones..... 22,324
 Robert E. Coen..... 22,235
 Benny Dickson..... 22,054
 Daniel B. Heard..... 22,188
 W. D. Bell..... 22,031
 Melvin Bock..... 21,726
 W. B. Boyles..... 21,718
 L. C. Grissom..... 21,657
 James C. Graham..... 21,646

Harley Bussanmas..... 21,640
 James A. Littleton, Jr..... 21,583
 Travis Bundick..... 21,575
 James Sanderson..... 21,411
 R. V. Allcorn..... 21,396
 Kenneth Wiseman..... 21,321
 F. D. Clayton..... 21,242
 James E. Steffey..... 21,199
 Athol C. Light, Jr..... 21,174
 N. W. Emfinger..... 21,138
 Willie Steffey..... 21,051
 U. L. Gunter..... 20,911
 James L. Withrow..... 20,892
 Fred A. Smith..... 20,687
 Duane Gray..... 20,633
 Randall Roper..... 20,626
 Jimmy Nix..... 20,616
 O. D. Chester..... 20,430
 Jack Angeley..... 20,383
 Frank Wuertlein..... 20,313
 Glenn Vining..... 20,127
 Devern Mandrell..... 20,044
 M. R. Matthews..... 20,010

Total payees in county
 (109)..... 3,190,624

LASALLE COUNTY

Gerald Mann..... 23,917

LEON COUNTY

Oscar O. Brown..... 34,971
 Troy J. Brown..... 24,523
 Harrell Dean Brown..... 23,103

Total payees in county (3)..... 82,597

LIMESTONE COUNTY

Walter B. Honeycutt, Jr..... 29,793

LIPSCOMB COUNTY

Vernon G. Schultz..... 21,227

LIVE OAK COUNTY

Fred Thoms..... 47,424

LLANO COUNTY

Roddie Bros..... 22,999

LUBBOCK COUNTY

William E. Armstrong..... 69,515
 Standefer & Gray..... 65,572
 The Dunlap Co..... 62,175
 Wendell D. Vardeman..... 59,958
 L. L. Lawson..... 56,388
 Howard L. Alford..... 53,307
 Medlock Farms, Inc..... 52,880
 R. E. Jones..... 52,584
 Don Veretto..... 52,534
 Coyne E. Killian..... 48,959
 Fred E. McNabb..... 47,289
 James F. Davis, Jr..... 46,852
 Olan K. Dorsett, Jr..... 45,208
 Luther Lawson..... 44,828
 J. Carter Caldwell..... 44,332
 Kirby Hobgood..... 43,033
 Jay Stanton..... 42,460
 Smith Brothers..... 42,001
 Elijah M. Debusk..... 41,686
 Kenneth Davies..... 41,671
 Earl Foerster..... 41,645
 George Oliver Jackson..... 41,113
 Leroy Grawunder..... 39,461
 A. L. Cone..... 38,834
 Roy C. Clark..... 38,460
 San Augustine Ranch..... 37,669
 Greenlee Farms..... 37,502
 Glen B. Payne..... 36,721
 W. R. Sage..... 36,324
 J. W. Furgeson..... 35,732
 Morris S. Smith..... 35,683
 Graham C. Holmes..... 35,387
 George H. Harlan..... 33,929
 Brodie A. Darby..... 33,380
 Edward S. Smith, Jr..... 33,226
 Billy Meyers..... 33,021
 Ferman R. Priddy..... 32,990
 J. W. Shadden..... 32,876
 Sam A. Durham..... 32,770

Ward W. Carroll..... 32,766
 Debusk Enterprises, Inc..... 32,745
 Max Barnett..... 32,622
 Frank W. Hancock..... 32,202
 Weldon M. Boyd..... 32,152
 Robert Melcher..... 31,957
 Glenn Brown Blackmon..... 31,928
 Wlenke Bros..... 31,695
 J. H. Kurklin..... 31,664
 Excell W. McFarling..... 31,659
 Harold E. Voigt..... 31,167
 David S. Enger..... 30,865
 E. C. Moseley, Inc..... 30,556
 B. B. Hobgood..... 30,528
 O. B. Chesshir..... 30,317
 Delphine J. Hlavaty..... 30,258
 Newman Lusk..... 30,144
 C. W. Teal..... 29,937
 Alton L. Lawson..... 29,911
 Clayton E. Enger..... 29,713
 Clifford Hamilton..... 29,569
 J. C. Heinrich..... 29,519
 Herbert Pinkert..... 29,341
 L. T. Foster..... 29,286
 Ray D. Langford..... 29,222
 Farm Enterprises, Inc..... 28,892
 Billy J. Robbins..... 28,710
 Willie C. Neel..... 28,538
 Boyce Middlebrook..... 28,521
 Walter O. Heinrich..... 28,518
 D. D. Qualls..... 28,304
 Billy Bryan Boyd..... 28,178
 O. W. Smith..... 27,780
 C. O. McNabb..... 27,732
 D. J. May..... 27,681
 W. A. Bill Alsbaugh..... 27,672
 Lowery M. James..... 27,605
 Randal L. Rieger..... 27,549
 Johnnie Joiner..... 27,451
 Zack Payton..... 27,424
 Medlock Inv. Co., Inc..... 27,318
 J. P. Thompson..... 26,946
 Jack Don Dulaney..... 26,880
 Leon L. Lincecum..... 26,833
 James Attebury..... 26,722
 Melvin H. Jack Phipps..... 26,488
 George H. Johnson..... 26,421
 Smith Keller..... 26,363
 William H. McKelvy..... 26,335
 John T. Paterson..... 26,268
 Hugh V. Newton..... 26,221
 Charles W. Wood..... 26,019
 Roy Allen Forkner..... 25,862
 George A. Taylor, Jr..... 25,826
 Paul Cates..... 25,650
 Earl Reasoner..... 25,640
 Jack Adamson..... 25,532
 Ronnie Joe Darby..... 25,427
 M. J. Williams..... 25,380
 Bennie L. James..... 25,182
 Joe W. Felty..... 25,011
 Paul D. Kitchens..... 24,816
 Buddy Hettler..... 24,740
 Harold Campbell..... 24,715
 I. Arnold Chauncey..... 24,615
 James T. McMenamy..... 24,611
 Walter E. Morgan..... 24,200
 Tom Ed Reynolds..... 24,196
 Joe McCollum..... 24,069
 Chester B. Gilmore..... 24,014
 Albert C. Henderson..... 23,904
 Charles R. Hedges..... 23,839
 Milton Kirksey..... 23,639
 William V. Halford..... 23,512
 Franklin Heinrich..... 23,506
 Jack Loudon..... 23,281
 A. C. McCallon..... 23,276
 Robert H. Park..... 23,230
 Leroy Zieschang..... 23,132
 L. D. Stanford..... 23,054
 Robert Fehlelson..... 23,044
 O. D. Sanders..... 23,020
 Bruce Isom..... 22,888
 Lester W. Caraway..... 22,820
 Clifford Hilbers..... 22,801
 Bobby Joe Harlan..... 22,772
 A. L. Rose, Jr..... 22,533
 William B. Criswell..... 22,521
 Omer D. Lindsey..... 22,515
 James Riney..... 22,438

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas—Continued

Bruce Gentry, Sr.	22,381
F. D. Drachenberg	22,316
O. Ford Bell	22,314
Raymond R. Marshall	22,256
John B. Lamb	22,235
Doyle Curry	22,166
Kenneth G. Wright	22,087
Paul E. Crosnoe, Jr.	22,051
Gene Reid	21,985
Jerry F. Melcher	21,961
Tommy D. Adams	21,923
Clinton Powell Adams	21,787
Berlin Haught	21,533
Dick Park	21,492
Joe Leaverton, Inc.	21,419
L. D. Phillips, Jr.	21,338
R. B. Stanton	21,306
Horace L. Turnbow	21,160
Kenneth Granger	21,136
May Lewis Stewart	21,107
Walter H. Luker	21,075
Robert C. Baxter	21,068
L. E. Bartlett	20,933
Donald E. Adrian	20,818
Wesley W. Ferguson	20,817
Donnie Shafer	20,764
Billy H. Piercy	20,627
Durward D. Mahon	20,552
Melvin Tischler	20,494
Ralph B. Mabry	20,427
Don Freeman	20,402
Carl D. Jones	20,383
W. M. Brazell	20,369
Melba N. Thompson, Jr.	20,293
L. C. Childers, Jr.	20,231
E. Donald Bledsoe	20,157

Total payees in county (165) 4,887,620

LYNN COUNTY

Guy Bennett	60,006
W. C. Huffaker, Jr.	59,926
Cecil Dorman	59,412
J. T. Forbes	58,884
W. A. Russ	57,087
Natt Park	56,418
R. L. Dulin	56,329
J. W. Gardenhire	55,478
John A. Crutcher	54,401
A. G. Crutcher	53,965
Eva Colleen Geren	52,903
Cass Edwards, II	52,900
L. C. Unfred	52,809
C. R. Phifer, Jr.	51,851
Wm. G. Lumsden	47,958
Jerry McKibben	47,214
W. T. Kidwell	47,212
Draper Brothers	46,546
Jim Bob Smith	45,253
Wayne Huffaker	44,437
H. T. Barrett	44,176
Carl Sanders	43,139
Sam Singleton	42,978
R. L. Thomas	42,563
C. A. Moore	42,388
Othell Meeks	42,095
J. A. Evans	41,816
Harold Payne	41,533
James H. Sanders	40,845
Don D. Balch	40,757
L. H. Nettles	40,639
Jack Webb	38,769
Mack Forbes	38,603
C. E. Roper	37,674
Wayne Clayton	37,133
Billy G. Gardenhire	37,006
Dallas Vaughn	36,824
Jerry Brown	36,295
Ray Cook	36,174
Clarence Church	35,658
Woodrow Brewer	35,535
Edward Bartley	35,034
Felix H. Macha	34,416
Pat Childress	34,398
Theodore B. Franklin	33,838

J. Weldon Martin	33,811	G. G. Norman	20,927
R. L. Warren	33,639	Robert Edwards	20,837
C. L. Mason	33,408	J. T. Miller	20,697
J. Robert Fillingim	33,300	C. T. or Gene Ingle	20,635
Glen B. Brewer	32,850	R. A. Taylor	20,577
Bryan Wright	32,227	J. B. Rackler	20,381
Larry Hagood	32,218	J. Martin Basinger	20,226
Charles Schniers	32,187	R. W. Overstreet	20,150
Bennie W. Edwards	31,812	Delmar Wilke	20,027
David L. Hill	31,536		
A. P. Edwards	31,389	Total payees in county (144)	4,534,387
Wayland F. Taylor	31,385		
G. W. Jones	31,090		
C. T. Louder	29,987		
Harold Brumit	29,808		
Eldon Gattis	29,696		
Buel Draper	29,520		
Dick Franklin	29,462		
Bonnie Brown	29,355		
Oscar Lowrey	29,350		
Howard Moore	29,213		
Olen Renfro	29,204		
O. C. Sikes	29,120		
H. G. Franklin	29,074		
A. C. Fillingim, Jr.	28,935		
Lynn West Est.	28,305		
Leland White	28,267		
Wayne Carroll	27,797		
Ray Adams	27,778		
Boyd Pebsworth	27,568		
J. W. Pirtle	27,300		
Lester Adams	26,765		
Gene Cantwell	26,481		
D. W. Hancock	26,453		
W. J. Kahl	26,345		
Leroy Snider	26,232		
N. B. Hancock	25,754		
C. E. Thetford	25,733		
Raymond H. Lawrence	25,684		
James F. Roberts	25,294		
Jearld Barton	25,261		
Willie A. Nieman	25,202		
W. W. Hagood	25,165		
Glynn Moore	24,994		
Charles A. Smith	24,974		
D. R. Adamson	24,961		
E. L. Short	24,834		
Mickey Pearce	24,825		
Walton Terry	24,760		
Clayton Carter	24,531		
D. J. Bessire	24,187		
Weldon Bailey	23,833		
T. B. and Chas. Mason Ptnrshp	23,804		
Buster Phipps	23,759		
Bill M. Clayton	23,735		
Aubrey Smith	23,282		
Elmer Schoppa	23,093		
Milton Piwonka	23,091		
Clayton Lawrence	23,010		
Royce Steven Greer	22,968		
C. W. Armes	22,967		
W. P. Scott	22,962		
Luther Foerster	22,892		
R. T. Brewer	22,890		
W. C. Wharton	22,841		
Willis Pennington	22,829		
W. H. Cook	22,815		
Maurice J. Huffaker	22,600		
G. W. Turner, Jr.	22,285		
Willie Mae Edwards	22,236		
C. L. Littlepage	22,222		
Miriam Collins Green	22,178		
W. A. Caveness	22,176		
Wendell B. Morrow	22,127		
Elton Childress	22,040		
E. R. Blakney	21,984		
Horace Strickland	21,902		
J. T. Middleton, Jr.	21,808		
Frank Timmons	21,793		
Lit H. Moore, Jr.	21,761		
Joe D. Unfred	21,650		
B. R. McDonald	21,443		
Ralph M. Beach	21,258		
V. O. Caswell	21,200		
R. M. Thomas	21,174		
V. P. Haley	21,169		
Glen Akin	20,994		
Joe Brewer	20,993		
D. W. Gaignat	20,934		
L. D. Halford	20,931		
A. C. Woodward			
Larry Zane Shaw			
Glen Cox			
Ralph Wesley Williams			
Melvin Harris			
Eula Preston Madison			
Jack Hershell Kuhlman			
James G. Sawyer			
Clarence Fryar			
Buster Haggard			
Dean Russell Fleming			
Romine Bros			
Erma Blagrove			
Odie Harris			
Thomas E. Fuller			
James Ernest Franklin			
Eddie C. Cook			
Charlie A. Nichols			
Billy Fryar			
Glen Morrison			
James Newman Biggs			
Earl Vernon Hightower			
Floyd Martin			
Malcolm Tunnell			
Hill Top Farms, Inc.			
Derwood Blagrove			
Earl Vernon Holcomb			
Darrell Froman			
Jimmy Eugene Freeman			
Don Dwayne Holcomb			
Quinton Alrhart			
John Morgan Hale			
Feaster & Hale			
E. & E. Farms, Inc.			
John Wallace Kelly			
Dolphus Edward Richards			
Newell Wayne Tate			
Edmond Tom Ranch, Inc.			
Moncue McKaskle			
H. D. Howard			
Guadalupe Morales			
Jerry Hall			
Clifton Carlton Grigg			
Jull Reid			
Ronnie Deatherage			
Elmer Cecil Dyer			
J. Alex Haggard			
Sam B. Parham			
James Edward Pollock			
Richard L. Linney			
Michael E. Hale			
Myrtle Romine			
D. W. Dickenson			
Chloice Shofner			
Edward Lee Richards			
R. H. Sample			
Charles King			
Vestal Norman Phillips			
John Calvin Jones			
Robert Joe Deatherage			
W. H. Woody			
Wayne D. Stroud			
John Woodward			
Tommy R. Newman			
Gale Batson			
Gleen Lovless Holloway			
Raymond A. Pribyla			
Norwood Eugene Holloway			
Teddie Dewitt Barnhill			
Marvin L. Standefer			
Claud Gaspie, Jr.			
C. W. Gilmore			
J. N. Woody, Jr.			
Thomas Edward Smith			
Leonard Clifton Hazlewood, Jr.			
Glen Petree			

Wesley Weems Williams, Jr.----- 20,611
 Billie Joe Gill----- 20,255
 Elvis Dean Holcomb----- 20,232
 C. M. Holcomb----- 20,232
 Bob Hill----- 20,196
 Wayne Cook----- 20,091
 Robert R. Hunt----- 20,077

Total payees in county
 (83)----- 2,589,085

MATAGORDA COUNTY

Vernon Hunt----- 28,645
 Carl M. Hansen, Jr.----- 27,330

Total payees in county (2)----- 55,975

MAVERICK COUNTY

Jack Keisling----- 38,225

M'CUULOCK COUNTY

G. R. White Est----- 20,441

M'LENNAN COUNTY

Lankart Seed Farms Ltd----- 42,843
 J. B. Vandiver----- 42,082
 James M. Warner----- 42,076
 J. Weldon Youngblood----- 40,841
 Walter Rush----- 54,771
 Jim Radle----- 25,798

Total payees in county (6)----- 228,411

MEDINA COUNTY

Ed Wanjura----- 30,204

MIDLAND COUNTY

Alan Spinks----- 45,039
 Jerome Hoelscher----- 39,413
 Robert Morgan----- 33,952
 R. V. Robinson----- 28,432
 Louie Koonce----- 26,969
 Bob Evans----- 25,948
 Carlos Dusek----- 24,246
 Eugene F. Jones----- 23,618
 Forest G. Eggemeyer----- 23,215
 A. C. Teinert----- 23,084
 Bobby Howard----- 23,074
 Roy D. Jones Est----- 21,549
 Roy Graham----- 20,621
 Russel E. Jones----- 20,005

Total payees in county (14)----- 379,165

MILAM COUNTY

Wilburn E. Beckhusen----- 40,787
 Daniel D. McDaniel----- 40,197
 Calvin Cobb----- 37,182
 Derwood Cobb----- 35,776
 Darrel Cobb----- 31,845
 Walter Pyle----- 29,839
 Slavik Bros----- 26,275
 John J. Fagan----- 24,049
 Kenneth G. Willy----- 20,172
 Donny R. Heine----- 20,164

Total payees in county (10)----- 306,286

MILLS COUNTY

Charley McLean----- 20,443

MITCHELL COUNTY

D. M. Pieper----- 46,836
 J. E. Brown----- 43,397
 W. H. Narrell----- 43,266
 Travis P. Turner----- 40,612
 D. M. Smith----- 40,219
 Raymond Watlington----- 38,627
 Wayne Oliver----- 36,500
 Kenneth Dockrey----- 33,392
 Hammond and Son----- 32,385
 Mack G. Ritchey----- 32,024
 A. K. McCauley, Jr----- 31,436
 Warren Anderson----- 30,989
 Curt Shaw----- 30,204
 Chas. N. Stubblefield----- 28,648
 Linden Solomon----- 28,442
 Foy Webb----- 25,407
 Mary V. Barber----- 25,011

James K. Butler----- 24,617
 Jack Long----- 24,170
 J. R. Erwin----- 23,743
 James Cox----- 22,761
 J. C. Barkley----- 21,163
 Manuel Munoz----- 21,105
 Jim Maddox----- 20,998
 Joe L. Blackard----- 20,411
 Dewey A. Turner----- 20,107

Total payees in county
 (26)----- 786,473

MONTAGUE COUNTY

Glen Lynch----- 21,242

MOORE COUNTY

Gossetts, Inc----- 62,012
 M. & S. Agri. & Livestock Co., Inc----- 60,689
 Marshall Cator----- 58,391
 Rex Hall, Jr----- 52,752
 Schuman Farms, Inc----- 52,325
 Gordon Taylor----- 52,305
 Hunt Farms, Inc----- 48,621
 Stringer Farms, Inc----- 44,625
 McMurry Farms, Inc----- 41,881
 D. Rex Langley----- 40,691
 Linda & Howard Moore----- 39,459
 Jack H. Mills----- 39,318
 Durward N. Gamblin----- 36,783
 Harold N. Keisling----- 35,448
 John A. McMurry, Jr----- 34,553
 Gladwin Gillispie----- 34,146
 Verde & Lloyd Beauchamp----- 33,968
 Cleve & Frederick Roussier----- 33,757
 Carl Beauchamp----- 32,699
 Paulus Schroeter----- 32,677
 Arthur B. Stavio----- 31,189
 H. D. Lewis----- 31,095
 J. W. Huff----- 30,911
 Arvel A. Perky----- 29,653
 Coleman Agrietrprises, Inc----- 29,175
 Thurman E. Fisher----- 28,253
 Joe Cox----- 28,204
 Thomas E. Harbert----- 27,065
 Wells Agricultural Corp----- 26,605
 Brent & Sons Ptrshp----- 26,442
 James Tatum, Jr----- 26,357
 Edward L. Stallwitz----- 25,307
 Earl B. Byrd----- 25,280
 Triple T. Farms, Inc----- 25,171
 Jimmy C. Stokes----- 25,145
 Edward M. Stallwitz----- 25,027
 A. J. Harris----- 24,848
 Joe Schuman----- 24,560
 Jessie Glynn Burnett----- 24,138
 H. D. Mell----- 23,897
 James W. Medford----- 23,387
 Nelson E. Burton----- 23,322
 Johnny Lynn Harris----- 23,011
 Arie K. Smith----- 22,765
 101 Ranch Farm Acct----- 22,511
 J. W. Brian----- 22,467
 Claude Johnson & Son----- 22,155
 P. F. Younger----- 21,880
 M. D. Jack Bain----- 21,824
 Johnson Trust----- 21,765
 Roy Clark & Sons, Inc----- 20,927
 Jimmy Wells----- 20,690
 E. C. Britain, Jr----- 20,579
 Chester Rigdon----- 20,226
 John H. Goodwin----- 20,048

Total payees in county
 (55)----- 1,732,979

MOTLEY COUNTY

Alfred Kenneth Barton----- 35,590
 Allan L. Thomas----- 21,869
 George B. Bowles----- 20,929

Total payees in county (3)----- 78,388

NAVARRO COUNTY

Drew Gillen----- 36,822
 Robert L. Colquitt----- 31,098
 Jarvis Paris Murphy Co., Inc----- 28,828
 Jimmy Hooser----- 27,935
 Delma Ray Spence----- 26,886
 James Fortson----- 26,233

Webb Armstrong----- 25,989
 Emil Moucka----- 25,989
 Laura Johnston----- 25,972
 Joe B. Fortson, Jr----- 25,788
 W. M. Lowe----- 24,531
 Charles T. Pullins----- 24,463
 B. B. Bennett----- 24,063
 J. L. Aven----- 23,143
 J. F. McLain----- 22,622
 Charles Martin----- 20,948
 Donal Butler----- 20,574
 James W. Brown----- 20,220

Total payees in county
 (18)----- 462,104

NOLAN COUNTY

D. S. Riggs----- 71,021
 Herbert L. Williams----- 62,410
 Max Wright----- 57,371
 R. B. Pieper----- 52,846
 George E. Parrott----- 50,836
 Ray Hendricks----- 50,816
 Clyde H. Ater----- 44,886
 Jerland F. Freeman----- 42,301
 Joe G. Williams----- 38,882
 Ronda H. Whorton----- 37,358
 Philip V. Haynes----- 37,146
 T. D. Young----- 36,835
 Melvin D. Dally----- 33,301
 R. R. Ranch----- 31,137
 Wendell Kent----- 30,691
 Raymond E. Althof----- 29,993
 James E. Reed----- 28,642
 Clifford C. Etheredge----- 28,640
 Dean D. Alexander----- 28,061
 J. B. Cooper, Jr----- 26,583
 Jesse Faust----- 25,267
 Curtis Riggs----- 25,159
 Harold C. Althof----- 25,068
 Mancel T. Pointer----- 24,775
 John M. Boston----- 23,585
 Alfred F. Henrichs----- 22,979
 Wilbert H. Althof----- 22,871
 Donald A. Menn----- 22,830
 L. L. Medlock, Jr. & Son----- 21,200
 Veltie E. Turner----- 20,892
 Cecil McIntire----- 20,521
 Robert T. Dunlap----- 20,515
 Arlon W. Orman----- 20,185
 Ronald E. Williams----- 20,170

Total payees in county
 (34)----- 1,135,773

NUECES COUNTY

Hale & Hale----- 64,061
 Harper Farms----- 62,823
 Berta C. Cunningham, Est----- 44,533
 C. A. Lowman----- 42,115
 Roger Whitmire----- 39,976
 W. W. Walton----- 39,359
 Randy Farenthold----- 38,453
 W. A. Whitmire----- 37,315
 Barkley Farms, Inc----- 35,203
 C. L. Lehman----- 34,572
 Santa Cruz Farms----- 34,177
 W. M. Bevely----- 33,558
 Driscoll Foundation----- 31,254
 Paschal Farms----- 30,207
 Myrtle E. Cardwell----- 29,512
 Frank Moravek, Jr----- 29,241
 Mack B. Norris----- 28,823
 Alvin McNair----- 28,281
 Clifton E. Frazier----- 28,021
 E. M. & Cornie Wilson, Est----- 27,294
 C. C. Albrecht----- 27,149
 J. D. Weaver----- 26,108
 J. C. Mayo----- 25,577
 W. M. Bevely, Jr----- 25,187
 Leon Bernsen----- 24,946
 J. W. Callaway----- 24,580
 Lynn Dugger----- 24,545
 Perry & Company----- 24,099
 Bar D River Ranch----- 23,486
 J. N. Gillis & Son----- 23,461
 Wright Bros. Farm----- 23,336
 Howze Partnership----- 22,857
 Perry Foundation----- 22,006
 H. L. Gillespie----- 21,927
 E. H. Kirkpatrick----- 21,883

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas—Continued

F. W. Hoepfner	21,652
B. I. Barnes	21,380
Eugene Hellmann	21,158
Alton H. Koenning	20,890
Doyle London	20,776
A. F. Bartosch	20,748
R. L. Garrett	20,659
Robert Callaway	20,514
Melvin McNair	20,215
George Rogge	20,117
Lloyd Morris	20,073
Henrietta C. Crook	20,056

Total payees in county (47) - 1,348,163

OCHILTREE COUNTY

Bob Urban	40,080
Frank Buzzard	32,915
Jewell Pearson	31,315
James Lair	28,465
Dunnihoo Timmons, Inc.	27,854
Gerald C. Betty	27,795
Earl Leslie	26,634
Charles Morton Share Trust	26,522
R. H. Holland & Son	25,777
Philo Butler and Son	25,232
H. C. Brillhart & Son	24,281
Burger and Burger	24,035
Alma O. Schaefer	21,709
Davis Co.	21,310
Thomason Farm	21,159
John Meinders	20,483

Total payees in county (10) - 425,566

OLDHAM COUNTY

George B. Doshier	52,497
Herman Grusing	41,572
Taylor Brothers	25,613
Vega Land Cattle Co., Inc.	24,864
Charles B. Short	24,349
E. Duane Allred	23,635

Total payees in county (6) - 192,530

PARMER COUNTY

Clarence Martin	81,652
Dave M. Thompson	65,537
Fangman Farms, Inc.	62,087
Bruce Parr	59,517
J. T. Ford	59,044
Sloan Osborn	51,235
James W. Barnett	45,916
J. C. Mills	42,602
Ranza Bogges	42,456
Verney Towns	42,272
Walter R. Nabry	41,270
Glenn Phillips	41,074
Fred Burch	40,355
Billy L. Marshall	40,320
Ralph W. Shelton	39,672
Roscoe Q. Silverthorne	39,665
J. D. Kirkpatrick	39,367
Tom Caldwell	37,433
Edward D. Chitwood, Jr.	37,003
Herman D. Gerles	36,817
Thomas N. Browning	35,802
W. O. Chadwick	35,641
Marston G. Mars	34,635
Arlin L. Hartzog	34,407
James W. Dixon	33,882
Dean McCallum	33,787
Floyd T. Dyer	33,569
Leroy Johnson	33,556
Thomas D. Ware	33,231
Vernon C. Willard	33,038
Gene Smith	32,646
John Renner	32,439
R. J. Renner, Jr.	32,318
Thomas L. Whaley	32,278
David Grimsley	31,712
C. L. Mercer & Sons	31,462
Clawson Bldg., e/o C. Clark	31,454
Richard & Jerry London	31,341
Royce G. Welch	31,338
Phillip C. Weatherly	31,140

Leonard L. Grissom	31,134
Billy E. Boulton	30,761
John L. Ray	30,571
J. A. Rushing	30,366
Bill St. Clair	30,331
Wyle M. Bullock	30,040
C. V. Potts	29,558
J. G. McFarland	29,483
Walter Kaltwasser	29,097
James M. Proctor	29,073
Daniel L. Carmichael	29,016
Van E. Nichols	28,887
Edwinston Clark	28,495
Louis L. Welch	28,418
Henry Haseloff	27,847
Melborn C. Jones	27,746
M. A. Black	27,276
J. B. Sudderth	27,259
Jack Moseley	27,201
Lawrence Jamerson	26,857
Ellis W. Tatum	26,738
Voges & Reisiger	26,718
Billy J. Thorn	26,285
Durward K. Bell	25,909
Howard N. Hayes	25,764
Donald Christian	25,582
J. E. Knight	25,371
Raymond K. Schueler	25,307
Ball W. Carthel	25,022
John W. Hand	24,569
Troy Christian	24,430
W. M. Sherley	24,254
Jerry Fancher	24,119
John R. Hays	24,091
Robert G. Sparks	24,039
Eddie W. Nickels	23,834
Glyn Hamilton	23,744
A. L. Black	23,637
Edwin L. Lide	23,444
Don Williams	23,440
Woodrow W. Whitaker	23,384
A. A. Allen	23,372
Joe F. Blair	23,238
Charles Myers, Jr.	23,197
Dalton K. Caffey	23,115
Alphonse L. Reznik	22,976
Stephen L. Struve	22,896
Clarence A. Johnson	22,740
Adolf H. Haseloff	22,723
Max Steinbock	22,704
Virgil Young	22,585
Jim R. Daniel	22,526
Grady W. Sorley	22,468
A. Dargin Kirk	22,441
Fred W. Foster	22,375
Monty Barrett	22,255
Cole Bros.	22,232
David H. Carson	22,226
Norman R. Taylor	22,009
William S. Ingram	21,877
Don B. Sudderth	21,862
J. H. Dunbar	21,845
Curtis W. Murphree	21,793
Oakley D. Stevenson	21,660
Stan Barrett	21,620
Floyd L. Rector	21,437
Joe A. Schilling	21,430
Keith Garner	21,229
Gilbert A. Kaltwasser	21,190
Walter R. Riethmayer	21,035
Melvin Southward	21,030
Herbert I. Howell	21,002
R. H. Schueler Est.	20,958
Bill Brown	20,839
Jimmie Heard	20,491
Henry L. Ivy	20,482
Jack Smith	20,439
Melvin G. Sachs	20,426
R. W. Jones	20,412
Thomas W. Beauchamp	20,389
J. T. Mayhew	20,251
Norman C. Sulser	20,187
James Ensor	20,129

Total payees in county (123) - 3,616,158

PECOS COUNTY

Ralph C. Dickson	60,674
W. H. Riley II	58,514
Trans Pecos Farms, Inc.	58,077

C. and C. Farms	57,156
Mike A. Burkholder	55,153
A. B. Foster	54,800
Harrell and Harrell	44,746
David C. McAteer	44,451
Lakeside Farms	41,678
Bennie J. Emerson	39,591
W. L. Kingston	38,830
Luther C. Holladay	38,708
Glen J. Ellis	36,243
Marshall G. Nevill	32,691
Albert J. Hoelscher	32,080
Clark Bros., Inc.	29,629
Allison Ranch Co.	26,404
Larry E. Kingston	26,145
Clarence A. Stephan	23,025
Harrall and Marable	22,615
Andrew J. Sittton, Jr.	22,581
Carpenter Farms, Inc.	22,394
Clint Ellis Owens	21,898
Richardson Farms	21,613
Rose Ranch Co.	21,443

Total payees in county (25) - 931,139

POTTER COUNTY

C. B. Emeny	34,098
E. B. Fite	20,440

Total payees in county (2) - 54,538

PRESIDIO COUNTY

Valley Farms Co.	37,277
Charles Spencer	36,495

Total payees in county (2) - 73,772

RANDALL COUNTY

Eldon Durrett Trusts	43,528
Earnest L. Barnett	33,774
Jack R. C. Vincent	31,001
Simon G. Elliott	29,452
W. T. Smot, Jr.	27,985
Pete E. Fischbacher	27,298
John A. Williams	27,294
Robert C. Sims & Sons	26,699
Elliott Bros.	25,933
Gilbert Irlbeck	25,865
Johnny Sluder	24,843
Fred Fegel	24,567
Paul Schniederjan	24,299
Clinton Glenn	22,522
D. L. Allison	22,349
Howard Fuqua	21,888
Northrup Farms	20,992

Total payees in county (17) - 460,289

REAGAN COUNTY

Alfred J. Schwartz	33,663
John Gregory Powell	24,610

Total payees in county (2) - 58,273

RED RIVER COUNTY

First American Farm, Inc.	43,811
John M. Ward	41,704
Kenneth M. Allen	24,134
Doug Alsobrook	20,680

Total payees in county (4) - 130,329

REEVES COUNTY

L. G. Worsham	109,445
Dingler Farms, Inc.	79,609
W. A. Sullivan	66,472
Jack Duke	64,305
Loy Kilgore	62,660
Joe Lee McMahon	61,672
Kenneth Lindemann	59,605
W. W. Hill	59,398
Ray Kesey	58,252
Ted Lindemann	56,996
T. J. Wilson	56,914
Coy Fraley	56,423
Charles A. Weinacht	56,419
William R. Ramsey	56,382
G. G. Passmore	56,370

C. J. Kesey	56,147	Gathan Reistino	51,471	Dehnisch Bros	22,599
Frank Bounds	55,698	Fred J. Ferrara	51,293	Taft Morrow	22,591
Bobby Rogers	55,341	Ross Cash	50,542	Albert Kastner	22,161
R. E. Roberts	55,182	Joe Reistino Estate	46,999	Edwin Schneider	21,816
J. R. Clark	55,182	T. D. Wilson	45,718	Clyde C. Mayo	21,685
Rachec, Inc	54,915	Joe Scarpinato	40,079	Woodrow Hart	21,421
Robert G. Worsham	54,714	Michael Muse	36,106	Arlen Glen Jostes	21,277
Reetex Farms, Inc.	54,174	Leon Anthony Denena	34,044	D. Randolph Rachal	20,878
Pecos P and C Co., Inc.	52,875	Frank Sam Loria	31,946	Charlie F. Spiekerman	20,370
West Texas P. C. A.	51,827	Anthony L. Scamardo	30,610	Hattie Bell Ferguson	20,334
Red Bird Farms	51,794	Frank B. Seale Estate	30,387	Glenn Dorris	20,171
Jack O. Nutter	43,614	3 D Farm & Ranch	30,248	U. E. Ray	20,103
L. M. Jones	43,614	Pete L. Scamardo	27,891	Stanley Webb, Jr.	20,073
Dale Toone	43,350	Luke Scamardo	27,818	Loree Svadlenak	20,001
W. W. Clem	42,487	Ben Perrone	26,444		
Hoefs Farms, Inc.	41,995	Louise Muse	25,271	Total payees in county	
Don Weihnacht	41,058	Joe Cotropla	25,135	(55)	1,635,489
W. T. Lattner, Jr.	40,421	Joe & Matt Salvaggio	24,879		
Peppy McKinney	39,716	Joe L. Collette	24,184	SAN SABA COUNTY	
Christelle Mills	39,659	Frank Destefano	23,270	Owen Brothers Cattle Co.	41,517
Paul C. Davidson	39,384	A. R. Albrecht	22,831		
A. J. Broyles	36,199			SCHLEICHER COUNTY	
J. T. McKinney	35,973	Total payees in county		James L. Powell	31,687
B. V. Shaw	34,861	(31)	1,270,284	Virginia Bruton	23,643
H. R. Hudson, Jr.	34,550			Total payees in county (2)	55,330
David D. Davis	33,964	ROCKWALL COUNTY			
Jerry Jenkins	33,448	A. R. Seabolt, Jr.	30,247	SCURRY COUNTY	
West Texas Farm Co.	33,291	Henry Zollner	26,747	C. A. Daugherty	60,230
Cherry Draw Co.	33,155	Carlton D. Clinard	23,330	Billy Huddleston	52,326
C. S. Hess and Son	32,836	Charles W. Holt	21,070	Don Wills	42,473
Cherry Creek Farm	31,778	Marvin Goodwin	20,125	Granville E. Chorn	40,431
Chocolate Flats Farm Co.	31,251			J. B. Autry	37,994
Raymond Beauchamp	30,980	Total payees in county (5)	121,519	Clements Bros	37,333
Charles Spence	30,737			Jerry Gannaway	32,862
Garland Derword Rowe	30,457	RUNNELS COUNTY		Mozell Roggenstein	32,601
Evans Butler	30,346	Bennie W. Wilde	33,890	Wayne Key	32,069
Clem Crowley	30,084	Melvin R. Williams	23,840	G. L. Wall	31,020
R. V. Turnbough	30,025	L. P. Schwertner	23,782	Terry Nachlinger	30,171
Broyles Pecos Farm	28,649	Harvey E. Gully	23,697	Max Von Roeder	29,572
Jack Davis	27,601	Dalton C. Lacy	23,106	Ray Merring	28,980
James L. Sears	27,329	Newman E. Smith	22,229	Forest Hess	27,399
A. J. Carpenter	27,281	Walter B. Adam	22,137	Glenn Foster	26,350
Ennis B. Tudor	25,552			Ernest Schattel	25,092
W. B. Evans	25,402	Total payees in county (7)	172,681	J. H. Stansell & Son	24,876
Robert M. Owen	25,354			R. J. Kubena	24,024
L. M. Collier	24,481	RUSK COUNTY		Henry G. Gafford	23,813
Tom Passmore	24,348	Otho Morris	31,400	Billy J. Voss	23,378
J. S. Wofford	24,241			Jackie D. Nachlinger	22,677
Hermosa Farms, Inc.	24,090	SAN PATRICIO COUNTY		Emil Schattel Est.	22,156
Robert R. Butler	24,090	Heirs of Jos. F. Green	75,923	R. L. Drum	21,534
Charlie Taylor	23,529	Vahlsing Christina Corp.	54,996	Horace Shifflett	20,617
Louis D. McNeil	22,665	Donald B. Horne	50,269	Doyle Wemken	20,194
Herbert H. Toone	22,134	H. G. Ritchie, Jr.	50,219	J. W. Byrd	20,049
Roy Blahosky	21,394	Williams & Burkhardt	49,719	Dee Pylant	20,047
B. C. Kesey	20,975	R. E. Hart	42,093		
Herman Bippes	20,261	Floyd Webb, Jr.	39,972	Total payees in county (27)	810,268
Coy Nichols	20,155	H. G. Ritchie, Est.	38,130		
		Adams Brothers	37,184	SHACKELFORD COUNTY	
Total payees in county (72)	2,987,535	Thomas Touchstone	36,234	Robert L. Reves, Sr.	22,804
		J. D. Patrick, Jr.	36,055	Kenneth Hansen	22,031
REFUGIO COUNTY		W. O. Hart	34,744	Total payees in county (2)	44,835
Voges and Boeng	35,248	George J. Ermis	34,497		
G. H. Frazier	28,572	Daniel P. Moore	32,964	SHERMAN COUNTY	
Hartmann Farms	25,500	Martin Schneider	32,588	Jimmy Cluck	116,362
Roger Williams	23,823	Jackson & Stripling	32,175	R. M. Buckles Est.	46,815
David Zabel	23,338	Charles H. Mayo	31,462	Wood B. Craig	38,323
R. L. Shaw	21,460	Stanley Webb, III	31,346	Jack Hell	37,423
W. F. Abney	21,135	Thomas Ardel Setliff	30,497	Monroe Bros	35,549
J. C. Ermis	20,984	O. L. Gorbet	28,983	Jesse C. Cooper	35,345
T. G. and R. L. Jackson	20,951	R. C. Dillon	28,464	Elmo Fortenberry	35,326
Virginia H. Tatton	20,768	Chester B. Brittain	28,337	McClellan & McClellan	35,050
Charles J. Schindler	20,716	Homer C. Easterwood	28,155	Ezra F. Fisk	34,016
		T. D. Threadgill, Jr.	28,038	Stratford Feed Yards, Inc.	33,224
Total payees in county		K. G. McKamey Est.	27,706	Dietrich & Gurley	33,080
(11)	262,495	W. L. Shelburne, Jr.	27,694	Dean G. Cluck	31,269
		Cecil Hart	27,425	Dick Diehl	31,160
ROBERTS COUNTY		Q. M. Priday, Jr.	26,338	Wallace N. Bridwell	30,524
W. R. Holland	25,063	Mercer I. Ivey	26,070	Wallace Corse	30,498
		Floerke Bros	25,927	Orland Lasley	30,410
ROBERTSON COUNTY		John H. Schmalstieg	25,445	Halle Bros	29,937
Goodlands Farms, Inc.	62,737	Ray Troup	25,444	Sam R. Cluck	29,262
Vence Corpora	60,077	C. L. Mayo	25,176	Helen Buckles Est.	29,241
John C. Reistino	58,939	J. M. Edmondson	24,771	Wendell Stacy	28,451
Sam Degella Sr.	56,807	Roots and Roots	24,616	Everett Bros	28,238
James H. Jones	56,741	Beyer Bros	24,232	Leroy Robison	28,028
Pauline Doremus	54,464	David Bevely	23,807	Huber R. Tillery	27,571
Ned Fachorn	54,133	W. C. McDaniel	23,713	Pat Holt	26,817
John W. Nigilazzo, Jr.	53,560	W. D. Miller Farm	23,098		
John W. Nigilazzo	53,546	Howard H. Webb	22,850		
Sam Destefano	52,114	Irvin Hart	22,653		

M. H. Wagner.

29, 477
28, 635
28, 533
27, 994
27, 914
27, 846
27, 759
27, 382
26, 976
26, 581
26, 539
26, 227
26, 222
26, 168
25, 749
25, 659
25, 290
25, 092
24, 982
24, 374
24, 258
24, 187
24, 182
23, 980

M. H. Wagner.
D. A. Kelly---
Robert E. Sm.
David Auburn
H. J. & S., Inc.
J. W. Hawkins
John Shirley
M. E. Hinson
Keith Vandiv
Dan A. Day---
W. C. Cabe---
Don C. Day---
Doyle Moss---
H. L. King---
James F. Tu
Robert Beasle
Davis Beasley
Leon Clark---
S. M. Dill---
Troy Phillips
Doyle Hargro
W. M. Hunter
Rufus Dill---
Milton Addis

23, 980
23, 440
23, 031
22, 902
22, 817
22, 786
22, 766
22, 608
22, 588
22, 532
21, 940
21, 828
21, 823

Milton Addison
Melton Briscoe
Lloyd W. Yow
D. S. Carroll
N. R. Marchbanks
Kenneth Purvis
George Weiss
Forrest D. Spivey
G. I. Simms
Rex Wilkes
Mack Wilmes
Donald Hancock
J. Frank Jones

21,770
21,593
21,232

21, 116
21, 042
21, 006
20, 959
20, 951
20, 916

J. C. Chamberlain
W. Wayne Leavelle
Herman Wheeler
C. A. Winn
J. V. Riley
Jess McWhorter

20, 703
20, 688
20, 614

20, 614
20, 546
20, 255
20, 156
20, 120

G. W. Henson
Billy R. Jones
Bill W. Black
C. R. Farrar
Odell L. Low

419,575

Art W. Adair
Tom Adams
Travis Farms

42, 34
35, 40

Cletus Floyd
James J. Ma
M. H. Botlis

77, 753

45, 07
34, 35
25, 32
23, 30
23, 09
20, 84
20, 44

Doyle Neigh
Ray Gober...
T. J. Christo
Thomas J. W
Dale Andrew
James G. Da
David Turn
R. R. McNie
Harper Cou

192, 43

62, 98
62, 78
61, 85
61, 11
60, 22
59, 53
59, 20
57, 18
55, 25
54, 37
54, 02
53, 73
53, 62
52, 69
52, 36
50, 81

L. R. Gober
Truman Ha
Billy Timme
G. M. Newso
J. A. Webb-
G. W. Dill-
Joe W. Grim
Jacky G. Be
Tatum Farn
C. S. Carroll
R. L. Burnet
C. J. Falls, J
Larry D. Str
W. L. Steph
Homer C. B
D. L. Adcoc
Melvin Car
L. M. Willia

5	L. M. Williams	23, 963
---	----------------	---------

Kermitt Shults	23,877
Geo. L. Sullivan, Jr.	23,871
R. O. Webb	23,822
L. P. Joplin	23,643
R. D. Jones, Jr.	23,604
Burton F. Foshee	23,600
Brown Farms	23,585
Edward L. Jordan	23,532
Graves Nelson	23,300
Merlin Speed	22,943
G. C. Cattle Co., Inc.	22,865
Tommy Brashears	22,668
L. T. Rettmann	22,421
Donald Currie	22,271
M. W. Baccus	22,201
Edward L. McCutcheon	22,002
Gene Newsom	21,990
James E. Thurman	21,948
J. D. Oliver	21,785
Bill Keesee	21,706
Truett Flache	21,657
Ralph Spain	21,483
J. W. Lasiter	21,265
R. H. Clements	21,256
Raymond Vardeman	21,137
Hugh Clark	20,995
Fred H. Turner	20,905
J. V. Gilliam	20,768
Leroy Jeter	20,712
Don Martin	20,613
Earl Caswell	20,608
J. O. Farrar	20,562
Billy Yeatts	20,544
Jimmy Pendergrass	20,509
R. G. Nutt, Jr.	20,480
Gary McCallister	20,442
M. R. Paddack	20,416
Victor Watts	20,401
Cecil Cowan	20,353
Dennis Givens, Jr.	20,316
J. W. Cooper	20,161
Monroe Rowden	20,025

Total payees in county
(149) 4,844,733

TOM GREEN COUNTY

B. R. Weatherford	44,966
Dewey Farmer, Jr.	33,578
Edwin J. Wilde	32,274
C. M. Arrott	30,467
Fenton A. Wilde	30,021
Bill Pfuger	29,685
Ripple Brothers Part	27,522
A. Phinney, Jr.	27,024
Richard Book	26,889
Leon Kiesling	25,946
Lewis R. Runion	23,871
Dorval D. Lee	23,396
Robert Lee Vidler	23,105
Jimmy Brenek	22,066
Edwin A. Book	21,406
Otto W. Dierschke	20,500

Total payees in county
(16) 442,716

TRAVIS COUNTY

Wilburn Burkland	36,724
Clyde Lundgren	27,743
Fred Lundgren, Jr.	20,047

Total payees in county (3) 84,514

UPTON COUNTY

E. F. Noelke Ranch Co.	26,145
Robert Latzel	24,801
Ray R. Barrett, Jr.	23,879

Total payees in county (3) 74,825

UVALDE COUNTY

Dolph Briscoe, Jr.	52,544
Elizabeth Raney	32,402
Jesse Raney	23,367
Harvey Guiley & Son	22,752
Ed Young	22,048
Burger Bros	21,346

Total payees in county (6) 174,459

VAL VERDE COUNTY

W. H. Wardlaw	56,175
Hutto Brothers	45,387
Kelly Ranch	37,419
Davenport Brothers	31,566
Double R Ranches	29,965
Charlie F. Hinds	24,197
Jim Bob Altizer	22,274
Continental Ranch Co.	20,915

Total payees in county (8) 267,898

VAN ZANDT COUNTY

Thurman J. Miles	30,849
------------------	--------

VICTORIA COUNTY

William B. Bayer	32,503
------------------	--------

WALKER COUNTY

Texas Dept. of Corr.	150,236
----------------------	---------

WARD COUNTY

Bluford A. Thornton	23,714
W. I. Winter	22,759

Total payees in county (2) 46,473

WHARTON COUNTY

Wendel, Inc.	41,588
W. D. McMillan	37,386
Mahalite Bros.	31,106
Nilson Farms	28,537
Lawrence Petersen	28,504
R. D. Williams	26,778
Lawrence Nilson	25,400
Ralph Petersen	25,178
Heyne Brothers	24,073
Curtis H. Jensen	23,403

Total payees in county (10) 291,953

WHEELER COUNTY

J. M. Tindall	29,568
Raymond Moore	21,451
A. W. Burrell	21,329
W. W. Aaron	20,315

Total payees in county (4) 92,663

WICHITA COUNTY

Montgomery & Crumpler	34,347
H. C. Preston Est.	24,530
Rayford Young	22,859

Total payees in county (3) 81,736

WILBARGER COUNTY

W. T. Waggoner Trust Est.	72,830
John H. Turner	38,474
Roy W. Judd	33,736
Robert H. Belew	29,856
J. C. Riggins	29,104
Robert H. Belew, Jr.	28,895
J. W. Overton	22,732
Curtis A. Graf	21,535
Jack Lee McMichael	21,313
Marshall K. Berry	21,156
Sam Judd, Jr.	20,432
Lorene and H. B. Dockery	20,318

Total payees in county
(12) 360,381

WILLACY COUNTY

D. E. Morrow	67,300
B. W. Kirsch	67,037
Sebastian Cotton & Grain	65,272
Adele M. Schmidt	62,311
K. L. Morrow	61,490
S & S Seed	60,240
Funk Farms, Inc.	54,996
Jerry Funk	54,157
Tommy Funk	54,156
Wayne Labar	52,631
Alden Johnson	52,515
James Whitfield	45,197
Chester A. Johnson	44,187
Yturria Farms	42,775
Vassberg Bros.	42,380

Lagerstam Farms, Inc.	40,565
Willamar Farms, Inc.	38,944
W. Don Stone	36,894
A. C. Durlivage	36,487
Curtis L. Roberts	35,866
D. C. & Ted Parham, Ptns.	34,713
Weldon Haynes	33,134
J & L Properties	32,700
Swanberg Twins	30,915
John Wreden	30,111
A. J. Shewmaker	30,035
Virgil D. Oakes	29,962
G. M. & C. Ring	26,768
G. F. McGee & Sons	26,163
Lloyd M. Funk	25,367
Monty Stewart	24,545
D. V. & J. T. Mayo Ptns.	24,002
James M. Lucas	23,530
Fred Klostermann	23,068
Brite Hart	22,791
J. A. Pennington	22,467
Paul Meers	22,402
Cooley Farms	22,357
Chas. Wetegrove Co.	22,024
Hoot Farms	21,463
Thomas J. Rains	21,343
D. B. MacAllister	21,311
D. Seltzer	20,731
Clarence R. Anderson	20,658
Chester Hart	20,448
Leland Harris	20,440
M. B. Bourne, Jr.	20,295
Donald Florence	20,048

Total payees in county (48) 1,709,191

WILLIAMSON COUNTY

Stiles Farm Foundation	42,337
Ed Carlson, Jr.	25,223
Telander Bros.	23,193
Billy Turner	22,300

Total payees in county (4) 113,053

YOAKUM COUNTY

Wheeler Robertson	66,535
Alton Billings	65,335
Grady Warren	63,229
Bill Moore	62,232
Tommy Billings	59,739
Darwin Hobbs	59,672
T. A. Hicks	59,395
Olen Edwards	57,339
Phil Addison	54,815
John Avara	50,403
Thurman Skains	45,566
Truett F. Jones	44,133
E. B. Hicks	43,087
Tom Warren, Jr.	42,408
Bob Lee	41,994
Tekell Farms & Gaylon Tekell	41,311
Don Thrash	40,659
R. G. Hartman	38,011
I. W. Bailey	37,836
Mont Hamm	35,395
James W. Warren	34,504
Louis Eubanks	33,001
Bobby Bailey	32,660
Robert A. Long	32,485
W. R. Nelson	30,828
C. O. Head	30,580
Wendell Norman	29,434
Billy J. Smith	28,776
C. Loran Gayle	28,692
L. D. Hamm, Jr.	28,446
Robert Hamm	27,970
Raymond Crain	26,845
W. M. Nelson	26,552
Yoakum Farm Co.	26,104
Dallas Brewer	25,928
T. A. Elmore	25,747
T. D. Roberts	25,702
Donald Ray Lackey	24,987
Earl Kiser	24,654
Rayford E. Bearden	23,646
Dan Beck	23,115
J. L. Hyde	22,699
E. O. Winkles	22,113
Don Williams	22,084
Morris Lowe	21,840
Alvin Joiner	21,627

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Texas—Continued

Billy Winn.....	21,237
Homer T. Sudderth.....	21,131
W. C. Wilmeth.....	20,549
A. O. Bearden.....	20,532
C. C. Perkins.....	20,464
C. R. Tucker.....	20,361

Total payees in county (52)..... 1,834,587

YOUNG COUNTY

F. Dwight Hamilton, Jr..... 30,306

ZAVALA COUNTY

Norment Foley.....	72,606
Mayfair Minerals.....	35,421
Malcolm A. Maedgen, Jr.....	34,854
Batesville Farming.....	30,230
Leslie H. Laffere.....	29,046
R. C. Campbell.....	23,062
Two L Farms, Inc.....	21,748

Total payees in county (7)..... 249,967

Total payees in State (3,989)..... 127,217,633

1971 ASCS and Great Plains Program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Utah

BOX ELDER COUNTY

Selman & Goring.....	32,885
Curlaw L&L.....	32,345
Delbert Holmgren.....	31,507
Oleen Garn & Sons.....	30,343
Wayne & Dallas Sandall.....	29,210
Norman Grover.....	27,245
Laurence G. Whitney.....	25,093
Dennis Petersen.....	23,648
Young Brothers.....	22,245
Ray Adams.....	20,871
Nick Chournos.....	20,678

Total payees in county (11)..... 296,070

CACHE COUNTY

Lee & Leona Pritchett..... 22,472

JUAB COUNTY

Wilson Brothers..... 20,904

MILLARD COUNTY

Triple C. Farms..... 20,798

MORGAN COUNTY

Charles R. Kippen..... 26,916

SALT LAKE COUNTY

Desert Lvst. Co. Inc.....	99,374
Thousand Peaks Lvst. Co.....	53,043
Thayne Acord.....	34,702
Jones Brothers.....	23,687
J. R. & R. R. Fitzgerald.....	22,507
Alonzo H. Freeman.....	20,670
Leo M. Bertagnole.....	20,642

Total payees in county (7)..... 274,625

UINTAH COUNTY

Meagher Sheep Co..... 123,427

UTAH COUNTY

Richard Greenhalgh.....	49,527
Garn Holbrook.....	29,306
Elberta Farms, Inc.....	20,983

Ralph Davis..... 20,789

Maurine D. Childs..... 20,212

Total payees in county (5)..... 140,817

WASATCH COUNTY

Smith Lamb Producers.....	25,189
Bert T. Coleman.....	23,497
Robert F. Clyde.....	20,229

Total payees in county (3)..... 68,915

WASHINGTON COUNTY

E. J. Graff..... 42,353

WEBER COUNTY

Wilson Beef and Lamb Co.....	61,471
Lloyd Keller Corp.....	34,601
Clarence M. Keller.....	27,722

Total payees in county (3)..... 123,794

Total payees in State (35)..... 1,161,091

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Virginia

CHESAPEAKE COUNTY

V. L. Whedbee..... 22,735

VIRGINIA BEACH COUNTY

Frank T. Williams..... 24,998

Total payees in State (2)..... 47,733

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Washington

ADAMS COUNTY

Columbia Producers, Inc.....	58,097
Donald Damon Est.....	56,102
D. E. Phillips.....	55,833
Hutterian Brethren, Inc.....	55,420
Robert V. Phillips.....	55,337
Ralph Gering & Sons.....	50,809
Robert A. Franz.....	46,341
Richard L. Kagele.....	38,720
Gilbert Brothers.....	36,804
J. Boyd Phillips.....	35,951
Johnson Agriprises, Inc.....	34,320
John G. Schlomer.....	33,134
Henry J. Franz.....	33,034
Muriel Jensen.....	32,658
Walter E. Franz.....	30,292
D. E. Phillips Ranch, Inc.....	29,474
Rex T. Lyle.....	28,395
Elwyn Lyle.....	28,395
Gene Kagele.....	28,296
Godfrey Meilke.....	27,943
Blankenship Farms, Inc.....	26,928
Baumann Farm, Inc.....	25,963
Clarence Strohmaier.....	25,387
Bruce Farms.....	24,475
Elmer Schoesler and Sons.....	24,364
Victor R. Franz.....	23,883
Williams and Williams.....	23,611
Homer Evans.....	23,092
M. C. Hollenback.....	23,001
Albert Sackmann.....	22,906
James Kagele.....	22,698
Ed McKay.....	22,273
Wayne F. Klindworth.....	22,175
Leonard H. Franz.....	22,023
David A. Davis.....	21,365
Kummer Bros.....	21,039
Nick C. Seivers.....	20,597
Walter Jantz.....	20,444

Total payees in county (38)..... 1,211,584

ASOTIN COUNTY

Morley D. Grothe.....	21,909
Houser & Sons, Inc.....	21,708

Total payees in county (2)..... 43,617

BENTON COUNTY

Bl-County Farms.....	49,570
Mercer Ranches, Inc.....	47,177

Vollmer-Bayne.....	43,521
Bateman Bros.....	38,422
Gould Brothers.....	35,129
Horrigan Inv. Co.....	31,221
Wirth Brothers.....	30,475
Horrigan Farms.....	30,151
Bafus White, Inc.....	26,218
Emerson L. Eby.....	24,459
Kenneth Lee Smith.....	23,782
Allen C. Deffenbaugh.....	23,222
Carl L. Smith.....	21,934
Earl Walker.....	21,908
R. P. Nicolson Ranch.....	21,341
Harry G. Owens Ranch, Inc.....	20,900
Van Klinken Brothers.....	20,771
John Wiley.....	20,365

Total payees in county (18)..... 530,563

COLUMBIA COUNTY

Conrad E. Tucker.....	44,094
Mead Ranch.....	33,173
Richard Archer.....	32,372
Eslick Farms.....	27,949
Dallas W. Long.....	26,711
Donohue Farms, Inc.....	24,518
David Archer.....	24,292
R. F. Young.....	24,269
Ellsworth Conover.....	23,656
Thorn, Inc.....	21,566
Robert Patton.....	20,512

Total payees in county (11)..... 303,112

DOUGLAS COUNTY

State of Washington.....	205,602
Russell Hunt.....	29,129
Nelson Brothers.....	29,117
Josh Barnes & Son.....	24,872
Dezellem Farms, Inc.....	23,797
Howard Jorgensen.....	21,506
D. G. Davis.....	21,262
E. John Isaak.....	20,654
Howard N. Long.....	20,358

Total payees in county (9)..... 396,297

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Wm. Geo. Harder.....	43,826
Herron Bros.....	40,122
William V. Casper.....	34,162
Maynard Ballie.....	30,058
Melvin Moore and Sons.....	28,949
Kenneth Owsley.....	27,643
Lyle W. Neff, Inc.....	27,129
J. H. Klundt & Sons.....	26,480
Jimmie McCary.....	22,751
Wilbur Dent, Jr.....	22,382
Bauermeister Brothers.....	22,159
Lloyd K. Cochrane.....	21,647
L. V. Dougherty.....	20,996
Cook Brothers.....	20,957
John V. Fisher.....	20,951
Francis Havlina.....	20,946
Richard Hart.....	20,149

Total payees in county (7)..... 451,307

GARFIELD COUNTY

Klaveano Ranches, Inc.....	32,816
John E. Elsensohn.....	29,676
Wayne Beale.....	24,449
A. E. Blachly.....	22,295
Pearl Gwinn.....	20,604

Total payees in county (5)..... 129,840

GRANT COUNTY

David Stevens.....	38,060
Kelley Brothers.....	37,146
Lourence Dormaier.....	35,169
Donald Frick.....	35,046
Higginbotham Brothers.....	32,171
Bob Zimmerman.....	31,250
Willard D. Lange.....	30,149
V. P. Hoersch.....	25,444
Art Schorzman.....	24,782
Ruth Barbre.....	24,752
S and C Ranching.....	24,743
Pete Perez, Sr.....	23,481
Howard Morgan.....	23,091

Heer Brothers.....	22,980
Phillip Villegas.....	22,683
H. N. Boger.....	22,240
Dick Edwards.....	22,163
S. E. Flanagan.....	21,768
Agatha Keener.....	21,401
David W. Frick.....	21,190
C. C. Claassen.....	20,861
Walter Spies.....	20,018

Total payees in county (22) - 580,588

KITTITAS COUNTY

Cone Livestock Co.....	66,936
------------------------	--------

Klickitat County

Robert Andrews.....	28,933
Robert Imrie.....	28,417

Total payees in county (2) - 57,350

LINCOLN COUNTY

Tanke Farms, Inc.....	30,943
George H. Ellis.....	30,526
Homborg Farms, Inc.....	30,039
Rockdale Farms /P/.....	29,440
A. Bodeau and Sons.....	28,797
Lewis Kagele.....	28,140
L. Sheffels & Son, Inc.....	27,926
Wilbur Security Co.....	26,650
Pfeifer Brothers /P/.....	26,555
E. and D. Phillips, Inc.....	26,339
The Sheffels Co., Inc.....	24,937
Edna Deptuch.....	24,588
Hardung, Inc.....	24,417
Lyka Corporation.....	23,803
Attie L. Turner.....	23,281
Robert A. Kramer.....	23,117
Carl E. & George W. Mielke /P/.....	22,592
Robert Riehl.....	22,074
Gary W. Geib.....	21,882
Dewane S. Buddrius.....	21,855
Alvin D. Fink.....	21,532
Peyton Tr.....	21,303
Don and Wallace Welshaar.....	20,488
Don B. Piper.....	20,311
Richard Dreger.....	20,280

Total payees in county (25) - 621,815

SPOKANE COUNTY

Osborne Belsby.....	43,926
Miller Bros.....	25,758
Cornwall Farms.....	21,834
Bell & Bell, Inc.....	20,605

Total payees in county (4) - 112,123

WALLA WALLA COUNTY

K2H Farms, Inc.....	122,185
Kent Land Co., Inc.....	54,015
Grote Farms, Inc.....	51,478
Kenneth Smith.....	51,175
John H. Rea.....	44,377
Robison L. and L. Co.....	42,851
Lonneker Farms, Inc.....	39,026
Erwin Bros.....	35,148
Twain Boomer.....	34,849
Matt Lyons.....	33,754
Schwerin Farms, Inc.....	33,434
Phillip Anderson.....	32,987
Foundation Farm, Inc.....	31,552
Martin Farms, Inc.....	31,463
John E. Hair.....	31,400
Allen D. Struthers.....	29,308
Tompkins & Sons.....	28,959
Tucker Farms, Inc.....	28,748
Harold V. Gorham.....	28,180
Fred Sherry.....	27,251
Dwelle Jones.....	26,364
Emeral Duncan.....	26,257
Fred J. Kimball.....	26,128
Mervin Deruwe.....	25,646
Henry V. Zuger.....	25,035
Frank Hart.....	24,606
Peterson Bros.....	24,548
Robert D. Prazier.....	24,262
Ernest Gluck.....	24,090
Marvin Tucker.....	23,299

Charles M. Walsh.....	23,263
S. Earl Cochran.....	23,122
Cecil R. Anderson.....	22,665
Casey Farms, Inc.....	22,478
Universal Land, SN, RI.....	22,472
Eugene Valaer.....	22,423
K & R Walters.....	22,372
Wallace Evans.....	22,369
Albert P. Kibler and Son.....	22,123
Hofer Bros.....	22,116
Don Thomas.....	21,974
A. Fred Zuger.....	21,671
H. Vincent and W. Johnson.....	21,356
Blacklaw Bros.....	21,321
Van I. Walkley.....	20,711
Gar Ran, Inc.....	20,504
John S. Anderson.....	20,474

Total payees in county (47) - 1,435,789

WHITMAN COUNTY

McGregor Land & Livestk Co.....	94,044
Pffaf Bros., Inc.....	53,673
Glen Miller.....	47,205
Gordon Miller.....	46,975
Clinton Miller.....	46,975
Harold Boyd.....	42,347
Hinderer Bros.....	40,351
Richard E. Despain.....	38,216
Urgel Bell.....	37,544
Bennett Lnd. Co.....	33,836
Maley Land & Livestock.....	33,725
Boyd & Sons.....	30,912
Clark Farms % Asa Clark.....	30,686
Glorfield Bros., Jack & Benny.....	30,363
Carl Boyd.....	30,234
Davis Farms, Inc.....	29,969
Joe Myers.....	28,781
Ira Scott.....	28,527
Virgil Klaveano.....	27,905
R. Paul Cocking.....	27,892
Dan Hood.....	26,044
Robert Whitmore.....	24,467
Filan Brothers.....	23,431
James Knott.....	23,395
Jackson W. Smith, Inc.....	23,185
Earl Crowe.....	22,990
Roy Smith Est.....	22,957
Herbert Camp & Sons.....	22,933
Lehn Brothers.....	22,865
Harold H. Smick.....	22,792
Maley Farms, Inc.....	22,759
Crow Farms, Inc.....	22,641
Sodorff Farms, Inc.....	22,216
Henry Fisher.....	21,531
Harp Brothers.....	21,429
Gary Cochran.....	21,169
Nelson Bros.....	20,891
Pioneer Stk & Grain Farm, Inc.....	20,653
David Gfeller.....	20,626
William H. Evans.....	20,301
Edgar L. Smith.....	20,110

Total payees in county (41) - 1,249,545

YAKIMA COUNTY

Simon Martinez.....	34,330
Harlan Shinn.....	27,616
Harold R. Clayton.....	23,517
F. T. Gamble.....	23,240
Hislop Sheep Company.....	22,217
Ralph Mains.....	21,639
William S. Parrish.....	21,287

Total payees in county (7) - 173,846

Total payees in State (249) - 7,364,315

1971 ASCS and great plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Wisconsin

COLUMBIA COUNTY

L. J. Kaasa.....	20,341
------------------	--------

DANE COUNTY

Stoughton Farms, Inc.....	37,837
William F. Renk and Sons, Inc.....	28,410

Total payees in county (2) - 66,247

RACINE COUNTY

Charles H. Kulper.....	28,409
------------------------	--------

ROCK COUNTY

Stuart Rahberg.....	20,273
---------------------	--------

Total payees in State (5) - 135,270

1971 ASCS and great plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Wyoming

BIG HORN COUNTY

C. A. Lewis Estate.....	66,718
Harry Grabbert.....	35,075

Total payees in county (2) - 101,793

CAMPBELL COUNTY

Wagon Hammer L. & L.....	58,057
Taylor Ranch.....	30,775

Total payees in county (2) - 88,832

CARBON COUNTY

Rochelle Livestock Co.....	65,473
Anderson Farms Inc.....	46,378
Palm Livestock Co.....	46,044
Buzzard Ranch.....	41,078
Four Mile Sheep Co.....	32,200
P. H. Livestock Co.....	28,696
Louis Larsen Sheep Co, Inc.....	26,516
Swanson & Johnson.....	26,407
Elmer G. Peterson.....	25,639
Stratton Sheep Co.....	25,147
Sandstone Sheep Co.....	25,024
Chace Bros.....	23,085
Miller Estate Co.....	21,975
Cronberg Bros, Inc.....	20,692
Stanley Jolley.....	20,149

Total payees in county (15) - 474,503

CONVERSE COUNTY

Morton S. Inc.....	88,407
The Dilts Co.....	29,220
George Lebar.....	27,110
Smith Sheep Co.....	27,006
Ogalalla Ranch Co.....	25,117

Total payees in county (5) - 196,860

CROOK COUNTY

W. R. Gibson.....	29,486
-------------------	--------

FREMONT COUNTY

Mazet & Sons, Inc.....	27,471
Crofts Sheep Co., Inc.....	24,766

Total payees in county (2) - 52,237

GOSHEN COUNTY

Red Cloud Cattle Co.....	25,772
--------------------------	--------

JOHNSON COUNTY

Harriet Brothers.....	56,175
Marton Brothers.....	38,245
Esponda Ranch.....	34,200
Iberlin Brothers.....	34,122
Van Irvine.....	29,101
Sussex Ditch Co.....	26,437
Moore Ranch Co.....	26,427
Peter Meike & Sons.....	23,006
Smith Brothers.....	22,203
Miller Livestock.....	22,197

Total payees in county (10) - 312,113

LARAMIE COUNTY

Ardic Inv.....	34,354
Leroy Goertz.....	31,102
Warren Livestock.....	30,927
Henry Jessen.....	23,377

Total payees in county (4) - 119,760

1971 ASCS and Great Plains program payments of \$20,000 or more—Excluding loans—Washington—Continued

LINCOLN COUNTY	
Thompson Land & Livestock Co.	86,105
Bagley Livestock Co.	29,366
Doyle Child	27,131
Etchevery Sheep Co.	26,427
Nelson Sheep Company	25,084

Total payees in county (5) - 194,113

NATRONA COUNTY	
Diamond Ring Ranch	60,469
Coffman Ranch Co.	47,399
Irvine Bros.	44,172
Rochelle Sheep Co.	43,476
Herman Werner	41,095
Willow Creek Co.	37,898
Cole Creek Sheep Co.	29,358
R. E. Creager	28,510
Burke Sheep Co.	25,756
Mark J. Davis	25,045
Werner, Inc.	23,134
William Irvine	21,962

Total payees in county (12) - 428,274

NIOBRARA COUNTY	
Boner Brothers	28,830

PARK COUNTY	
Hunt Oil Company	20,023

SHERIDAN COUNTY	
Seven Up Ranches, Inc.	45,008
W. F. Peters	22,722

Total payees in county (2) - 67,730

SWEETWATER COUNTY	
Green River Ls. Co.	52,313
Midland Livestock Co.	50,745
G. & E. Livestock, Inc.	43,441
Magagna Brothers	35,889
Mau Livestock Co., Inc.	35,481
Bar X Sheep Co.	34,393
Rife Ranch	29,786
Isaac N. Brooks	27,807

Total payees in county (8) - 309,855

UNITA COUNTY	
Arthur M. Larson	28,069
Painter & Company	25,825
Cook Sheep Company	25,761
Victor Powers	24,076
J. Grant & D. A. Broadbent	20,865

Total payees in county (5) - 124,596

WASHAKIE COUNTY	
Coutis Land & Livestock Co.	59,984
L.U. Sheep Co.	37,214
Frank B. Clark	28,344
Monier Sheep Co.	26,717

Total payees in county (4) - 152,259

Total payees in State (80) - 2,727,036

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 13315, TO PROVIDE FOR THE DISSEMINATION AND USE OF CRIMINAL ARREST RECORDS IN A MANNER THAT INSURES THEIR SECURITY AND PRIVACY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that

Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the Judiciary will hold a series of public hearings on H.R. 13315, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the dissemination and use of criminal arrest records in a manner that insures their security and privacy. These hearings will commence with testimony from Hon. Nicholas Katzenbach, vice president and general counsel, IBM Corp., Thursday, March 16, 1972 at 9:00 a.m., Room 2237 Rayburn House Office Building. Additional witnesses will be scheduled to testify at later dates.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Room 2137 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

MATTERS MARINE—PILOT COURSE IN OCEANIC STUDIES A HUGE SUCCESS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert in the RECORD a column written by Capt. Thomas L. Lewis, U.S. Navy, retired, about a pilot course in oceanic studies.

Captain Lewis writes a regular column for the Times-Picayune entitled, "Matters Marine."

I think this column about this important program will be of interest.

The column follows:

PILOT COURSE IN OCEAN STUDIES A HUGE SUCCESS

SCHOOL TO OFFER CLASS ON REGULAR BASIS (By Capt. Thomas L. Lewis, U.S. Navy, retired)

A report from the University of Virginia says its president, Dr. Edgar F. Shannon Jr., has announced because of the success of its pilot course in oceanic studies, "Humanities of the sea"—the first of its kind in the United States . . . it will be offered on a regular basis in Northern Virginia beginning next month and expanded for the future.

The course is the first "credit course" of its kind in the country. It has been conducted on an experimental basis in recent months by the University's School of General Studies through its Center for Continuing Education at Falls Church, Va.

Co-sponsored by the Oceanic Educational Foundation, the report notes that the lecturers have included the leading experts in maritime and oceanic studies in the United States.

Included among the lecturers for the semester beginning Feb. 9 (for the course taught at George Mason College in Fairfax) will be George E. Lowe, coordinator of environmental education for the U.S. Office of Education; Rep. William R. Anderson, D-Tenn., who became the first undersea explorer of the North Pole when he commanded the submarine USS Nautilus.

Also, Helen Delich Bentley, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission; Robert E. Able, director of the National Sea Grant Program; and other scholars in the field.

The pilot course which ends this month was developed, the UV report says, to introduce the new discipline of economic education to the American educational system.

Dr. Shannon said, "It immediately became oversubscribed, reflecting the mounting interest in oceanic study. The reaction of students and lecturers makes it evident that there is an increasing need for a number of courses to provide intellectual insight into the world's oceans and man's increasing dependence upon the environment of the sea." Already approved for this fall semester is a companion course, "The Science of the Seas."

"THE WORLD OCEAN"

The university will also organize a credit course for independent study. Dr. Shannon said it is called "The World Ocean" and is in its School of General Studies, the university's state-wide division that offers continuing higher education programs.

Also, a course for public schools called "Teaching the World Ocean," is being developed by the School of Education for its summer session this year at Charlottesville, Va.

According to UV's report, the university already offers masters and doctoral degrees in marine science through its department of marine science in association with the Virginia Institute of Marine Science at Gloucester Point.

The president of the Oceanic Educational Foundation, Palen Flagler of New York, looking to the future, remarked, "Based on the outstanding results of this pioneering program and the future plans developed by President Shannon, I hope that long-range developments would include degrees in humanistic oceanic education and studies to complement science-resource-research studies in oceanography."

"In the long term I foresee creation of a center of oceanic advancement on the grounds of the university which would bring scholars together in a multi-disciplinary pursuit of the potential of the oceans toward the betterment of mankind. Certainly there is a need for a maritime industrial park that could very well be established in the State of Virginia."

OCEANIC SCHOLARS

Dr. Shannon suggested that a major step in developing a comprehensive program in the humanities of the sea would be the establishment of a professorship at the university and that this chair would enable the university to bring oceanic scholars to Charlottesville to teach at all levels.

"It is increasingly apparent that all levels of teaching must afford expanded opportunities for students to gain knowledge of the oceans. Here in Virginia, manifestly a maritime state, we recognize our unique responsibility," he said.

He noted that persons who enrolled in the weekly classes of the first semester of the pilot course included educators, representatives from industry and government (including the Congress) and also private citizens. He said some were in it because of their recreational interests in the oceans.

Lecturers for the course, the report notes, are Gilven M. Slonim, course coordinator and vice president of the Oceanic Educational Foundation; Dr. Vincent Davis, director of the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky;

Wayne A. Wallace, associate professor of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia; Raymond J. McHugh, Washington bureau chief of the Copley News Service; Dr. John R. Thomas, project director of Soviet studies for the Research Analysis Corporation; Dr. Sheldon W. Simon, a political scientist at the University of Kentucky;

Dr. H. Douglass Sessums, chairman, curriculum in recreation administration at the University of North Carolina, and Dr. Horace M. Kallen, professor emeritus of philosophy at the New School of Social Research.

In addition, Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., a congressional leader in the field of oceanic programs, will hold a seminar in May.

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS: A
MAJOR BUDGET CONTINGENCY

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, like all budgets, the President's fiscal 1973 budget comprises a package of plans, proposals, and projections. The budget totals—the reestimated fiscal 1972 totals and the tentative fiscal 1973 totals—include dollar amounts based on such plans, proposals, and projections, both as to new appropriations proposed—technically called new budget authority—and as to projected budget expenditures—technically called budget outlays.

One part of the budget package is the new legislative proposals recommended—the items that generally first require consideration by various legislative committees—and subsequently the House and Senate—prior to the materialization of specific budget requests for funds to be considered by the Committees on Appropriations. How Congress reacts to these proposals—or its failure to act—obviously impacts on the budget and the final budget results for the fiscal year or years involved.

I refer only to new legislative proposals. There are many annual authorization bills for ongoing programs under existing law that must also be processed. Those are not dealt with here.

I am inserting for the information of Members and others a tabulation of all such new legislative proposals as identified in the 1973 budget submitted on

January 24. They involve both the current fiscal year 1972 budget totals and those for the forthcoming fiscal year 1973 which begins July 1 next.

For fiscal 1972 these budget proposals for new legislation involved—

New budget authority in fiscal year 1972 of \$4,026,017,000; and

Estimated budget outlays in fiscal year 1972 of \$2,661,248,000.

For fiscal 1973, they involve—

New budget authority in fiscal year 1973 of \$10,041,155,000; and

Estimated budget outlays in fiscal year 1973 of \$10,456,473,000.

As the tabulation discloses, they involve a wide range of programs—general and special revenue sharing; reform of the military retirement system; emergency school assistance; the social security program; and others. Some involve large amounts, others do not.

A handful of the legislative proposals involve reductions rather than increases, and those reductions are cranked into the overall budget totals. In the fiscal year 1973 totals, they are about \$1.3 billion in budget authority and about \$1.5 billion in outlays. Failure of Congress to accept such proposals would have the effect of increasing the budget.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

The largest single dollar amount in these budget proposals for new legislation relates to general revenue sharing—about half of the 1973 totals and considerably more than half of the revised 1972 totals. More significantly, Mr. Speaker, the general revenue sharing proposal contemplates a bill that would not only authorize the program but would

also actually make the appropriation, automatically, each year without the requirement for any further appropriation action by the Congress.

Enactment of any such revenue sharing proposal would further increase the so-called relatively uncontrollable expenditures in the budget—already accounting for about 71 percent of budget outlays—and thus further erode, as a very practical matter, the flexibility of the Congress to annually adjust and fix priorities to meet changing conditions and needs.

For the 6-year period, fiscal 1972–77, the budget estimates a total of \$33,800,000,000 for general revenue sharing, beginning with \$2.5 billion in fiscal 1972 and escalating to some \$7.5 billion in fiscal 1977.

SIX-YEAR COST PROJECTION, NEW LEGISLATION

A complete list of 6-year projected costs of legislative proposals for major new and expanded programs in the 1973 budget is in table 16, at pages 540–542, of the 1973 budget.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, George Shultz, told the Committee on Appropriations on January 24:

For all practical purposes, the Government is very much on the spot. We must face more squarely the longer-range implications of decisions. We can no longer accept proposals because "they do not cost much in the first year." Whenever a new program is proposed, that program must be important enough to warrant taking something else out of the budget or important enough to warrant a tax increase.

I include a tabulation of the proposals:

1973 BUDGET, ITEMS PROPOSED FOR LATER TRANSMITTAL UNDER PROPOSED LEGISLATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Executive Office of the President: Council on International Economic Policy	1,130	980	1,341	1,316
Funds appropriated to the President: International financial institutions	380,000	10,000	910,000	103,000
Department of Agriculture:				
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:				
Administrative and operating expenses			—1,000	—1,053
FCIC fund				1,452
Farmers Home Administration:				
Direct loan account		—20,158		3,977
Agricultural credit insurance fund	—163,094	20,158	—136,503	—593,816
Total, Agriculture	—163,094		—137,503	—589,440
Department of Commerce: Maritime Administration: Operating differential subsidies	15,000	15,000		
Department of Defense:				
All-volunteer Armed Force			400,000	390,000
Military retirement systems reform			296,000	290,000
Total, Defense			696,000	680,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Food and Drug Administration:				
Food, drug, and product safety			38,845	29,743
Health Services and Mental Health Administration:				
Health services planning and development	57,000	9,000	60,000	36,000
Office of Education:				
Education revenue sharing			223,911	110,000
Emergency school assistance	500,000	80,665	1,000,000	381,000
Higher education	259,500		—288,000	—28,500
National Foundation for Higher Education	3,000	1,000	100,000	30,000
National Institute of Education	3,000	2,500	125,000	50,000
Social and Rehabilitation Service:				
Grants to States for public assistance			—859,220	—859,220
Social and rehabilitation services			10,000	2,348
Footnotes at end of table.				
Social Security Administration:				
Payments to social security trust funds			175,000	175,000
Social security trust funds: Benefit increases, and tax base and rate changes	200,000	15,000	1,303,000	4,020,000
Welfare Reform			450,000	350,000
Total, HEW	1,022,500	108,165	2,338,536	4,296,371
Department of Housing and Urban Development: Urban community development revenue sharing			490,000	490,000
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Land Management: Management of land and resources			20,000	10,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
Resources management			4,000	4,000
Revolving fund for loans	5,000	1,000	5,000	1,000
Territorial Affairs: Trust territory of the Pacific Islands	1,000		1,000	1,000
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research			5,000	4,000
Bureau of Mines: Conservation and development of mineral resources			7,000	7,000
Total, Interior	6,000	1,000	42,000	27,000
Department of State: International Boundary and Water Commission: Construction	12,881	503		4,345
Department of Transportation: Federal Railroad Administration: Federal grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	170,000	105,000		65,000
Department of the Treasury: General revenue sharing	2,500,000	2,250,000	5,300,000	5,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency: Operations, research, and facilities			35,000	22,000

Footnotes at end of article.

1973 BUDGET, ITEMS PROPOSED FOR LATER TRANSMITTAL UNDER PROPOSED LEGISLATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973			Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Veterans' Administration:					Other Independent Agencies:				
Compensation and pensions.....	25,000	25,000	151,700	151,700	Federal payment to the District of Columbia.....	1,000	1,000	22,000	12,000
Readjustment benefits.....	54,100	143,100	163,300	167,300	Federal contribution to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.....			8,481	8,481
Medical care.....			15,945	15,945	Payment to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....			155	155	Water Resources Council.....			1,000	800
General operating expenses.....			-1,000	-1,000	Total, other independent.....	2,500	2,500	32,981	22,781
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....			2,700		Total, items proposed for later transmittal under proposed legislation.....	4,026,017	2,661,248	10,041,155	10,456,473
Total, VA.....	79,100	168,100	332,800	334,100					

¹ The budget proposes for "Expansion of defense production," legislation which provides for the termination of interest payments and the cancellation of remaining borrowing authority. The proposal is not included in the above list, since it does not affect budget authority or net budget outlays. For further details, see p. 107 of the Appendix to the Budget.

Source of table: Office of Management and Budget, January 1972.

TO WALK THE STREETS SAFELY

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in 1969, I authored a book, "To Walk the Streets Safely," about modern techniques for dealing with predatory crime. This book was the result of the very great impact that crime and the fear of crime were having upon the lives and the emotions of my constituents. The effect was so great that I spent several years investigating the ways in which modern technology could be applied to help in the fight against crime, and the book was a product of those investigations.

Now, some 3 years later, I find that from my constituents' point of view, the situation has not changed very much. The crime statistics still demonstrate an intolerable increase in the number of crimes against the person, and in my own district during the past 60 days alone, I attended the funerals of a woman killed in her apartment, a businessman killed in his shop, and a police officer killed in the streets.

We in the Congress have attempted to deal with the problem through legislation. We have enacted several bills over the years designed to deal with crime and the havoc it is creating.

Of these legislative measures, great hope was expressed for the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. This act established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which was designed to provide funds to the States to help them improve their law enforcement effort. LEAA was slow in starting, and money—some would say a great deal—has been wasted. But, LEAA has in fact funded a number of important and significant projects.

One such project involved the grant of \$185,000 to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for the development and free distribution of silent alarm systems to small businesses.

In 1969, I suggested that inexpensive silent alarm systems could serve as tools to detect intruders and to arouse the police. The installation of effective systems of this type in business establish-

ments and the lobbies of apartment buildings, I contended, could serve as effective crime deterrent devices.

The LEAA grant to Cedar Rapids has demonstrated that this is indeed the case. The installation of silent alarm systems in 350 small businesses at a cost of \$185.60 per system has increased the capture of night-time prowling thieves by more than 300 percent. And another dividend of the system is that while the alarms are watching for burglars in nearly 400 places, the night-shift patrolmen are free to cover more ground, making conventional patrols in high-crime areas.

Another project which is now enthusiastically supported by LEAA, involves the use of high-intensity street lighting as a tool to decrease night-time crime. Again, in 1969, I suggested that better street lighting could serve as one of the more effective deterrents to crime, as well as an aid to detection, since it makes the criminal and his potential target more exposed to observation. A recent experiment in the District of Columbia seems to demonstrate the truth of this proposition.

The District recently installed 3,000 high-intensity sodium vapor street lights in four areas of the city. These lights, which provide nearly two and one-half times the light normally used, have resulted in a decrease in night-crime of 32 percent in an area equivalent to 120 city blocks with a population of 30,000 at a time when all crime decreased in the District by only 14 percent.

A third technique which has also been supported by LEAA and which, like the alarms and high-intensity lights, appears to have a significant effect upon crime, involves the saturation patrolling of a particular area with large numbers of patrolmen. Thus, the New York City Rand Institute recently studied an experiment which involved increasing the number of patrolmen in the 20th police precinct, located on the West Side of Manhattan, by an average of 40 percent—from 200 to approximately 300. On the whole, the institute found, total felonies, including such crimes as manslaughter, rape, murder, and robbery, decreased by approximately 14 percent.

All three of these methods—alarm systems, high-intensity lighting, and saturation of an area with patrolmen—have one significant drawback. Used sepa-

ately, each may cause a mere displacement of crime—that is a movement by criminals from areas where they are employed to other areas where they are not.

However, there is no reason why these devices cannot be used in conjunction with each other. For example, the use of alarm systems in one area may reduce the number of patrolmen required in that area. The patrolmen thus released could be used for the saturation patrolling of another area.

In any event, the effectiveness of these devices, particularly the alarm systems and high-intensity lighting, appear to have been demonstrated beyond question.

It is time to move from the demonstration stage to widespread usage. I am, therefore, today introducing legislation to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to direct LEAA to give special emphasis to funding State programs for the distribution of alarm systems to small businesses, for high-intensity lighting, and for saturation patrolling.

Of course, the funds contained in the amendments will not do the job completely. Even at \$185.60 per alarm system, for example, the total cost of providing each of the 8 million small businesses identified by the Small Business Administration with alarm systems would cost over \$8 billion. But, at least the funds will provide a start. Further delay is unnecessary and intolerable.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION II: THE ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO POLICE ITS RENT INCREASE GUIDELINES

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a little-publicized development in the area of economic controls calls into serious question this administration's stated devotion to "law and order." I refer to the abject failure of the President's Cost of Living Council, the Justice Department and the Internal Revenue Service to en-

force the Price Commission guidelines for rent increases.

Since phase II began last November, I have received numerous complaints from citizens of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey about landlords who were exacting illegal rent increases. In cases where the landlord was adamant, it was necessary for me to refer the constituents' complaints to the local branch of the Internal Revenue Service. After weeks of delay, the IRS generally met with the landlord and persuaded him to lower the rent to an amount within the guidelines. No criminal action was taken against these landlords, even in two cases where they had gone so far as to file eviction papers against tenants who were merely exercising rights conferred on them explicitly by the Price Commission's December 30 guidelines. Nor did the IRS evidently examine the landlord's books to determine if illegal increases were being demanded of tenants in other units in the same complex. At the most, the landlords were administered a slap on the wrist and told to lower the rent about which a specific complaint had been made.

After I had followed several such cases closely, it became clear to me that the policing mechanism of the so-called New Economic Policy was hopelessly ineffective. Landlords have nothing to fear by demanding an increase in excess of the guidelines. If a tenant should be so brave as to risk eviction by reporting an illegal increase to the IRS, chances are that he will see no action taken. If the IRS does act, the landlord at most has to roll back the rent of the complaining tenant. Thus, by violating the guidelines he has thousands of dollars to gain and nothing to lose.

On February 18, I wrote to Mr. Donald Rumsfeld, director of the Cost of Living Council, urging that the administration seek criminal penalties against landlords who have violated the guidelines. I am including that letter and the response I received from Mr. Rumsfeld's office in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. As the letter from Mr. Abrahams of the Cost of Living Council indicates:

The Justice Department has filed five court actions for alleged violations of rent increase regulations.

In only one of these however, did the Department seek criminal penalties. One criminal prosecution during the 4 months of Phase II.

In commenting on this single action, Mr. Rumsfeld in a March 3 press release stated:

This decision should serve as an indication of the determination to see that the Economic Stabilization Act is fully and fairly enforced.

I can only ask Mr. Rumsfeld where he and the other economic policemen have been for the past 4 months. And, one has to be extremely naive to believe his assertion that a single criminal action at this late date will have any deterrent effect.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's failure to police its rent regulations is just one example of the inequity and ineffectiveness of the President's so-called New Economic Policy. A muddled bureauc-

racy has seen to it that price controls are no more effective. And, of course, stock market profits and numerous other sources of income for the rich are subject to no regulation at all. The workingman must be content with a 5-percent raise, however. What we are witnessing is a redistribution of income from the poor and middle-income citizen to the wealthy and to the corporations. That alone is the net effect of the New Economic Policy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD, the referred-to correspondence with the Cost of Living Council as well as a timely article on rent guidelines enforcement by Mr. Philip Shabecoff of the New York Times:

FEBRUARY 18, 1972.

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD,
Director, Cost of Living Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUMSFELD: Since the various rent increases guidelines were adopted by the Price Commission in late 1971, I have received numerous complaints from constituents about illegal rent increases. In most instances, I have been able to supply the constituent with a summary of the rent increase regulations and negotiations with the landlord resulted in a downward adjustment of the requested rent increase.

However, in a number of cases it has been necessary for either the aggrieved constituent or myself to contact the local Internal Revenue Service to request an investigation of the rent increase. In most cases the landlord has been found to be demanding an increase in excess of the guidelines and under IRS pressure has reduced the amount. In two of the cases I have worked on, the landlord was actually in the process of evicting the complaining tenant at the time of the IRS intervention.

It is evident to me, just from the complaints I receive (and I am sure that I see only the tip of the iceberg) that numerous landlords are flagrantly defying the Price Commission rent guidelines. Yet, I am not aware of any action by the IRS, the Justice Department or any other agency to exact criminal penalties from violators. At most, the landlord is simply required to adjust the rent increase to meet the guidelines.

There is no excuse for most landlords, nearly two months after publication of the final guidelines, to be violating these regulations. On the contrary, most of the cases I have dealt with involved corporate landlords, well supplied with competent legal counsel who could easily interpret the complex regulations.

Nevertheless, violations of the letter of the regulations continue. I am convinced that this is due chiefly to the fact that the price control bureaucracy has given the image of a paper tiger, at least insofar as rent controls are concerned. Unscrupulous landlords have apparently gotten the message that they can violate the guidelines with little or not fear of prosecution. This obviously undermines the effectiveness of the "New Economic Policy" and confirms many citizens' views that the President's economic restraints are chiefly beneficial to the wealthy and powerful. I am sure that the President would be highly dismayed were he to learn that the special interests were profiting from his economic policies. The President's great concern for the problems of the common man is well known.

In light of all this, I would appreciate knowing what the Cost of Living Council's policy is with respect to violations of the rent restraints. Specifically, could you advise me as to whether any criminal sanctions have been sought by the government and

whether any sanctions will be sought in the future.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

HENRY HELSTOSKI,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
COST OF LIVING COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1972.

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HELSTOSKI: Director Rumsfeld has asked me to thank you for your inquiry concerning rent increases under the Economic Stabilization Program.

As of this date, the Department of Justice has filed five court actions for alleged violation of rent increase regulations. These cases have involved rentals of apartments, houses and trailers in Florida, Delaware, Massachusetts, New Mexico and Arkansas.

In one case, U.S. vs. Futura Inc. and Charles F. Tunnecliff, the landlord was convicted of violating regulations in increasing the rent on two houses. A date for sentencing has not yet been set. In three of the cases the courts granted temporary restraining orders preventing evictions of tenants or implementation of allegedly unlawful increases. One case was settled when the landlord voluntarily agreed not to implement a planned increase.

Please be assured that the program is monitoring and investigating rent increases and that it will continue to seek court action where appropriate. The program does, however, rely heavily upon voluntary compliance and citizen participation and we appreciate learning of the efforts of you and your constituents in this regard.

If my office can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ALBERT E. ABRAHAMS,
Assistant Director for Congressional and
Public Affairs.

COMPLAINTS ON RENT RULES INCREASING (By Philip Shabecoff)

WASHINGTON.—The Price Commission's complex rent regulations, one of the biggest headaches of the economic stabilization program virtually from the outset, are coming under increasing criticism in Washington and throughout the country.

Despite the announcement yesterday that a landlord in Florida had been convicted of violating the rent regulations—the first criminal conviction under the stabilization program—consumers, Congressmen, tenants organizations and individual tenants have been expressing concern that the rent rules are not being enforced.

There are increasing complaints about landlords harassing tenants who report violations of rent rules.

There is even some concern within the Nixon Administration about whether the rules themselves are workable.

Although more than half the complaints that come into the field offices of the Internal Revenue Service about violations of controls are about rents, fewer than a dozen cases on rents have been taken to court.

MORE EVICTIONS FEARED

Reports are starting to flow in from watchdog units of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and other sources of landlords retaliating against tenants who complain by evicting them.

In fact, the labor federation's price monitors in Denver decided this week to drop all investigations of rent violations because they did not want to be responsible for the eviction of tenants.

A spokesman for the National Tenants Organization charged that landlords were using

the flexibility of the rules to raise rents by amounts far in excess of the 2.5 per cent blanket increase for costs allowed by the Price Commission.

The spokesman for the tenant organization said that evidence was coming in indicating that many landlords were using the rent regulations to raise rents when no increase would normally have been due. She also said there was wide violation of the rules requiring formal notification of rent increases coupled with a statement of the tenant's right to appeal.

Leo Perils, who heads the A.F.L.-C.I.O. national price watch operation, charged that "the Price Commission's guidelines are no more than a blueprint for profits for landlords."

Landlords, meanwhile, are complaining that the complexity of the regulations makes them difficult to understand and to follow. Landlords are also contending that the controls are causing trouble with tenants who believe that rents are frozen by Price Commission regulations.

MUCH CONFUSION FOUND

In a speech earlier this week, the chairman of the Price Commission, C. Jackson Grayson Jr., conceded that the regulations issued on rents on Dec. 29 were fair but "were so detailed that they often confused landlords and tenants alike."

Mr. Grayson disclosed in his speech that the commission was now involved in simplifying rent regulations. Earlier, the commission had asked the Internal Revenue Service for a survey of compliance with rent rules in 10 to 15 major cities.

Meanwhile, there is evidence to indicate that some landlords are taking advantage of the confusing rules to evade compliance with controls.

In Denver, Mrs. Vi Waggoner, who heads the local price watch program, reports, "We've found landlords here slapping on a coat of paint and using that as an excuse to raise rents by \$25 a month."

Among other cases investigated by the Denver price watchdogs was a landlord who placed coin boxes on washing machines previously supplied free to tenants after price controls were announced.

Now, however, the Denver watchdogs have stopped investigating rent complaints. "We found," explained Mrs. Waggoner, "that after we'd file a complaint with the I.R.S. the tenant involved would often be evicted on some other excuse such as making too much noise. We then felt responsible for finding the tenant new housing and that was too much of a responsibility."

NO RECOURSE SEEN

Mrs. Waggoner reported that revenue service officials in Denver told her that there was nothing they could do about landlords who evicted tenants in retaliation for complaints about rent increases even though that was against the law. The landlords always come up with other reasons, Mrs. Waggoner said she had been told.

The Government need not travel to Denver to find questionable applications of rent rules. Here in Washington, only six blocks from the offices of the Price Commission, a young couple are being evicted from their apartment after complaining to the Internal Revenue Service about an illegal rent increase.

The couple, whose name is not given because of pending legal action, filed the protest after the landlord raised the rent on the apartment, which was rented on a monthly basis, from \$215 to \$235, a 9.5 per cent increase.

The couple complained that the rent should be raised by no more than 2.5 per cent under the commission's rules. After a meeting with the apartment manager during which they said they could not pay the higher rent, they received an eviction order.

The Internal Revenue Service has not yet acted on the complaint. But when called directly, the apartment manager conceded that a mistake had been made and that the rent should be increased by no more than 2.5 per cent, or about \$5. He said a correction would be made.

However, the manager then said that the eviction notice still stood. The couple was being evicted for another reason, he said. He would not say what the reason was.

An I.R.S. official said today that the service had gone to court on several occasions to prevent a landlord from evicting tenants in retaliation for complaining about illegal rent increases.

However, the official conceded that local eviction laws often made it difficult to stop a landlord from throwing tenants out on pretexts having nothing to do with rent controls.

Donald Rumsfeld, director of the Cost of Living Council, said in a statement that yesterday's rent conviction in Florida "should serve as an indication of the determination to see that the Economic Stabilization Act is fully and fairly enforced." Mr. Rumsfeld also warned that action would be taken against landlords who "harass" tenants who complain of rent violations.

RAILROAD BRANCH LINE ABANDONMENTS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the latest handicaps being placed in the path of progress in rural America is the abandonment of railroad branch lines which serve thousands of our inland towns and are the only dependable means of mass transportation. Because of load restrictions on the highways in the spring of the year, truck transportation becomes slower and more costly.

Recently a group of some 90 concerned citizens from Minnesota came to Washington seeking ways to stop this abandonment of our branch line railroads.

An account of their efforts recently appeared in the Sanborn Sentinel, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, which, with your permission, and for the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

BERT BELLIG COMMENTS ON R.R. PLANS OF
LINE ABANDONMENTS

SANBORN, MINN.,

February 14, 1972.

Bert Bellig of Sanborn, who set out on his own on July 23, 1971, to stop railroad abandonments and started organizing the railroad fly-in, soon got help from Russell Schaadt of Sanborn, Harold Larsen of Springfield, and many other people interested. He has now written a joint letter to Mr. Ihan Ingraham, Federal Railroad Administrator in the Department of Transportation in Washington, D.C., and Mrs. Kenneth Tuggle of the Department of Interstate Commerce in Washington, D.C., following through on a promise he made them in Washington, D.C.

This is what he wrote:

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a copy of what I wrote and passed out on the plane on the way to Washington. I hope you will read it. I retired three years ago hoping to do a little hunting and fishing while I am in shape to

do so. But when I read in the papers what the railroad companies were planning to do to 20 communities in the area where I have lived all my life, and where we have some of the best farm land in the United States, and knowing what the railroads mean to the people that live here. I made up my mind that I was going back to work and do everything possible to stop their plans for abandonment. We cannot get along without the railroads.

I would like to tell you a little about what took place at the hearings in St. Paul in 1968, concerning the railroads. Our branch line from Wanda to Sanborn, was up for abandonment. During recess time, Stuart F. Gassner, the Chicago Northwest Railroad Attorney, as much as told us in no uncertain terms, that they did not give a damn about their railroads. He talked about the other industries that they were in when he told our group from Wanda that last year they made more off of farm chemicals than they did off their entire railroad system. And knowing how they run their railroads, I can believe this. I can get sworn affidavits from our group that was there as to what I have just said if it is necessary. They have made it quite obvious that they want to get out of the business of railroading! I feel it is time for our Government to help them out by nationalizing the railroads. I can see and understand that they are keeping pretty busy elsewhere. I understand that they are in business in over thirty other industries; they have changed their name to Chicago Northwest Industries.

The new ICC guidelines requiring 34 carloads of shipment per mile of branch line per year is completely unrealistic. This is just another way of eliminating railroad service. It will snowball, by picking off the one at the end of the line. Then the next one is in trouble and will be up for elimination and so on. This is just another way for them to get out of the business of railroading in a few years.

In closing, I want to say that I hope you will not make the mistake of letting our railroads be curtailed.

Yours truly,

BERT B. BELLIG.

P.S. We are now organized and the next time we come to Washington it will take more than one plane. In the meantime, the boys are really going to dig up the fact to be presented, and I hope we will have more time to present them.

AMERICANS, WAKE UP!

(By Bert B. Bellig)

Abandonment of the railroads must stop!! It is about time that the people in this country and our Government wake up to the facts as to what is happening to our railroad transportation system. The railroads, with the help of our Government, really pioneered the development of this Great Nation. Let's keep it that way by seeing to it that the railroads stay in business. We are supposed to be the most prosperous and highly industrialized nation in the world. But when it comes to our railroad transportation system we should hang our heads in shame.

Our Government is now spending billions of dollars in foreign aid to other countries to help them improve conditions within their boundaries. I think it is high time we start using money to keep things in shape within our own country. The restoration of rail service for the farmer and the small towns would be a good place to start. Labor should be no problem, according to the unemployment report put out by our Government. Instead of all these hand-outs, our Government should start by putting men back to work again. The fixing up of these railroad beds should have high priority on the list. The railroads mean a lot to rural America's economy. Farmers have always had a bad time trying to get a price for their produc-

tion. They certainly do not need the additional problem of getting their production to the market. I have lived on a farm by Sanborn all of my life. This area is one of the most agriculturally productive in the United States. I know for a fact that there is not one businessman or farmer who could survive if he did not take better care of his business than some of the railroad companies are taking care of theirs. To let the railroad pull out would be the biggest mistake our Government could ever make. I feel that anyone who is for letting them do so is not even a good citizen. There are a few that say that they would hate to see the Government take over the railroads—that our Government can not even do a good job of running the postal department. Well, I would hate to see the railroad boys run it, if they would run it like they do their railroads. Some of us would not get any mail for weeks and even months.

Maybe our Government should nationalize the railroad beds. Then it could charge the railroad companies for using them on the basis of what the truckers pay for using our highways. This way the railroad tracks would be kept in good shape. If we are to subsidize the railroad companies, then we must put a watch dog on their heels to see that every penny is spent on fixing up the railroad beds. Our local, state, and federal governments are spending billions of dollars to up-grade our roads and highways to meet the traffic they must bear. And when we check the casualty list of our nation's highways, one wonders if we are doing enough. The upkeep on our roads and the roads that will have to be built for all these additional semis will cost more than fixing up these railroad beds. I am sure that there is no one who drives an automobile who would like to see the railroads pull out and have all the additional semis and trucks that would be necessary to replace them added to our already congested highways.

Under our free private enterprise system, I have always felt that competition was the lifeblood of progress. To let the railroad companies discontinue their service would eliminate competition in our now competitive transportation system. With the antitrust laws we have in this country, the legality of this should be challenged. Our Government had better stop the trucking industry from getting a monopoly. I am sure they will all be organized by the Teamsters Union. In our democracy, are the majority of the people and their elected Government officials running the show, or a few of the railroad companies? I am not against organized labor. I know that well-employed and well-paid laborers are the best consumers of our farm products. But I am sure that if the railroads pull out and the trucking is left to take over, freight rates will go up. These higher freight rates will be passed on to the consumers. With all the recent concern about air pollution, I think our Government should have an investigation to find out which causes the most pollution per ton hauled—the railroad engine or the truck. One train engine will move fifty box cars of grain. It takes 125 diesel semis to move this amount.

If we are going to revitalize the development of our rural areas in this country and stop the migration of country people to the cities (where they have problems enough already), something must be done. We must improve our railroad transportation system to help accomplish this. Branch lines can not be curtailed. These railroad abandonments are not just a local or state problem, but a national one. The problem should be settled in the Congress of the United States once and for all. We must retain our railroads if we are going to remain a strong, prosperous nation.

THE SHIFTING STRATEGIC BALANCE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the position paper adopted by the Executive Council of the National Guard Association of the United States on the subject of "The Shifting Strategic Balance."

It is no secret that the entire Military Establishment has come into disrepute in some quarters in recent years, and I believe it is an understatement to say that many elected public officials have seized upon the public disenchantment with the war to gain support for policies and legislation that will accelerate the erosion of our position of militarily strategic superiority. The purported, but illusive, payoff is the promise that the billions of dollars that would be cut from defense spending would automatically be made available for more enlightened social welfare programs. When one recognizes economic realities and the persistence of Federal deficit financing, whether by fate or design, it is only a short step further to realize that a saving in any one program merely reduces the size of the deficit and does not go into some magical reservoir of great wealth to be distributed at will.

The position paper recites the President's observation as to the perils of military inferiority, and the point made bears special emphasis here:

There is an absolute point beyond which our security forces must never be allowed to go. That is the level of sufficiency. Above or at that level, our defense forces protect National security adequately. Below that level is one vast undifferentiated area of no security at all. For it serves no purpose in conflicts between nations to have been almost strong enough.

I commend the position paper to your attention:

THE SHIFTING STRATEGIC BALANCE

History offers ample evidence that it is military weakness, not strength, that most often leads to armed conflict between nations. That is one of the realities of World power relationships which great nations ignore only at terrible risk.

There is a growing body of evidence that, despite the harsh lessons of history, the United States is permitting World strategic superiority to shift to its chief adversary, the Soviet Union. Members of a Blue Ribbon Defense Panel which exhaustively studied the U.S. defense posture cited an unmistakable trend in that direction in supplementary statement to the Panel Report, and declared that "if these observable trends continue, the United States will become a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people."

The Soviet Union is the most powerful nation in the Communist system and is still expanding its great military strength. It already has overtaken the United States in a number of areas and has surpassed it in such critical measures of strategic power as long-range missiles and nuclear megatonnage. It is moving steadily toward the

first-strike capability that U.S. leaders often have said we cannot permit. Moreover, it has never swerved from its avowed determination to create a world dominated by the Communist system.

The United States for a quarter of a century has been the most serious obstacle to Communist attainment of their objective of global hegemony. Other nations large and small look to us as their shield against aggression and subjugation. Yet today, Americans are witnessing with apparent unconcern the most rapid contraction of their Military Establishment since World War II, along with a reduction of our relative strategic power vis-a-vis the major Communist powers.

The Nixon Doctrine of strength through international partnership and our National security policy of realistic deterrence are sound, but they are viable only so long as we maintain enough projectable military power and strength of purpose to make the deterrence both real, and credible to others.

There are many indications that we are rapidly approaching the point where both our military strength and our National will can be questioned. The strategic balance is being altered to our disadvantage and many Americans, including some in positions of national influence and power, not only are accepting this dangerous trend but are actively advocating further reductions in our armed might.

President Nixon very clearly outlined the perils of military inferiority when he said:

"There is an absolute point beyond which our security forces must never be allowed to go. That is the level of sufficiency. Above or at that level, our defense forces protect National security adequately. Below that level is one vast undifferentiated area of no security at all. For it serves no purpose in conflicts between nations to have been almost strong enough."

We are confident that when Americans fully understand the perils of strategic inferiority, they will insist that National security again be given the highest priority among the many difficult tasks confronting our society.

We endorse the Nixon Doctrine and the policy of realistic deterrence, but strongly believe that the present trend toward an unfavorable strategic balance must be reversed.

We are deeply concerned over the drastic reductions in the strength of the Active military forces. The Army, for example, must drop to a strength of little more than 850,000 by 30 June 1972 if it is to meet the mandatory ceiling imposed by Congress, and we believe that such a ground force is woefully inadequate under today's circumstances.

We support the Total Force concept on which Secretary of Defense Laird has laid such great stress, and agree that it must be implemented rapidly and fully so that the Nation's Reserve Components may play the more important defense role of which they are capable.

We pledge our best efforts to achievement of a zero Draft as rapidly as possible. We offer the reminder, however, that the National Guard and Reserves in all probability will not be able to maintain their authorized strengths in the absence of Draft pressures unless new membership incentives are forthcoming. Motivated, qualified manpower is the most vital ingredient of military readiness, for the Reserve Components as well as for the Active Forces. The drastic reductions in the Active Forces mean that the United States no longer possesses the military strength to honor its international defense commitments with the Active Forces alone. Additional responsibilities, therefore, have been assigned to the National Guard and Reserves.

If such concepts as self-determination, democratic rule and individual freedom are

to survive in this dangerous and imperfect World, it will be because this Nation maintained the strength and the will to continue acting as their chief guarantor. Without that guarantee, backed by adequate defense forces, freedom will not survive and America will be in jeopardy.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, in my traditionally rural State of Kansas, 41 percent of the population now lives in just four urban counties. Of the 105 counties in Kansas, 75 lost population during the 1960's.

Behind these simple statistics are thousands of people who were forced to make a decision they did not want to make. These people left their farms or their small towns—not because they wanted to, but because they had no choice.

America's rural areas, once the promised land for millions of city dwellers, are now a land where economic opportunities are few and the standard of living is below average. As a result, millions of persons have left rural America and are now contributors to and victims of the massive problems faced by our cities.

To cope with this worsening situation, the House of Representatives recently passed the Rural Development Act of 1972.

In the words of the Agriculture Committee report, this measure is designed—

To provide an effective program to enable rural America to offer living conditions and employment opportunities adequate to impede the steady flow of rural Americans to our nation's large population centers.

Once this outmigration is checked, this legislation proposes to make it desirable for Americans to actually return to our rural areas, thereby lessening the burdens and problems of the modern big city.

The bill, which authorizes an increased expenditure of \$580 million annually, amends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, among others, in providing new loan and grant authority for the Farmers Home Administration and the Soil Conservation Service.

Specific aspects of the Rural Development Act include the following:

An increase in water and sewer facility grants from \$100 to \$500 million annually;

An increase in the agricultural credit insurance fund from \$100 to \$500 million;

An increase in the size of farm operating loans from \$35,000 to \$50,000;

Removal of the \$4 million ceiling on community water and waste disposal loans;

Authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to share the cost of providing storage in watershed projects;

The sum of \$50 million annually in new grants for industrial planning and community development;

The sum of \$75 million annually in new grants for pollution abatement and control; and

A directive to the Secretary to carry out a land inventory and monitoring program and report at not less than 5-year intervals on soil, water, and related resource conditions.

This is, in sum, a far-ranging bill. It must be so, to meet the wide scope of problems which face our farms and our communities of under 5,500 population.

In my State, there are 600 such communities, containing almost one-half million Kansans. There are fewer of them than there were a decade ago; there will be fewer a decade hence unless we act boldly to reverse recent trends.

I met a short time ago with the mayor and city council of one of the small communities in my district. A town of about 1,000, it looked fairly prosperous. As with many such communities, it happens to be at the limit of its bonded indebtedness due to recent street work and other improvements.

Until recently, it felt secure in regard to its water situation. Then a few months ago its reservoir started dropping. It kept dropping until the water level fell below the intake pipes which fed the town. That reservoir is now useless, and the city fathers are unsure as to whether they will ever be able to utilize it again.

For the time being, they are taking water directly from a nearby creek. It is a very limited and uncertain source of water. With summer approaching, they are worried. Without a dependable water supply, they are worried about the very existence of their town. My advice: Put the town on the waiting lists. In 8 or 10 years, assistance might be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that that little town—and thousands of others like her across this Nation—does not have 8 or 10 years to wait. She cannot afford to wait those years for water, for a sewer system, or community services, for the home loans which are dependent on adequate water and sewer facilities.

Our little towns, our farms, are dying. They cry out for assistance, and we must answer them before it is too late.

Rural development should not be a partisan matter. Republicans and Democrats joined in passing the Rural Development Act. It is a fact, nevertheless, that existing programs of rural development and environmental assistance have not fared well at the hands of the present administration.

Last year Congress appropriated \$100 million in water and sewer grants; the Office of Management and Budget released only \$44 million.

This policy must change. An endeavor as important as rural development demands bipartisan cooperation in Congress and active administration by the executive branch, regardless of the party in power.

I strongly support the Rural Development Act, though I realize it is far from the final answer. Every section of the wide-ranging bill will not operate perfectly; changes will undoubtedly have to be made in the years ahead. But it is far better to act, even if mistakes are

made, than to sit and wait for the perfect program to present itself.

As a final point, it must be noted that the Rural Development Act will not act directly to solve the No. 1 problem of rural America—low farm income. Other action is demanded in that regard.

This bill does meet the other principal challenge facing rural America, that of providing attractive living conditions for rural residents. And this bill also takes action in another part of the economic sector by encouraging industrial development in rural areas.

Marching in step with sound programs to boost farm income, this bill has the potential to slow and then reverse the decline of rural America. We hear much talk about national priorities these days. As far as I am concerned, we have no higher priority than such a reversal in the fortunes of rural America. We must dedicate ourselves and our resources accordingly.

U.S. RELATIONS WITH NORTH AFRICA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, David D. Newsom, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, delivered a very good speech on our relations with the countries of North Africa to a conference at Princeton University last fall. Under the subtitle "Lessons From the Past and Future Directions," Mr. Newsom examines our evolving relations with Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, and Libya. Although our relations with these four Mediterranean littorals are significant, we read and hear little about them. I insert into the RECORD at this time Mr. Newsom's perceptive comments for the benefit of the Members.

His speech follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND NORTH AFRICA: LESSONS FROM THE PAST AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

(By Assistant Secretary David D. Newsom)

For the past several weeks in the Congress of the United States, a crucial debate has been raging. That debate has concerned some of the fundamentals of our foreign policy over the last three decades, including, the question of foreign aid.

In this debate, three charges have been leveled against the foreign aid program and our policies in the developing world: that we looked at the world solely in Cold War terms; that we have sought to support only certain kinds of regimes; and that we have not kept up with changing circumstances in the world around us.

I should like tonight to challenge these assertions, using North Africa as an example.

North Africa is, in many ways, a microcosm of the developing world. Among the four nations of this area: Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya, we find characteristics, problems, reactions and issues common to most of the "Third World."

The history of our relationship to this area over the past two decades suggests to me that our policies have moved and are moving with the changing tides. They are policies

which accept change and accept nations as they are.

These states have many characteristics in common: a strong sense of national pride, an underlying belief that the West has obligations to make up for earlier exploitation, and a keen sensitivity to outside interference. At the same time, they are diverse in their national characteristics, their forms of government, and their resources.

Let us go back 20 years—to 1951. Only Libya was moving toward independence, but its prospects for viability were poor. Its first annual budget was only \$6,000,000—and few knew where that would be found.

In the other three countries, France played a dominant role, largely to the exclusion of other outside influences. Americans in both government and the private sector, nevertheless, were beginning to learn about North Africa. They were beginning to be aware of its peoples and their quest for freedom. We realized earlier than most that independence was coming and coming rapidly.

But these were, at that time, side issues. Our concern as a nation then was the relationship of this area to the emerging position of the Soviet Union and to its containment. Before missiles and long-legged bombers, our Strategic Air Command bases in Morocco were considered vital for our national security. In 1951, also, we made the decision to seek to retain, in Libya, an important training base for our Air Forces in Europe. We ultimately reached agreement and committed ourselves initially to pay Libya \$4,000,000 per year in economic assistance.

Ten years later, the situation had changed dramatically, and we had changed with it. Morocco and Tunisia were independent. De Gaulle had stood in Algiers and had spoken one of history's great ambiguities, "Je vous ai compris." Libya had begun to realize that its deserts covered vast resources of oil.

In these ten years, U.S. policies had moved, too. President Eisenhower had agreed to the evacuation of our air bases in Morocco. Our earlier interest and confidence in Tunisia was followed by a pledge of long term development aid—without conditions or demands for facilities. In 1964, we agreed in principle with the Government of Libya to the evacuation of our military facilities whenever they were not wanted. We were preparing to help independent Algeria with substantial food and technical aid.

Each of these countries, as they become independent, looked to us in a special way. They sought alternatives to full dependence upon the former metropole. It was not yet fashionable to turn massively to the Soviets or the Chinese.

Morocco, because of early links with the United States, encouragement by individual Americans and the presence of our bases, expected special help.

Algeria, despite a resentment harbored because of our support for the French, looked to us as an early sympathizer and benefactor.

Tunisia, under the leadership of Habib Bourguiba, remembered earlier help and encouragement and looked to us.

Libya saw in us and the British the primary sources of critical financial help. The King felt both an indebtedness to us for our support at the UN for Libyan independence and territorial unity despite Soviet opposition, and a dependence upon us.

Ten years ago, we were deeply involved. These nations had expectations of us. We expected to find friends and support, particularly against growing inroads of Soviet influence. We did tend to judge nations in those days by their attitudes toward the Soviets and the Chinese. We, perhaps, underestimated their ability even then to stand up against external influences—from all directions.

Today, this has changed. We and they have adjusted to radically new circumstances.

Each of the four countries is now fully independent.

Each has, further, demonstrated its independence in policies toward the former metropolises and toward other countries. Each country has diversified its relationships. None is any longer dependent predominantly upon a single power, politically or economically. Each in its particular way has sought to qualify as "non-aligned."

The area has seen major political upheavals which have changed the leadership and, in the case of Libya, the basic reorientation of the country.

There has been a dramatic discovery and development of resources, primarily oil and gas, in the last ten years. The direct importance of the area economically to Europe has expanded.

All of this has brought a very basic change in the relationship between North Africa and the United States.

Except for the use of communications facilities at one Moroccan base, we no longer have any military facilities in North Africa.

The proportion of economic assistance provided by the United States has steadily declined as European countries have assumed a larger share.

US grant military assistance and military involvement has declined substantially.

Our relationship with the leadership is changing. The generation has passed or is passing which recall our initial help to the newly independent countries. This change happened early in Algeria where the original leaders of the FLN whom we had known were replaced by those we did not know. In Libya, those who recognized and welcomed our help to that country in its early years have been replaced; both the present prosperity and the changed circumstances have obliterated recollections of that earlier relationship.

Where there has been an abrupt change in a country in which we had close relations with the previous regime, we have had the added element of suspicions regarding our intentions on the part of the new leaders. Only time can overcome such feelings.

The last decade, further, has seen climactic events in the Near East which have affected our own relationships. Algeria broke diplomatic relations with us; relations with the other three became difficult in the months immediately following the 1967 war. The belief that we had helped Israel to win the Six Day War died hard. While these nations may not have been directly involved in the fighting, they were committed as Arabs and shared the feelings of humiliation and bitterness over these events. The Near Eastern issues remain a serious, but not insurmountable problem in our relations with North African countries.

In 1971, we have new interests and requirements. For the first time in our peace time history, we face shortages of significant resources. One of them is natural gas. In Washington, D.C., only a week ago, the local gas utility announced it could take no more new commercial customers; there was simply not enough gas. North Africa—and particularly Algeria—has large gas reserves.

Our approach to North Africa in these circumstances is based on certain clear assumptions:

First, North Africa remains important to us as an area. We have a keen interest in the freedom of the Mediterranean and in the continued access for all to that sea and to the nations around it. The establishment of dominant foreign influences adversely affecting these interests on the southern shore of the Mediterranean would be a matter of grave concern to us.

Secondly, the orderly development of these nations and their resources is important to them, to Europe, and to us. While there are, and will continue to be differing views on what constitutes a reasonable basis for access

to these resources, there is agreement that such access is important to all.

Thirdly, we shall remain an important source of the capital and technology required for the development of this area. The nature of arrangements may change, but the U.S. private role is likely to continue.

Fourthly, the nations of North Africa, despite policies shaped by different histories and influences, will all stoutly resist domination by any outside power. They will defy simple categorization in any East-West lineup.

Finally, events in North Africa, as in many other parts of the world, will move today with far less concern over the role of the United States and reference to us than in years past. If we have interests there, it is our task to preserve them, whether it be in investment, in trade, or in security. We cannot assume that others will do it for us.

Against the background of these assumptions, what is our approach to these nations today?

We regard them, first, not as pawns in an international game, but as independent, sovereign nations. We seek relations with them based on mutual interest, independent of their relations with others. We recognize and respect the variety among the nations. The Cold War is over—unless others choose to continue it. As the President said in his report to the Congress on Foreign Policy in February of last year, one of our two major concerns in Africa is "that the continent be free of great power rivalry or conflict in any form. This is even more in Africa's interest than ours."

We have had particularly close ties with Morocco and Tunisia.

Despite withdrawal of military facilities from Morocco, our economic and strategic interests there remain substantial. We retain important Voice of America facilities. We have growing trade and investment in that country. We value the presence of this friend at the southern side of the gateway to the Mediterranean.

Morocco has, since independence, faced severe economic problems. We have helped in the development of its agriculture and in meeting problems of employment.

King Hassan, thrust suddenly into power in 1961, has led Morocco skillfully through critical years and critical problems. We have both benefitted from cooperation. Our relationship with Morocco, however, has given us neither the right nor the capability to determine the course of Moroccan political or economic life, even if we had desired to do so.

In foreign policy, too, King Hassan has followed an independent course. He has, over the years, improved his relations with Europe and has established friendly relations with the Soviet Union. He has taken an active role in Arab affairs and has frequently used his relationship with us to bring to our attention Arab concerns.

We do not in Morocco—no more than in any other developing country—seek to further or support any particular system or foreign policy. We feel that both are the responsibility of the peoples of the country.

We have established a mutually beneficial relationship with Morocco, despite the different nature of our systems of government. We find a common interest in continuing Moroccan economic growth and the continued absence in Morocco of influences hostile to our basic concerns. In the area of economic development, we have no magic formulae to guarantee either ourselves or the Moroccans growth. Only the Moroccans, themselves, can assure their own progress, political, economic, and social. We believe, however, that our assistance has improved their ability to make such progress.

Tunisia exemplifies a smaller country, ably governed by responsible leadership possessing influence beyond its borders, but endowed with modest natural resources.

The U.S. has enjoyed 15 years of very close relations with Tunisia and has contributed a very significant amount of economic assistance—well over \$600 million since 1956. We have no alliance with Tunisia, no bases there, and no real strategic interest in that country. U.S. investment is minimal. Yet U.S. policy over the years has been marked by strong support for Tunisia's economic and political independence.

The U.S. was one of the first governments to recognize Tunisia in 1956. Our assistance followed the 1961 decision that Tunisia should be one of the countries to receive a long-term commitment since it possessed the infrastructure, sufficient economic potential, and political will to serve as a model for other developing countries.

Despite this commitment and interest in Tunisia's success, we did not attempt to determine the path Tunisia chose for development. It is difficult to conceive of a leader of President Bourguiba's character permitting such interference if it had been tried. Tunisian successes and errors are their own. There were misgivings within the U.S. Government in 1966-1969 during the period of accelerated expansion of agricultural cooperatives and increased state control over the Tunisian economy. It was agreed, however, that the Tunisian experiment was worthy of our continued support. Tunisia's ensuing decision in 1969 to reverse the course of its economic policy to give greater emphasis to private enterprise and free market forces was entirely a Tunisian determination.

As a result of the farsighted reforms of President Bourguiba, Tunisia is, in social terms, still the most advanced of the Arab states. Its human resources are its greatest wealth and we will continue to be interested in its development and well-being.

Tunisia has always had an independent foreign policy. It continues to do so. As its leadership passes into other hands, we look for a continuation of our close relationship, one based essentially on a common interest in Tunisia development.

In both Morocco and Tunisia, however, the basic US role has changed in the past ten years. Economic assistance is flowing to both countries from more sources and the over-all US share has declined. Tunisia has been one of the models of the multilateral approach in which a Consultative Group, under the aegis of the World Bank has, for a number of years, coordinated the international effort.

French aid to Tunisia has held steady in real terms and aid to Morocco has increased in both real and proportionate terms. US aid has declined absolutely and proportionately in both countries.

Between 1960 and 1964, the U.S. provided two-thirds of all non-Communist economic aid each to Morocco and Tunisia. Between 1965 and 1969, this proportion declined to 42 percent of the aid flowing to each. In 1970, the US share dropped still further as other donors have increased their share. Our decreasing share is a reflection of the progress these countries are making and of the widening responsibility being assumed by other nations, a trend entirely consistent with overall AID policy.

Our relations with independent Algeria have been quite different from those with Morocco and Tunisia.

If we go back to 1962, US expectations about the potential benefits of bilateral relations with Algeria were probably higher than with most other newly independent countries. They were probably unrealistic then given our inexperience in dealing with each other. President Kennedy had felt a special interest in Algeria dating from his 1957 speech urging the independence of Algeria. Ben Bella had flown back to North Africa following his release by the French in a US Air Force plane. His first foreign visit as President was to the UN and Washington

where he was received by President Kennedy. The fact that Ben Bella chose to proceed directly from Washington to Cuba was perhaps an omen of what was to come.

The Algerians for their part always held a strong ideological bias against the U.S. They identified the US with France through NATO. Conversely, they felt a deep bond of sympathy with those states which had endorsed and supported the long bitter Algerian war of independence against France: North Vietnam, the UAR, the People's Republic of China, and Cuba, all countries with which in varying degrees, the US was at odds. In this environment of suspicion and hostility, and given the instability and rivalries of the Ben Bella period, it is not difficult to understand the lack of rapport. Even the fact that the US supplied some \$165 million of PL-480 foodstuffs between 1962 and 1967 was regarded by the Algerians as a minor recompense for the devastation suffered during their independence struggle.

The overthrow of Ben Bella on June 19, 1965 by Minister of Defense Houari Boumedienne revived briefly US hopes that satisfactory relations might be possible. Boumedienne's serious approach and his announced intention to concentrate on his country's problems seemed to augur well for such a development.

With the six-day war, however, Algeria broke diplomatic relations and all US aid to Algeria ceased by law. At the same time, Algeria seized almost all US firms operating there, principally oil companies.

In retrospect, the break in relations proved to have had some benefits. For one thing it cleared the air. The romantic view of the prospects for US-Algerian relations vanished overnight. We recognized that mutual confidence would not be based solely on aid programs, however well-intentioned, nor on public gestures of support—however sincere.

The subsequent upturn in US-Algerian relations has been marked by several turning points. One was the emergence of President Boumedienne as the undisputed leader of Algeria. He focused his government's efforts on domestic economic development, and in the pursuit of rapid industrialization, the Algerians found they wanted the expertise and technology that private American enterprise could supply. Many US firms responded to the indication that they would be welcome.

Another major turning point was the October 1969 agreement between SONATRACH and the El Paso Natural Gas Company for the sale of one billion cubic feet per day of natural gas in liquefied form for importation to the East Coast of the US. This project and others like it represent a natural fit between the US, with its estimated annual shortfall in gas supply of 35 trillion cubic feet by 1980, and Algeria with the fourth largest proven, and largely uncommitted, gas reserves in the world—130 trillion cubic feet.

But given the past history of U.S.-Algerian relations, and Algeria's treatment of U.S. petroleum companies, the huge amounts of capital needed, and the respective government authorizations required, it was clear even in 1969 that to bring these projects to fruition would be no easy task. If they could be implemented, however—and I am optimistic that they will be—they would create the most significant long-term economic links between the U.S. and North Africa in history. They would make a substantial contribution to Algeria's economic development and reduce Algeria's dependence on foreign governments for development financing.

During the past two years both governments have, in a spirit of businesslike cooperation, taken actions to enhance the possibilities for an early realization of these Liquefied Natural Gas projects. Algeria has upgraded and strengthened its diplomatic representation in Washington—still under the

flag of Guinea—and we have done likewise in Algiers under the Swiss flag. Algeria has resolved all but one of its expropriation disputes with U.S. companies. The Eximbank has informed SONATRACH that it is prepared to consider favorably—the financing of several hundred million dollars of U.S. exports for the construction of the necessary facilities in Algeria for this project. The American companies will make no investment in Algeria, but they will finance the LNG tankers. The final authorization by the Federal Power Commission—which will set important precedents for the LNG industry—is the one remaining requirement.

Turning now to Libya, U.S. relations with Libya over the past 20 years have gone through the same radical transformations as the country itself. In the pre-oil, pre-military coup period, Libya was considered one of the most disinherited of the developing countries and showed little promise of economic viability. In the early 1950s, Libya was dependent on U.S., U.K., and other foreign aid for its economic development and military assistance. Libya concluded a defense agreement with the U.K., and agreed to the establishment of Wheelus Air Force Base outside Tripoli and a British air base near Tobruk. Wheelus became, because of its ideal climatic conditions, the principal training base for U.S. fighter aircraft stationed in Western Europe.

This close relationship, which was clearly one of Libyan economic dependence on the US and the UK, was obviously headed for change when in December 1957, Esso became the first oil company to announce it had struck oil. By 1968, Libya had become one of the world's leading oil producers and the per capita GNP of its 1.6 million inhabitants had increased from about \$100 at independence to \$1,640. Reflecting this transformation, our assistance program was ended in 1965.

In Libya, the United States faced in a very special way the problem of identification with a regime. We had provided substantial financial support in the early days of the Kingdom. We enjoyed the benefits of military facilities. There was a widespread—but unfounded—belief that the British and American Ambassadors dictated policies to Libyan Governments.

There was much less awareness of the growing concern of American representatives in Libya at the increasing detachment of the King from events in the country, the influence of some of those around the King on policies and, what was particularly serious, the disenchantment of many of the best young men in the country with the lack of progress in the building of modern institutions.

It is tempting, but perhaps idle, to speculate on whether the United States could have had a significant influence on the course of events in this country. It is always easier to say what should have been done when one knows how the story turned out. Our aid had helped launch the country. The King and many of its leaders felt an indebtedness to us. Yet, it was clear to all of us in Libya during those years that the course of events was in Libyan hands and would be determined by Libyans. Neither an earlier withdrawal of our facilities from Libya nor the exercise of any extraordinary influence in that country would, in my view, have changed the basic direction of events.

It was, particularly regrettable, but not at all surprising, that the leaders of the coup of September 1969, under Lieutenant (now Colonel) Qadhafi took power with deep suspicions of the United States and with serious expectations that we would try to oppose their coup. The matter was further complicated by the fact that the new regime, deeply influenced by the frustration of the young

Arab military officers over the course of the six-day war made the Arab struggle against Israel a principal tenet of its foreign policy. Their belief in our unqualified support for Israel remains today the chief obstacle to better relations. Other suspicions have, I believe, been modified.

We adapted quickly to the change in Libya. It was never our intention to do otherwise. We agreed to the evacuation of our air base near Tripoli and our Coast Guard navigation station in the Gulf of Sirte. We modified the nature of our relationship to meet the new situation.

In Libya today, the greatest US interests are, in a sense, beyond the government domain. The investment and activities of private American companies in the development and production of Libya's vast oil reserves are essentially matters between the companies and Libya. Our role—when we have a role—is to seek to explain wider aspects of international relations which may bear on oil policy. In the negotiations last year, for example, our official effort was confined to explaining our primary concerns as a government over the consequences for the consuming nations of any breakdown in negotiations, and to explaining actions taken by the US Government in permitting the companies to concert on negotiations.

Today the OPEC countries are in a strong position as a result of the world energy outlook. Demand for oil and gas by the developed world is expanding by leaps and bounds. The OPEC countries have that oil and gas, far in excess of their own needs. A great amount of creative diplomacy by governments and business alike is going to be required if the demands of the producing countries for increasing revenues and for control of the companies are to be met without disrupting the industry, the consumers and the economies of the producing countries themselves. Libya will be a major driving force among the OPEC countries.

One can ask, in retrospect, what were the benefits we gained from our substantial assistance to Libya in its early days?

First, we must recall the strong efforts made by the Soviet Union in those days to have established a Soviet trusteeship over the former Italian colony of Tripolitania. Our help to Libya enabled it to emerge and survive as an independent nation. It gave us advantages in access and the utilization of key facilities during critical years following World War II. It provided a base on which the Libyans and private American firms could build the important petroleum industry that exists in that country today.

Events have moved. Circumstances have changed. We have changed with them. We should not regret what has gone before for that was important to where we are today. And today's Libya has a leadership with which we still have problems, but it is an independent leadership providing no more of an opportunity to other non-Arab forces than it provides to us.

North Africa is a significant area of the world, at the hub where Europe, Africa, and the Middle East meet. It lies on our route of access to southern Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean. It is a significant source of energy for Europe and will increasingly become so for us. It is an example of the trends and problems of the developing world generally.

We have, without forgetting our friends, adapted to change in North Africa. We see its nations as individual entities, each with unique characteristics, determining its own future and its own policies. We see our relations with them as important to our own interests. We can preserve those interests so long as we are prepared to continue an active role in the area and to find foundations for our relationships built genuinely on common interests.

GI BILL EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Vietnam era veterans will receive greatly increased GI bill education and training benefits under our bill that passed the House by unanimous vote on Monday. It was a very special honor for me to cosponsor this bill, H.R. 12828, and support its passage in our House Veterans' Committee.

Education is the answer to many of the problems today. Unemployment and underemployment of our returning Vietnam veterans is one of our most critical problems. It is tragic for men who have fought in the mud, mire, and filth of South Vietnam to return home and find no job available. The least we can do today is to provide increased education and training benefits, and thus encourage every returning GI to take advantage of the GI educational programs.

It is right for a grateful Nation to provide for educational benefits for those men and women whose education was interrupted by service in the Armed Forces. Every dollar we spend on the education of the Vietnam veteran will come back tenfold. It is an investment in tomorrow. It is an investment which will provide better housing, provide job opportunities, and is insurance against dissatisfaction, divisiveness, bitterness, and unemployment. Education is the greatest investment that this Congress can provide.

The GI education program for World War II veterans cost the Nation \$19 billion—\$19 billion to educate 10 million men and women. These 10 million veterans have already paid into the Federal Treasury an estimated \$100 billion more than they would have paid had they not been educated and thus provided with increased earning power. This does not take into consideration local taxes, State taxes, philanthropies, homeownership, and a better environment for these men and women.

Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest investment in the history of the world. It will pay the American people dividends in the years to come. It has been the opposite of Federal control of education and socialistic regulation of our people. The GI education program provided more freedom, dignity, and self-respect among our people. We should do no less for the Vietnam veteran today. Like the GI education program for World War II and the Korean veterans, this bill will provide further opportunity and justice for the Vietnam veteran.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide for an increase from \$175 a month for a single veteran student to \$200 a month. Proportionate increases are provided to student-veterans who have dependents and who are in part-time training programs. The bill also extends additional benefits to widows and children under the War Orphans Act, and to disabled

veterans in training and rehabilitation programs. It liberalizes the standards of the farm training programs for veterans. This is wise and sound legislation which will enable veterans to learn modern farming techniques and to progress in our rural areas, thus curbing the population flow to our already overcrowded urban areas. This bill provides the mechanics by which our veterans can receive their educational benefits in a timely manner and not place a burden on their families or cause mental anguish to themselves. This prepayment plan will do much to insure that the veteran will receive his benefits without unnecessary delay and with a minimum of paperwork. There are several other commendable features of this bill which will assist the veterans as they continue in their academic careers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our dynamic and able chairman, the Honorable OLIN E. "TIGER" TEAGUE, for his splendid efforts in passing this legislation. I also wish to commend my associates on the committee for their successful sponsorship of this timely legislation, which will open further the door of opportunity for our veterans who have served with honor and distinction.

HATCH ACT STATEMENT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today a bill which would restore to Federal civil employees their rights to participate, as private citizens, in the political life of the Nation and would protect Federal civilian employees from improper political solicitations.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 29, 1972, I testified before the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration at the invitation of the chairman. At that time I expressed my strong support for legislation to remove the unjust and overprotective restrictions on Federal civilian employees imposed by the Hatch Act. In particular, I addressed myself to the act as it relates and is interpreted in my own State of California.

The bill which I have introduced today is designed to remove these unnecessary and unreasonable restrictions, while maintaining the protection and integrity of the federal system of employment from unnecessary implication with the private political activity of its employees on the job.

It is deeply disturbing to me that such modifications have not been instituted long before this.

Public employment should not forcibly deprive a person of his rights to constitutional protection. The Federal Government should not be allowed to condition admission to and pursuit of public employment upon any terms which it may choose to selectively impose—especially when not all Federal employees are subject to the same re-

strictions. Such a double standard seems to me both arbitrary and quite unnecessary.

The notion that a public employee is a servant, and less equal than any other civilian employee whereby he must sacrifice his personal rights merely to engage in earning a living, should be labeled as false from the beginning. Yet the Hatch Act imposes just such a restrictive distinction upon these employees. Such restrictions can only force many fine Americans, who find it against their good conscience to be deprived of their most basic constitutional rights, out of a high calling toward Government service. It is ironic to me that through such laws we force the exclusion of those who hold these basic human rights so dear. As our Federal employment rolls swell each year, more and more Americans are being forced to make such a choice. It is disturbing to me that the "privilege" of Federal employment is based on such an unconstitutional requirement.

Because the Hatch Act is so broad and general, many varying interpretations of it are found. In some instances, it has been used as a lever to coerce employees to remain silent by throwing an unjustifiable fear into them of expulsion or prosecution. In other cases employees are denied the right to speak out or work against injustices of their political system, as private citizens.

But one of the most disturbing provisions of this act, with its broad and general language, is the flexibility that it allows for very subjective and selective interpretation and enforcement of the act. This is the most potentially dangerous provision because it allows the Federal Government, or segments thereof, to single out and remove or persecute any person of any given belief for actual or alleged political activity on his own time. The line between partisan and nonpartisan activity is hazy at best, and no assistance is given in outlining guidelines or criteria which are objective. I find this to be a most serious flaw.

Clearly, such interpretation is not the intent of Congress now nor was it the intent of Congress when the act was passed. Yet, this is just how the law can be distorted. The legislation which I propose today would tighten up the meaning of the act and loosen up the unnecessary and unfair restrictions. Not to do so is a discredit to both the lawmakers and all public employees who happen to come under its jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, in my own State of California, the State supreme court, in deciding Hatch Act cases of its own, has held that:

Only a "compelling" public interest can justify the imposition of restraints upon the political activities of public employees and that it must appear that the restrictions * * * are not broader than are required to preserve the efficiency and integrity of the public service.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize the need for the Federal Government, when circumstances absolutely compel to impose certain personal political restrictions upon particular employees when they are at work. But the practice of blindly restricting all Federal employees, all the time, from taking a most important part

in the mainstream of the Nation, its political process, is both unreasonable and unjust. My bill provides for the necessary restraint of private political activity while on duty or in uniform as a protection for the Federal institution. In addition, the bill also contains provisions to continue to protect the employee from being approached through his job for political solicitations. But these restrictions can and should be lifted from the employee once he leaves the office and returns home. He should be as free as the next man to set examples for his children and participate in the political process in any way he sees fit or chooses.

California Supreme Court Justice Tobriner stated that:

The expansion of Government enterprise with its ever-increasing number of employees marks this area of the law a crucial one. As the number of persons employed by the Government and governmentally assisted institutions continues to grow, the necessity of preserving for them the maximum practicable right to participate in the political life of the republic grows with it. Restrictions on public employees which, in some or all of their applications, advance no compelling public interest commensurate with the waiver of constitutional rights which they require imperil the continued operation of our institutions of representative government.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the entire text of Justice Tobriner's opinion in the RECORD at this point:

In the present case we consider once again the constitutionality of restraints imposed upon the political activities of a public employee. We once again review the factors which circumscribe the power of the government to exact as a condition of public employment a waiver of constitutional rights.

[1, 2] We have recently held that only a "compelling" public interest can justify the imposition of restraints upon the political activities of public employees and that, "It must appear that the restrictions * * * are not broader than are required to preserve the efficiency and integrity of the public service." (Fort v. Civil Service Commission (1964) 61 Cal.2d 331, 337-338, 38 Cal.Rptr. 625, 629, 392, P.2d 385, 389.) Similarly, in the present case, we hold that a governmental agency which would require a waiver of constitutional rights as a condition of public employment must demonstrate: (1) that the political restraints rationally relate to the enhancement of the public service, (2) that the benefits which the public gains by the restraints outweigh the resulting impairment of constitutional rights, and (3) that no alternatives less subversive of constitutional rights are available.

According to defendants, the particular restraints involved here may be sustained because they do no more than prohibit the public employee from campaigning against his own superior, an inhibition which has been upheld in *Fort*. We shall explain, however, that these restraints cover a far wider field of political participation than the campaign against one's superior. To the extent that the restraints operate beyond the sphere of the proffered justification they advance no compelling public interest and exact the waiver of constitutional rights without compensating public benefit. Such restraints cannot stand; a dismissal predicated upon them must be reversed.

In April 1960 the defendant hospital district hired plaintiff as a nurse's aide. In this capacity plaintiff performed such tasks as bathing patients, changing beds, and taking temperatures. The record shows that plaintiff

consistently performed her assigned duties to the complete satisfaction of her superiors.

Late in 1963 a number of citizens became dissatisfied with the policies of the defendant district and commenced a campaign to recall from office certain of its directors. Plaintiff participated in the activities of this group by attending some of its meetings, circulating recall petitions and distributing literature. The record indicates that plaintiff confined her activities on behalf of the recall campaign to her off-duty hours and that in seeking to influence interested citizens to vote for the recall she did not advise them of her employment by the district.

On February 7, 1964, the hospital administrator issued to all hospital personnel a memorandum entitled "Political Activities of Public Employees." The memorandum stated: "Notice is hereby given that the Board of Directors of the Washington Township Hospital District [has] instructed the Administrator to place all employees on notice that employee participation in any political activity for or against any candidate or ballot measure pertaining to the * * * District is unlawful and will not be acceptable conduct for an employee of this hospital and shall constitute grounds for disciplinary action and/or dismissal." The memorandum proceeded to state that the employees were "further advised" of certain sections of the Government Code relating to the political activities of public employees. The memorandum quoted in full the language of Government Code section 3205 which provides: "No officer or employee whose position is not exempt from the operation of a civil service personnel or merit system of a local agency shall take an active part in any campaign for or against any candidate, except himself, for an office of such local agency, or for or against any ballot measure relating to the recall of any elected official of the local agency."

Plaintiff thereupon sought to enjoin the district from representing to its employees that participation in the recall campaign was unlawful and from threatening or instituting reprisals against any employee for participating in that campaign.

While plaintiff's suit for an injunction was pending, the assistant hospital administrator called plaintiff into his office and demanded her assurance that she had withdrawn from participation in the recall movement and that she intended "to obey the letter and spirit of the directive of the Board of Directors." He also stated that plaintiff's failure to give such assurance would result in her prompt dismissal "on the ground that active participation in recall activities by any employee while remaining an employee of the hospital district causes a disruption of employee relations by creating dissension and unrest among employees, which in turn disrupts and impairs the service to the patient and the public." Plaintiff indicated that she intended to continue her participation in the recall movement. Her employment was thereupon terminated. Plaintiff has since amended her complaint to seek reinstatement, back wages and punitive damages.

In urging us to affirm the action of the trial court in sustaining a demurrer to plaintiff's complaint, defendant district notes that it maintains no civil service or merit system for its employees and that section 32121, subdivision (h), of the Health and Safety Code declares that employees of local hospital districts hold their positions "at the pleasure" of the hospital board. Since no provision of constitutional or statutory law purports to give plaintiff a right to secure or retain employment by the board, defendant urges that its right to terminate her employment knows no legal limit.

[3, 4]. Despite the antiquity of this argument, its reasoning today stands utterly discredited. Although an individual can claim no constitutional right to obtain public employment or to receive any other publicly-

conferred benefit, the government cannot condition admission to such employment or receipt of such benefits upon any terms that it may choose to impose. As Professor Thomas Reed Powell long ago observed, "Logically a thing which may be absolutely excluded is not the same as a thing which may be subjected to burdens of a different kind, even though such burdens would be regarded by all as less onerous than the burden of absolute exclusion. The 'power of absolute exclusion' is a term not identical with the 'power of relative exclusion' or the 'power to impose any burdens whatsoever.'" (Powell, *The Right to Work for the State* (1961) 16 Colum. L. Rev. 99, 111.)¹ Today courts and commentators alike recognize without question that the power of government, federal or state, to withhold benefits from its citizens does not encompass a supposed "lesser" power to grant such benefits upon an arbitrary deprivation of constitutional right.²

The faulty logic inherent in defendant's proffered syllogism was rejected by this court in *Danskin v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist.* (1946) 18 Cal. 2d 536, 171 P. 2d 885. That case involved a school district which had undertaken to confine the use of its buildings to organizations whose members gave a satisfactory account of their views. In the course of that opinion we declared: "The state is under no duty to make school buildings available for public meetings [citations]. If it elects to do so, however, it cannot arbitrarily prevent any members of the public from holding such meetings. [Citations.] Nor can it make the privilege of holding them dependent on conditions that would deprive any members of the public of their constitutional rights. A state is without power to impose an unconstitutional requirement as a condition for granting a privilege even though the privilege is the use of state property [citations] * * *. It is true that the state need not open the doors of a school building as a forum and may at any time choose to close them. Once it opens the doors, however, it cannot demand tickets of admission in the form of convictions and affiliations that it deems acceptable." (*Danskin v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist.*, supra, 28 Cal. 2d at pp. 545-547, 171 P. 2d at pp. 891-892.)

Similarly, in *Syrek v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board* (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 519, 532, 7 Cal. Rptr. 97, 354, P. 2d 625, 632, this court stated that, "[A]lthough the state need not legally have provided unemployment benefits for anyone, once it has done so it cannot withhold them from one who has good cause for declining a proffered employment."

[5] On the other hand, we cannot accept the apparent suggestion of some few cases that government may never condition the receipt of benefits or privileges upon the non-assertion of constitutional rights. (See, e.g., *Frost & Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Com.* (1926) 271 U.S. 583, 593-594, 46 S.Ct. 605, 70 L.Ed. 1101; *Terral v. Burke Constr. Co.* (1922) 257 U.S. 529, 532-533, 42 S.Ct. 188, 66 L.Ed. 352.) The government employee should no more enjoy the right to wrap himself in the flag of constitutional protection against every condition of employment imposed by the government than the government should enjoy an absolute right to strip him of every constitutional protection. Just as we have rejected the fallacious argument that the power of government to impose such conditions knows no limits, so must we acknowledge that government may, when circumstances inexorably so require, impose conditions upon the enjoyment of publicly-conferred benefits despite a resulting qualification of constitutional rights.³

[6] In doing so, however, government bears a heavy burden of demonstrating the

practical necessity for the limitation. At the very least it must establish that the imposed conditions relate to the purposes of the legislation which confers the benefit or privilege.⁴ In the words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, "Congress may withhold all sorts of facilities for a better life but if it affords them it cannot make them available in an obviously arbitrary way or exact surrender of freedoms unrelated to the purpose of the facilities." (*American Communications Ass'n, CIO v. Douds* (1950) 339 U.S. 382, 417, 70 S.Ct. 674, 693, 94 L.Ed. 925, Frankfurter, J., concurring and dissenting.)⁵ Thus in *Housing Authority of City of Los Angeles v. Cordova*, supra, 130 Cal.App.2d Supp. 884, 889, 279 P.2d 215, 218, the court denied the power of the City of Los Angeles to exclude from public housing persons who decline to sign certificates of nonmembership in subversive groups, noting its doubts that "the laudable purpose of combating the efforts of subversives is advanced by compelling them to live in slums or substandard housing accommodations."⁶

[7] Not only must the conditions annexed to the enjoyment of a publicly-conferred benefit reasonably tend to further the purposes sought by conferment of that benefit but also the utility of imposing the conditions must manifestly outweigh any resulting impairment of constitutional rights.⁷ Further, in imposing conditions upon the enjoyment of publicly-conferred benefits, as in the restriction of constitutional rights by more direct means, the state must establish the unavailability of less offensive alternatives and demonstrate that the conditions are drawn with narrow specificity, restricting the exercise of constitutional rights only to the extent necessary to maintain the integrity of the program which confers the benefits.⁸

[8] The public employee surely enjoys the status of a person protected by constitutional right. Public employment does not deprive him of constitutional protection. In the absence of an imperative necessity to protect the public from irresponsible activity of so serious a nature that it would disrupt the public welfare, such protections are not subject to destruction by a public employer's insistence that they be waived by contract.

We recognized and applied these principles in our recent decision in *Fort v. Civil Service Commission*, supra, 61 Cal. 2d 331, 38 Cal. Rptr. 625, 392 P.2d 385, holding that only "compelling" public interests can justify a governmental entity in demanding a waiver of constitutional rights as a condition of public employment. "Although * * * one employed in public service does not have a constitutional right to such employment [citation] it is settled that a person cannot properly be barred or removed from public employment arbitrarily or in disregard of his constitutional rights." (61 Cal. 2d 331, 334, 38 Cal. Rptr. 625, 627, 392 P.2d 385, 387.)⁹ We further noted in *Fort*, "The principles set forth in the recent decisions do not admit of wholesale restrictions on political activities merely because the persons affected are public employees, particularly when it is considered that there are millions of such persons. It must appear that restrictions imposed by a governmental entity are not broader than are required to preserve the efficiency and integrity of its public service." (61 Cal. 2d at pp. 337-338, 38 Cal. Rptr. at p. 629, 392 P.2d at p. 389 (italics added); see also *Kinnear v. City etc. of San Francisco* (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 341, 343, 38 Cal. Rptr. 631, 392 P.2d 391.)

The restrictions imposed upon plaintiff's political activities by Government Code section 3205 and the board's directive are not, as *Fort* insists that they must be, "required to preserve the efficiency and integrity of [the] public service." The sweeping prohibitions of the statute and the directive are not necessary to the successful functioning of the civil service system. Indeed, the defend-

ant district has not even attempted to demonstrate that such political restrictions even relate to the general purposes of the civil service legislation.

[9] The single ground upon which the defendant would sustain these restrictions is that it may constitutionally prohibit a public employee from running or campaigning against his own superior officer. Defendant rests upon the declaration in *Fort* that "A strong case, we think, can * * * be made for the view that permitting a public employee to run or campaign against his own superior has so disruptive an effect on the public service as to warrant restriction. It is, of course, possible to draw a restrictive provision narrowly in order to deal specifically with such abuses." (61 Cal. 2d 331, 338, 38 Cal. Rptr. 625, 629, 392 P.2d 385, 389.) Since the instant limitations were not narrowly drawn to deal with this specific abuse, however, they cannot rest upon this circumscribed ground.

[10] We have recognized that administrative disruption may ensue from the participation of a public employee in a campaign for or against his own superior and that the state may meet such danger by specific restriction. Here, however, we do not reach that question; we need not determine whether the working relationship between plaintiff and the board was so immediate that the board might be considered her "own superior." We shall point out that the present restrictions attempt too wide a prohibition. "Where the statute is attacked on First Amendment grounds the court is not limited in its examination to the application of the statute involved in the particular case, but may consider other possible applications of the statute." (*Canon v. Justice Court*, supra, 61 Cal. 2d 446, 450 39 Cal. Rptr. 228, 230, 393, P.2d 428, 430; see also *Fort v. Civil Service Commission*, supra, 61 Cal. 2d 331, 338-340, 38 Cal. Rptr. 625, 392 P.2d 385; *NAACP v. Button*, supra, 371 U.S. 415, 432-433, 83 S.Ct. 328; *Talley v. State of California* (1960) 362 U.S. 60, 63-64, 80 S.Ct. 536, 4 L.Ed. 2d 559; *Thornhill v. State of Alabama* (1940) 310 U.S. 88, 96-99, 60 S.Ct. 736, 84 L.Ed. 1093; Note, *Inseparability in Application of Statutes Impairing Civil Liberties* (1948) 61 Harv. L. Rev. 1208). Accordingly, we need not determine whether the conduct of plaintiff disclosed by the present record so closely imperiled compelling public interests as to be properly subject to regulation by a more narrowly drawn statute.

Both Government Code section 3205 and the board's directive would prohibit conduct that does not fall within the statement in *Fort* that the state may constitutionally restrict the freedom of a public employee to run or campaign against "his own superior."

The directive proscribes participation in "any political activity for or against any candidate or ballot measure pertaining to the district." By extending its ban to "any ballot measure pertaining to the district" the directive embraces matters other than campaigns against an employee's "own superior." Indeed, in its present form, the directive, like the restriction struck down in *Fort*, would include "even * * * measures which would directly and personally affect the employee such as one relating to his own salary or working conditions." (61 Cal. 2d 331, 335, 38 Cal. Rptr. 625, 628, 392 P.2d 385, 388.)

[11] The overbreadth of the statute lies in the wide swath of its prohibition of employee participation in a number and variety of elections. Subject to an exception for persons "exempt" from civil service, the statute provides that no employee of a "local agency" may participate in "any campaign for or against any candidate, except himself, for an office of such local agency." Since Government Code section 3201 defines "local agency" as "a county, city, city and county, political subdivision, district, or municipal corpora-

tion," the ban of section 3205 would, for example, prevent an employee of a city from participating in the campaign of any officer of his city, and perhaps even his county, however remote might be the working relationship between such employee and such officer. So broad a rule cannot find justification in our dictum that a public employee may constitutionally be prevented from opposing the reelection of "his own superior."

We turn, finally, to the suggestion that the statute does not apply to a public employee, such as plaintiff, who does not enjoy the benefit of a civil service or merit system. The statutory ban here expressly extends only to public employees who are "not exempt from the operation of a civil service personnel or merit system." Accordingly, the argument runs, the employees of a government agency which, like the present defendant, has instituted no civil service or merit system for its employees are thereby rendered "exempt from" the operation of such a system within the meaning of the statute.

If there were no other guide to the meaning of this phrase, we might well conclude that the statutory ban applies only to persons who enjoy the protection of a civil service or merit system and that the Legislature intended to preserve intact the political freedom of all other public employees as a surrogate for the job security which they lack. We note, however, that article XXIV, section 4, of our Constitution sets forth an extensive list of "Offices and Employments Exempt From Civil Service." For the most part, these positions are elective or high appointive offices whose holders could not reasonably be expected to refrain from political activities without profoundly affecting the workings of our representative institutions. Since the Constitution has made explicit by definition the officers who are "exempt from civil service," we cannot at will vastly expand that category.

[12] The purpose of the Legislature in confining the ban of Government Code section 3205 to persons "not exempt from" a civil service or merit system was to exclude only persons affirmatively exempted from the operation of such a system by its own terms or by the terms of statutory or constitutional law. Thus the failure of the defendant district to institute a civil service or merit system for its employees does not excuse them from compliance with Government Code section 3205, if that provision were otherwise valid.

In summary we note that the expansion of government enterprise with its ever-increasing number of employees marks this area of the law a crucial one. As the number of persons employed by government and governmentally-assisted institutions continues to grow the necessity of preserving for them the maximum practicable right to participate in the political life of the republic grows with it. Restrictions on public employees which, in some or all of their applications, advance no compelling public interest commensurate with the waiver of constitutional rights which they require imperil the continued operation of our institutions of representative government.

This court has recognized the right of governmental agencies to preserve their harmonious operation by restricting such political activities as directly threaten administrative disruption or a loss of integrity. When, however, the sweep of the restrictions imposed extends beyond the area of permissible limitation, we are obliged to strike down such strictures and any official act predicated upon them.

We reverse the judgment of dismissal entered by the trial court pursuant to its order sustaining defendants' demurrer and remand the cause for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

FOOTNOTES

¹ See also Comment, Unconstitutional Conditions: An Analysis (1961) 50 Geo.L.J. 234, 236-239; O'Neill, Unconstitutional Conditions: Welfare Benefits with Strings Attached (1966) 54 Cal.L.Rev. 443, 460-462.

² Sherbert v. Verner (1962), 374 U.S. 398, 404-406, 83 S.Ct. 1790, 10 L.Ed.2d 965; Speiser v. Randall (1958) 357 U.S. 513, 518-519, 78 S.Ct. 1332, 2 L.Ed.2d 1460; Hannegan v. Esquire, Inc. (1946) 327 U.S. 146, 156, 66 S.Ct. 456, 90 L.Ed. 586; State of Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada (1938) 305 U.S. 337, 349, 59 S.Ct. 232, 83 L.Ed. 208; United States ex rel. Milwaukee, etc., Pub. Co. v. Burleson (1921) 255 U.S. 407, 430-431, 41 S.Ct. 352, 65 L.Ed. 704 [dissent of Brandeis, J.]; Steinberg v. United States (1958) 163 F.Supp. 590, 592, 143 Ct.Cl. 1; Fort v. Civil Service Commission, supra, 61 Cal.2d 331, 334, 38 Cal. Rptr. 625, 392 P.2d 385; Housing Authority of City of Los Angeles v. Cordova (1955) 130 Cal. App.2d Supp. 883, 884-886, 279 P.2d 215; Lawson v. Housing Authority (1955) 270 Wis. 269, 275-278, 70 N.W.2d 605; O'Neill, Unconstitutional Conditions: Welfare Benefits with Strings Attached, supra, 54 Cal.L.Rev. 443, 456-460; Linde, Constitutional Rights in the Public Sector (1965) 40 Wash.L.Rev. 10; Note, Unconstitutional Conditions (1960) 73 Harv. L.Rev. 1595; Willcox, Invasions of the First Amendment Through Conditioned Public Spending (1955) 41 Cornell L.Q. 12; Hale, Unconstitutional Conditions; and Constitutional Rights (1935) 35 Colum.L.Rev. 321.

³ "[F]ew if any forms of government benefit are so essential or of such a high order that they cannot constitutionally be conditioned in any way." (O'Neill, Unconstitutional Conditions: Welfare Benefits with Strings Attached, supra, 54 Cal. L.Rev. 443, 445.)

⁴ Alternatively, perhaps, the state might meet the test of relevance by demonstrating that enjoyment of the benefit by the class which the condition excludes would affirmatively harm compelling public interests. In the Danskin case, for example, we stated: "One must inquire why the measure in question seeks to prohibit 'subversive elements' from holding meetings in a school building, when presumably they can hold them elsewhere without arousing fears of baneful consequences. Is it reasonable to suppose that meetings that would be harmless elsewhere would take on a sinister quality in a school building?" (Danskin v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist., supra, 28 Cal. 2d 536, 545, 171 P.2d 885, 891; see also, Note, Unconstitutional Conditions, supra, 73 Harv.L.Rev. 1595, 1600; O'Neill, Unconstitutional Conditions: Welfare Benefits with Strings Attached, supra, 54 Cal. L.Rev. 443, 467-468.)

⁵ See also Bates v. City of Little Rock (1960) 361 U.S. 516, 525, 80 S.Ct. 412, 4 L.Ed. 2d 480; Schwere v. Board of Bar Examiners (1957) 353 U.S. 232, 239, 77 S.Ct. 752, 1 L.Ed. 2d 796; Syrek v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, supra, 54 Cal.2d 519, 529-530, 7 Cal.Rptr. 97, 354 P.2d 625; Note, Unconstitutional Conditions, supra, 73 Harv.L.Rev. 1595, 1600; Willcox, Invasions of the First Amendment Through Conditioned Public Spending, supra, 41 Cornell L.Q. 12; cf. McLaughlin v. State of Florida (1964) 379 U.S. 184, 190-191, 85 S.Ct. 283, 13 L.Ed.2d 222; Morey v. Doud (1957) 854 U.S. 457, 465, 77 S.Ct. 1344, 1 L.Ed.2d 1485; Toomer v. Witsell (1948) 334 U.S. 385, 403, 68 S.Ct. 1156, 92 L.Ed. 1460; Smith v. Cahoon (1931) 283 U.S. 553, 566-567, 51 S.Ct. 582.

⁶ See also Chicago Housing Auth. v. Blackman (1954) 4 Ill. 2d 319, 326, 122 N.E. 2d 522; Lawson v. Housing Authority, supra, 270 Wis. 269, 284, 70 N.W. 2d 605.

⁷ Sherbert v. Verner, supra, 374 U.S. 308, 406-409, 83 S.Ct. 1790; Bates v. City of Little Rock, supra, 361 U.S. 516, 524, 80 S.Ct. 412; NAACP v. State of Alabama (1958) 357 U.S. 449, 463-466, 78 S.Ct. 1163, 2 L.Ed.2d 1486;

American Communications Ass'n v. Douds, supra, 339 U.S. 382, 405, 70 S.Ct. 674; Garner v. Board of Public Works (1951) 341 U.S. 716, 720-721, 71 S.Ct. 909, 95 L.Ed. 1317; Shelton v. Tucker (1960) 364 U.S. 479, 490, 81 S.Ct. 247, 5 L.Ed.2d 231; cf. Stevens v. Marks (1966) 383 U.S. 234, 243-244, 86 S.Ct. 788, 15 L.Ed.2d 724; Marsh v. State of Alabama (1946) 326 U.S. 501, 509, 66 S.Ct. 276, 90 L.Ed. 265; People v. Woody (1964) 61 Cal.2d 716, 727, 40 Cal.Rptr. 69, 394 P.2d 813; Comment, Unconstitutional Conditions: An Analysis, supra, 50 Geo.L.J. 234, 247-248.

⁸ Sherbert v. Verner, supra, 374 U.S. 398, 407, 83 S.Ct. 1790; NAACP v. Button (1963) 371 U.S. 415, 432-433, 83 S.Ct. 328, 9 L.Ed.2d 405; Braunfeld v. Brown (1961) 366 U.S. 599, 607, 81 S.Ct. 1144, 6 L.Ed.2d 563; Shelton v. Tucker, supra, 364 U.S. 479, 487-490, 81 S.Ct. 247; Dean Milk Co. v. City of Madison (1951) 340 U.S. 349, 354, 71 S.Ct. 295, 95 L.Ed. 329; Cantwell v. State of Connecticut (1940) 310 U.S. 296, 304, 311, 60 S.Ct. 900, 84 L.Ed. 1213; Canon v. Justice Court (1964) 61 Cal.2d 446, 459, 39 Cal. Rptr. 228, 393 P.2d 428; Wollam v. City of Palm Springs (1963) 59 Cal.2d 276, 286-288, 29 Cal.Rptr. 1, 379 P.2d 481; O'Neill, Unconstitutional Conditions: Welfare Benefits with Strings Attached, supra, 54 Cal.L. Rev. 443, 469-470.

⁹ See also Cramp v. Board of Public Instruction, Orange County, Fla. (1961) 368 U.S. 278, 288, 82 S.Ct. 275, 7 L.Ed.2d 285; Torcaso v. Watkins (1961) 367 U.S. 488, 495-496, 81 S.Ct. 1680, 6 L.Ed.2d 982; Slochower v. Board of Higher Education (1956) 350 U.S. 551, 555, 76 S.Ct. 637, 100 L.Ed. 692; Wieman v. Updegraff (1952) 344 U.S. 183, 191-192, 73 S.Ct. 215, 97 L.Ed. 216.

SIXTY YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday marks the 60th anniversary of an organization which has meant much to this Nation throughout the years—the Girl Scouts of America.

Like many parents, my wife and I know from personal experience something of the value of the Girl Scout program. Our daughter, Liz, is a former member of the Girl Scouts and our other daughter, Lynn, is now a Brownie. Hence, I can appreciate the fine work this organization has done in developing character and skills in the young women of our great country.

I have also had the opportunity to view firsthand the fine work of the many Scouts and volunteers of the Girl Scouts Cahaba Council in the Birmingham, Ala. area, which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress.

The nearly 10,000 girls and 2,500 volunteers participating in the Cahaba Council Scouting program have repeatedly reinforced the outstanding reputation which Scouting has earned over the years through such programs as the Helping Hands Drive to collect clothing for the Salvation Army, gathering gifts for the Juliette Low World Friendship Fund, helping put programs together for the Alabama Education Association plus numerous other civic activities.

The myriad of programs offered by the Girl Scouts will prepare the girls of our Nation for the roles they will play as adults in our society and permit them to become active now in providing solutions to some of our current problems.

Their work in the environmental field is well known and gives these girls insight into the problems we face in protecting our environment while giving them guidance in helping to clean it up.

It is an organization of girls of all races and creeds, promoting understanding in a world where the lack of understanding has given rise to so many conflicts.

Scouting stimulates initiative and provides training in six broad areas—the meaning of the Scouting promise and laws, service to others, troops management by the girls themselves, which provides a lesson in self-government, citizenship, international friendship, health, and safety.

The reports of Girl Scouts helping others are countless, and reflect the character which these girls have developed.

But it is not just the Girl Scout organization which must be saluted on this, its 60th anniversary, it is the Scout leaders throughout the Nation who have given so many hours of their time and so much of their energies unselfishly to encourage the development of this Nation's youth.

There can be no question but that this Nation is richer for the contributions which the Girl Scouts of America have made over the past 60 years and that this wealth will grow for future generations.

NIXON'S CHINA TRIP BREACHED THE WALL

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's historic journey to mainland China will undoubtedly be remembered as one of the foremost achievements of his administration. It will be months and probably years before a full assessment of its impact on the course of history can be made. Nonetheless, the importance of this first step is clear. The Jackson Citizen Patriot of Jackson, Mich., in its lead editorial on February 29, the day after the President returned, provided its readers with a thoughtful discussion of some of the possible ramifications of this trip and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON'S CHINA TRIP BREACHED THE WALL

President Nixon and his considerable entourage are back in the familiar surroundings of the Capitol today as the first American President ever to visit China while in office.

The one-week sojourn in that still somewhat ancient kingdom brought no startling announcements of friendship or diplomatic relations. It did help to thaw considerably the iceberg that has separated the two countries during the past two decades.

Much of the ice is still there as evidenced by the joint communique issued by the

President and Chou En-lai shortly before the President departed on his return trip.

The communique spelled out areas of disagreement in very general terms but ended with a message of hope that the two big nations would continue to pursue the relationship begun by the President's trip.

Without doubt, the most significant statement made by the President was that this nation would remove its military collar from the islands of Taiwan at some future date as tensions in that area lessen.

Perhaps this is an exercise in futility.

Any reduction in American military forces on or near Taiwan is likely to make the Nationalists edgy and contribute to increased tension in the area, not less.

However, that is a problem the President and his advisors apparently will not have to face in the immediate future.

Few expected any startling agreement with regard to the other situations in Indochina and none was forthcoming.

Chou En-lai, long a supporter of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese, did nothing to jeopardize his relationship with these two groups.

Vying as it is with the Russians for the No. 1 position in the hearts of the North Vietnamese, China could not afford any concessions that would appear to be a softening of its well-known position vis-a-vis the United States.

There was hardly any diplomatic movement on either side in regard to the other vexing questions in Indochina.

The Chinese Communists are again looking warily at a prospering Japanese nation. They know that history often repeats itself and no one in power wants a repeat of the exploits of the Japanese Empire of the Thirties at Chinese expense.

They know that a prosperous nation often seeks to improve its commercial stature with military expansion.

When Japan could no longer find enough raw material to support its burgeoning industrial empire in the Thirties, it went looking for that raw material in China's backyard.

That doesn't seem possible today because China is a much more powerful nation today than it was 40 years ago. But the Chinese don't forget easily and they are uneasy over Japan's new-found industrial might.

Chinese leaders quite naturally reason that what happened in the Thirties and Forties could happen again in the Seventies.

With Russia on the north growing more hostile, Japan on the east and the Nationalists on the south, the Chinese communists have every reason to be wary about their position in Southeast Asia.

That is why they are looking to the possibility of, if not a friendship with the United States, at least a neutralization of a previously unfriendly relationship.

Because of that, this nation can probably expect new overtures from the Chinese with emphasis on cultural and journalistic exchanges, without fully recognized diplomatic relations. We have similar exchanges now with other Communist countries without an exchange of ambassadors.

The President's visit to China is recognition of the role that nation plays in world diplomacy and the actual power it holds as one of the world's leading powers.

In order to deal with the problems that power engenders, the President first had to make some formal recognition of it. That has been done now. The groundwork for further discussions and diplomatic debate has been laid.

And Taiwan cannot possibly feel that it is the only nation affected by this big power meeting. Japan, and certainly many of the other nations of Southeast Asia, must be wondering how their national interests were treated by the President and Chou En-lai.

Other than some never-before revelations

about life in China, the press coverage of the President's trip provided few insights into what the two leaders discussed.

We shouldn't have expected more than that; even the President cautioned against expecting too much in terms of breakthrough agreements.

Just getting beyond that invisible China wall proved refreshing. How long will the euphoria last? We don't know. But a breath of fresh air often does wonders for lagging spirits.

HON. HUGH CAREY CALLS FOR A UNITED IRELAND

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us are deeply concerned over the tragedy of the situation in Northern Ireland, but few have been as persistent and vocal as my friend and colleague from New York, HUGH CAREY. Congressman CAREY has spoken out against the injustices being perpetrated against the Catholics in Ulster on numerous occasions, and is the chief House sponsor of the Kennedy-Carey resolution calling for, among other things, a united Ireland.

The February 27 issue of the Sunday Press carried an interview with Congressman CAREY on the Irish situation. I urge each of my colleagues to take a few moments to read this very fine article.

[From the Sunday Press, Feb. 27, 1972]

FROM THE IRISH EMBASSY—NOTHING

Tomorrow, in the august House of Representatives in Washington, a two-page resolution, bearing the number H. Res. 702, will be dealt with by the European Affairs Subcommittee.

There will be public witnesses called to show why the motion which, summarized, calls for peace in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a United Ireland, should be the subject of a debate in the 92nd Congress—the Joint Assembly of 435 U.S. Congressmen and 100 Senators.

The resolution has been tabled by Congressman Hugh Carey of New York, and backed by Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Garmatz, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Hawkins and Mrs. Green, of Oregon, and Mr. Ellberg.

Senator Kennedy and Senator Ribicoff are co-sponsors of the resolution.

H. Res. 702, a four-page pamphlet, requests the United States Government, at the highest level to urge the immediate implementation of the following actions.

1. Termination of the current policy of internment and simultaneous release of all persons detained thereunder.

2. Full respect for the civil rights of all the people of Northern Ireland and the termination of all political, social, economic and religious discrimination.

3. Implementation of the reforms promised by the United Kingdom since 1968, including those reforms in the fields of law enforcement, housing, employment and voting rights.

4. Dissolution of the Parliament of Northern Ireland.

5. Withdrawal of all British Forces from Northern Ireland and the institution of law enforcement criminal justice under local control acceptable to all parties.

6. Convening of all interested parties for the purpose of accomplishing the unification of Ireland.

The European Affairs Subcommittee will

hear evidence from witnesses representing all shades of opinion in America on the Irish question. The committee can decide to have the matter discussed in Congress, if it goes to a vote, and the resolution is passed, it will mean that the world's most powerful voice will be urging Britain to act.

MICHAEL HAND TALKS TO THE MAN BEHIND MONDAY'S VITAL RESOLUTION ON THE NORTH

Hugh Carey is very well informed about Ireland's problems. He has been to the North on a fact-finding mission and met with Opposition M.P.s and Stormont Ministers. He has also had talks with Ministers in Dublin, and with U.S. Embassy officials in London.

After Derry, and the subsequent propaganda machinery of the British Information Service, he was bitterly disappointed that there was no flow of information from the Irish Embassy in Washington.

He told me: "When I was in Dublin, I stressed the importance of getting the Irish side of the stories across via the Embassy here. I was promised that this would be available."

"I haven't received a single scrap of news. I don't blame the Ambassador, he's done everything he could. But the flow hasn't been coming from Dublin. It's a great pity."

"The British were very quick off the mark. Newspapersmen and television people used the Heath argument blatantly. Some of the news stuff was just pure hand-out material. One columnist described the Northern minority as a 'White' Panther group."

"I would like the Irish Embassy here to feed us—and the media—with informative excerpts of the latest happenings from the minority point of view. As of now, they haven't been particularly effective."

"I'd welcome news from all sources—even Stormont. I'm a fair-minded person. My wife Helen is of Scottish Protestant stock, but she seeks the same justice as I do."

Hugh Carey claims he didn't see fair administration of justice on his visit to the North. Nor did subsequent conversations with two Stormont ministers convince me that there was even intent.

He told me: "I talked with Mr. Baillie, the Commerce Minister, and Mr. Fitzsimmons, the Minister for Health. The former told me that he would welcome someone like John Hume into the Cabinet perhaps as his assistant."

"He said that the two of them could go on a sort of goodwill tour of the world in a bid to get industries for the North. I asked Mr. Baillie would there be a guarantee of fair job allocation, and pointed out that the shipyards employed 8,700 Protestants and 300 Catholics."

There couldn't be a repetition of this. I added.

"I couldn't get this guarantee and I was of the opinion then that the Stormont government were going soft on the promised reforms."

"In a talk with Fitzsimmons, he told me that the real problem with Catholics in Northern Ireland was one of education. He offered the excuse that as Catholics produced too many children and sent them to inferior schools, they weren't fit for key jobs."

"With an attitude like that, how could any reasonably thinking man have faith in such a Government?"

Mr. Carey is against violence in any shape or form. "The British troops were sent there as a peace-keeping force. But soldiers like these don't act as policemen. They are the assailants; they are trained to kill."

"Violence only begets violence. I am against the sniping at British soldiers. The use of arms with intent to kill or maim is never justifiable. But I am realistic enough to know that the policy of internment, the failure for many to secure a living wage, tends to drive people to band together and they look to the I.R.A. as a protection."

"And after Derry, when that man Mc-

Keague said on the Frost show, which was seen throughout America, that his people called Bloody Sunday, Good Sunday, many who had accepted the British line were shocked."

Mr. Carey is a firm supporter of the civil disobedience campaign. "The withdrawal of Opposition M.P.s from parliament was justified," he said.

"There is no alternative to this when laws are unjust and seen to be so. Senator Kennedy and I predicted that something like Derry would happen. We hope there is no repetition."

"The most amazing reaction to our stand on Ireland has been the bitter condemnation by British leaders of our actions. They talked about interfering in the affairs of a foreign power."

"It's funny, you know, on what the British class as interference. They didn't say we were meddling when we fought against the Germans. I stood side by side with British soldiers in that war in a common cause."

"They didn't cry stop when the U.S. have bailed their pound on occasions. Or when we stepped in to save Rolls Royce. Or when we backed their sanctions against Rhodesia—another foreign power."

"The British, rightly, have spoken out against Vietnam."

"Are we to stay silent on the apartheid policy of South Africa? I wonder where the demarcation line lies in so-called 'interference.' It appears to us that it is only when we speak out on Ireland that they lay down the law."

"The Americans and the British are cousins—in blood and tradition. A President is honoured in Runnymede and we've always had the highest regard for their sense of fair play. The United States is in a position to call for justice to friends and foes and see an end to war."

"This resolution should be seen as an offer to conciliate. Gradually, we are getting more backing from the House of Representatives and the Senate. Senators Muskie, Brooke and Buckley, while not agreeing with all our proposals, are, in principle, with our proposals."

Hugh Carey, whose grandparents emigrated from Tyrone to know the truth. Tomorrow, Washington and the nation, will be listening to the beginning of the story.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1971, Mr. Henry Schuman, commander of the United Veterans Service Council of Queens County, N.Y., spoke before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Mr. Schuman's fine organization represents more than 1 dozen county council units. Because the Disabled American Veterans were inadvertently omitted from the listing of participating county council units which appeared in the printed record of the hearing, I have taken this opportunity to correct the record. The Disabled American Veterans group is one which deserves not only mention, but special recognition, because its members have made such tremendous sacrifices in their service to our Nation. Their being represented at the hearing last May, therefore, was especially important and meaningful to myself and my colleagues on the committee.

"LET'S FREEZE GOVERNMENT TOO"

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, a timely message has come across my desk, and I am sure many of you have received it, entitled "Let's Freeze Government Too: A Message Addressed to the President and Members of Congress."

A commentary on the administration of the Economic Stabilization Program, the gist of the message is contained in this one paragraph:

It is unfair to control the economic decisions of people—while letting federal spending run rampant. Government must do its part—it, too, must show self-discipline.

Indicative of this "self-discipline," and I say that facetiously, you will recall the actions in the Senate earlier this week in connection with the House-passed bill to increase the national debt limit to the phenomenal level of \$450 billion. By a rather substantial margin, one amendment was adopted to impose a firm ceiling of \$246.3 billion on Federal spending for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. Ironically, however, the Senate then turned around 180 degrees and approved an amendment providing that if the Senate votes more in any appropriations bill than requested in the President's budget, the ceiling figure is automatically raised by a corresponding amount. Furthermore, another amendment would exempt from the ceiling any increased outlays for farm price supports, the social security and national service life insurance trust funds, and for interest on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of financial wizardry is a hoax and it is about time the Congress lives by the rules it purports to approve as applied to the private sectors of the economy. "Let's Freeze Government Too" is a message that we should all take to heart and I include its text at this point in my remarks:

LET'S FREEZE GOVERNMENT TOO—A MESSAGE ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

Under the current program of controls and freezes, you are:

Asking working men and women to make sacrifices in holding down prices.

Asking businessmen to make sacrifices in holding down prices.

What sacrifices will government make? Government surely doesn't want to ask others to make sacrifices it isn't prepared to make itself. If your program to control inflation is to succeed, government must do two things:

1. Cut federal spending.
2. Restrain the creation of money through the Federal Reserve System.

It is unfair to control the economic decisions of people—while letting federal spending run rampant. Government must do its part—it, too, must show self-discipline.

To halt inflation, federal government spending must be frozen—better yet—CUT, and the money supply restrained. Economic controls deal with the results of inflation. Frozen or reduced spending is one sure way to reduce inflationary pressures. As wage and price increases are deferred, so too should spending for new federal programs be deferred.

It is also time for Congress and all agencies of government to evaluate existing programs by their measurable results and get rid of the deadwood programs that have a proven record of ineffectiveness. Congress too seldom reviews the need for legislation previously enacted.

Will you, Mr. President and members of Congress, face up to these needs?

Only you have the authority to investigate, hold hearings, ask questions and sit in judgment of these spending questions.

If you don't know where and how to stop spending, then you should set up the proper mechanism to find the answers.

If the citizens of the United States must struggle under economic controls then government should, in all equity, restrain its own actions, with emphasis on reduced spending and a restrained money supply.

It is time for government to cooperate with the American taxpayer in this fight against inflation.

Mr. President and members of Congress, the responsibility is yours.

CALIFORNIA CRUDE OIL PRICES FROZEN UNREALISTICALLY LOW

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress, the Executive and a host of other organizations and institutions wrestle with the impending energy crisis in this country, I would like to point out a situation which is unreasonably hampering our best efforts to expand domestic oil reserves.

California crude oil prices have been frozen at unrealistically low levels, in comparison with other comparable regions. This, of course, keeps a lid on available capital for increased exploration and generally leads to the depression of the California oil industry.

In using the Wilmington area of California as a comparison with the Upper Gulf Coast of Texas, the difference in oil price by gravity between the two areas becomes apparent. The accompanying table briefly illustrates the differences:

Gravity	Wilmington, Calif.	Upper Gulf Coast, Texas	Differences in price
30°	\$3.38	\$3.70	\$0.32
26°	3.17	3.62	.45
22°	2.89	3.54	.65
18°	2.61	3.48	.87

The discrepancy in the posted price between the two comparable areas is caused largely by an imbalance in the oil gravity differential. For example, Texas crude declines in price 2 cents per gravity degree while California crude declines in price 5 to 7 cents per gravity degree. This results in a progressively unrealistic lower price for California crudes.

This injustice existed prior to the initiation of price controls. The solution can be accomplished by adjusting California crude oil prices to a point of parity with other comparable producing areas; that is, the upper gulf coast of Texas. The gravity differential should

reflect no more than 2 cents per degree to be in conformity.

The reason this price differential exists is that until a few years ago refineries were tooled to produce a high percentage of fuel oil. This product often became a drug on the market which depressed the value of lower gravity crude oil since this type of oil, when refined by methods then used, produced a much higher percentage of fuel oil than high gravity oil—the lower the gravity the more fuel oil. The obvious economic result was that lower gravity crudes were simply worth less in proportion to higher gravities.

With the displacement of the burning of fuel oil by natural gas because of air pollution, refineries were forced to retool. Through the use of hydrocracking procedures, low gravity oil can now be refined—or cracked—into a very high percentage of high quality gasoline as well as other products much more valuable than fuel oil. The actual value difference between a barrel of low gravity oil as compared to high gravity crude is therefore minimal with current methods of refining. Yet, the large differential in price between gravities has persisted.

Prior to the price freeze, independent associations had been making some progress toward a proper price readjustment. The major purchasers recognize that the marked differential in values no longer exist but they can do nothing about it because of the price controls.

That California crudes have greater value is indicated by the fact independent refineries were offering a bonus above posted prices before the price freeze.

Evidence of the underpricing and increased demand for California crude oil was shown on November 8, 9, and 10 of 1971, when independent refiners competitively bid 15 to 21 cents per barrel bonus over the posted price for 12,000 barrels per day of 20 gravity oil from the State's share of production from the Long Beach unit of the Wilmington Field. This sale of crude oil was for a 3-year period commencing April 30, 1972, and had previously on October 14, 1971, been declared valid by the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

Importantly, an upward adjustment in the prices of California crude oil will result in a much needed renewal of exploration in prospective areas of the State. During 1970, according to the annual report of the Reserves Committee of the American Petroleum Institute, there were no new oil field discoveries in California and the proved oil reserves had a net decline of 259 million barrels from 4.24 billion barrels to 3.98 billion barrels. This was the largest decline in 1970 for any oil-producing State. In addition, preliminary reports indicate the consumption of oil in California has been far in excess of new reserves discovered during 1971. The grim reality of energy shortages no matter how it may have been caused was previewed recently in England.

The increased revenue thus generated for independent oil producers will provide the necessary additional capital to explore for new reserves of both oil and gas. Independent operators have histori-

cally done more exploration onshore and consequently have discovered far more oil than any other segment of the oil industry. The proper incentive is all that is needed to assure their continued leadership.

The discovery of new gas reserves is essential to keeping many industries operating in California and a consequent high level of employment. Utilities are sorely pressed to keep many of their current industrial users on stream. Gas reserves in the State of California are insufficient to even meet the increased demands during the winter months merely as a supplement to imported gas from other States and Canada. The reluctance on the part of Canada to permit new contracts for export to the United States together with the unavailability of gas from other States because of unrealistic price controls at the wellhead by the Federal Power Commission for interstate use has precluded the possibility of the importation of new supplies into California. Any new gas supply which can be found within this State should help alleviate the problem and to keep industries humming, thus avoiding a rise in unemployment.

The shutting down of major industries all over the State would obviously be a catastrophe. This is the grim reality California is facing in the not too distant future if some immediate steps cannot be taken to alleviate the problem. Other economic benefits would inure to the State and local governments in the form of additional tax revenue as well as increased royalties from offshore production to the Federal Government.

In short, there is an unrealistic difference in the price of crude oil as compared with other oil producing areas within the country having similar marketing and refining facilities. The injustice of lower crude prices for California producers primarily because of an imbalance in the gravity differential which existed prior to the time price controls went into effect, should be rectified. This would enable the California producers to attain parity with the end result of a more healthy California oil industry, greater assurance of a continuing supply of energy to keep all industries functioning with a high rate of employment, and a general strengthening of the national security.

WAR POWERS LEGISLATION

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, not long before the end of the first session of the 92d Congress, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations approved a bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress.

That bill, S. 2956, is expected to come to the floor of the Senate for debate and vote early in this session. Senate con-

sideration of the proposal is likely to spark renewed controversy on the nature of the war powers of Congress and the President.

It is a subject on which the House already has taken legislative action through the passage of House Joint Resolution 1 on August 2, 1971. In my view the House-passed measure is a preferable way of dealing with the war powers issue than S. 2956.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate will amend House Joint Resolution 1 and ask for a conference in order that differences may be expeditiously resolved.

Should S. 2956 be referred to the House it is very unlikely that war powers legislation will be taken up again. The House, it should be underscored, has passed the powers legislation in both the 91st Congress and 92d Congress.

Therefore, unless a war powers bill goes to conference, it is doubtful that any legislation on war powers will be approved before the end of the 92d Congress.

The Senate bill presents a number of constitutional and practical difficulties which make its passage undesirable.

In a recent article in the New York Times, Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Schweitzer professor of humanities at City University of New York and a former Presidential assistant, expressed his strong misgivings about the Senate committee proposal in an article entitled, "Fallacies of the War-Powers Bill."

In his article Dr. Schlesinger explains the fallacious reasoning which underlies the legislation. He also endorses the idea of written Presidential reports about the status and prospects of hostilities the Chief Executive may have initiated, which is the basis of House Joint Resolution 1.

Because of the pertinency of this article, I am inserting it in the RECORD and urge the attention of my colleagues to it.

The article follows:

THE PRESIDENCY UNDER CLASS II—FALLACIES OF THE WAR-POWERS BILL

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

The Indochina war has set in motion a wholesome and belated critique of the American Presidency. A direct product of this war is the proposed "War Powers Act of 1971," a bill designed to restrain the power of Presidents to carry the nation into undeclared hostilities. The bill's two particular architects are Senators Javits and Stennis. These two able men are not usually encountered as brothers in arms; and the collaboration of this odd couple suggests the range and weight of senatorial opinion behind the measure. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, after intensive hearings, has endorsed the bill. So, indeed, has The New York Times.

Nearly everyone agrees that Congressional control over the war power has faded dangerously in recent years. The war-powers bill realistically understands that emergencies may arise when Presidents must order military action without waiting for Congressional approval. But it would limit the authority of the President to act without a declaration of war to four specific categories of emergency. And it would stipulate that military action cannot continue for more than thirty days without express Congressional consent.

The bill's first fallacy is that it is possible to provide in advance for all foreseeable contingencies. By restricting the Presidential power to act without a declaration of war to

four static categories, the Senators are trying today, as George Ball has put it, "to do what the Founding Fathers felt they were not wise enough to do." The result may well be to tie a future President's hands when some unforeseen crisis arises.

The 30-day authorization period raises equally difficult problems. The best way to illustrate these problems is to consider what would have happened if the War Powers Act of 1971 had been in force during other times of emergency in our recent history. Specifically, would it have prevented President Roosevelt from conducting the North Atlantic intervention in 1941 and would it have prevented President Johnson from increasing the Vietnam intervention in 1965?

The short answer to these questions is that the war-powers bill probably would have prevented President Roosevelt from protecting the British lifeline against Nazi submarines—and that it probably would not have prevented President Johnson from escalating the war in Vietnam. If all this is so, then the bill will serve neither the purpose for which it was drafted nor the national interest.

In 1941 Britain, fighting alone in the west against Hitler, depended on American aid for survival. The Roosevelt Administration felt that British collapse and Nazi victory would jeopardize the security of the United States. Accordingly, Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox announced in September that the Navy had been "ordered to capture or destroy by every means at its disposal Axis-controlled submarines or surface raiders" in the western Atlantic. Now it is not at all clear that this action falls within the four categories of initiative permitted to Presidents by the war-powers bill. In any case, it is certainly not clear that Congress would have sustained the "shot on sight" policy after thirty days. In August, 1941, the House of Representatives, confronted by a bill to extend the draft, passed this relatively innocuous measure by only a single vote.

As for the Vietnam war, President Johnson could unquestionably have got all the Congressional blessing he wanted at any point up to 1968, and perhaps even then. And this suggests the second fallacy of the bill: that it forgets the overwhelming short-run ability of Presidents—especially in times when, unlike 1939-41, opposition has not been aroused by a great national debate—to define emergencies and compel support. During the shock of crisis the President is the dominant source of information. Naturally he gives Congress the facts that seem to justify his action, as during the Tonkin Gulf affair, and naturally the country rallies to him.

It generally takes longer than thirty days for other facts to emerge and for serious debate to begin. By that time the war-powers bill will have locked Congress into the war policy. If we had had that bill in 1965, Congress, far from controlling American intervention in Vietnam, would have implicated itself far more deeply through the simple process of renewing the Presidential mandate month after month.

The war-powers bill does contain some valuable ideas. One provision requires the President to send Congress periodic written reports about the status and prospects of hostilities he may have initiated. Another enables Congress to terminate such hostilities by statute or joint resolution and provides that one-third of the members of either house can bring such proposals to the floor within 24 hours. These provisions deserve enactment on their own very considerable merits. They would go far by themselves to achieve the goal of restoring Congressional authority over the making of wars.

But in general this problem will not yield to neat structural solutions. It is more fundamental than that. It requires different states of mind—a new will to seek participation on the part of the executive, a new

will to accept responsibility on the part of Congress. It requires much more systematic Congressional skepticism about information and forecasts handed them by the executive. It requires an end to the idea that foreign policy is too sacred for secular debate. Without these things the thirty-day authorization will only play into the hands of forceful Presidents. With them it will not be necessary.

CHANGES PROPOSED IN OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH RULES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD a recent announcement by the Department of Labor outlining upcoming revisions in standards under the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Forty-six changes in standards will be made by the midpoint of fiscal year 1973. The material follows:

George C. Guenther, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, said "OSHA's job safety and health standards are the keystone of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. They must be dynamic in order to fairly provide for maximum protection in the rapidly changing workplace environment."

The timetable calls for changes in 31 standards by the end of 1972 fiscal year (June 30, 1972) and an additional 15 by the midpoint of fiscal 1973 (December 31, 1972). Two more were announced last month.

Guenther said the changes are key parts of a three-phase program of standards development by the OSHA Office of Standards under Acting Director Gerald F. Scannell.

The first phase involves correction of typographical errors and similar nonsubstantive items found in the initial standards published in 1971.

The second phase clarifies adopted national consensus standards and revoked some provisions because of their discriminatory nature or because they conflict with other parts of the standards.

The third phase involves adopting new standards, developed either by national consensus standards organizations or by the Department under procedures presented by the Williams-Steiger Act.

Guenther said "We are announcing the schedule for these proposed changes so as to inform interested parties of OSHA's intentions. Due to the complex technical nature of many of the standards, the timetable cannot be considered absolute, but reflects our best estimate of what can be accomplished during the balance of 1972."

Among the proposed changes and target dates for completion are the following:

MARCH

Revoking the ban on steering knobs on industrial trucks.

Modifying the grounding requirement for woodworking machinery to permit the use of double insulated tools, and for switch controls on portable power tools.

Amending the construction section for roll-over protective structures for vehicles.

APRIL

Bringing standards for explosives into line with those of the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Internal Review Service (IRS) to provide a single uniform set of regulations.

Modifying flammable liquid container specifications to reflect DOT regulations.

Revoking requirements for women's retiring rooms and on the height of toilet partitions.

Modifying requirements on drinking water and ice, on the need for split toilet seats, and others.

Revoking a section on color code marking of physical hazards and on size requirements for signs.

Rectifying conflicts on railings, exit signs and color coding.

Making technical changes, largely to assure language conformity, in sections involving machinery and machine guarding, hazardous materials, fire protection, materials handling and storage, welding, cutting and brazing, and such special industries as pulp, paper and paperboard mills, textiles, bakery equipment, laundry machinery and operations, pulpwood logging and agricultural operations.

MAY

Making technical changes and corrections in sections affecting powered platforms, man-lifts and vehicle-mounted platforms, and compressed gas and compressed air equipment.

Adding new sections on protective helmets for electrical workers, slings, uniform traffic control devices, exits, sprinklers, foam, mechanical power transmission guarding, bakery equipment and floating cranes and derricks.

JUNE

Adding new sections on woodworking machinery, oil burning equipment, ovens and furnaces and installation of gas appliances.

Adopting the 1971 Threshold Limit Values of the American Congress of Governmental Industrial Hygienists on toxic substances and noise, replacing 1968 and 1970 levels.

Promulgating an asbestos standard to replace the emergency standard issued December 7, 1971.

Amending the construction standards to correct conflicts, duplications and technical errors, including those on catch platforms and scaffold heights.

Completing a section on electrical transmission and distribution lines and equipment, including a specific standard for the electrical utility industry.

Bringing sections of the general industry standards and the construction standards into conformity.

JULY

Adding a section on installation of gas piping and gas equipment on industrial premises.

Bringing maritime standards into conformity with other standards where like hazards are covered.

AUGUST

Adding sections on longshoring on the docks, diving operations and workmen's hoists.

Revoking the ban on pump-jack scaffolding.

Adding amendments on tunneling to the construction standards.

Resolving differences on scaffold requirements.

SEPTEMBER

Adopting a new standard on bis (chloromethyl) ether.

OCTOBER

Adding parts of a new consensus standard on machine guarding for woodworking machinery, and on work in confined spaces.

DECEMBER

Adding new sections on dredging and local exhaust systems.

Promulgating, in coordination with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, standards on two of the OSHA Target Health Hazards: carbon monoxide and silica.

THE CASE AGAINST
"GO METRIC"

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the empire builders among the bureaucracy are urging the Congress to hurl this Nation headlong into the metric system. They seek a crash program without the slightest idea of what it will cost in dollars, in lost trade, or in massive inconvenience and confusion. The cost is probably the last thing on their minds.

Mr. George C. Lovell, an industrial engineer and consultant, spent a year and a half as a member of the U.S. Metric Study Group at the National Bureau of Standards. This group has recommended that the United States "go metric."

Mr. Lovell, however, has not been lulled by the siren song of the metric advocates and he has made an excellent case against a nationwide conversion to the metric system and for the retention of our present system of measurement.

I hope that Members of the House will take the time to read the remarks of Mr. Lovell, which I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

A METRIC AMERICA—A DECISION WHOSE
TIME HAS NOT COME

(By George C. Lovell)

Passage of any legislation to convert this country to the metric system of measurement at this time in our history could well prove to be a classic case of economic hara-kiri. Most Congressmen, as with most businessmen and other citizens, are too preoccupied with immediate pressing national issues to be aware of what "going metric" really entails. The price-tag could reach \$100 billion¹ if we add to the direct costs the large bureaucratic apparatus necessary to carry out any "coordinated national program" and the massive assistance which will be necessary to enable the many small businesses to adjust to the new system, if indeed they manage to survive the dual impact of competitive disadvantage relative to the larger concerns and the flood of imports which such a national program would trigger (not to mention the million or more jobs lost to labor in the process!).

The metric system is a far superior system for the scientist and the chemist which explains why engineering and chemical sciences are taught in metric and why those industries closely aligned to scientific endeavor such as chemical, photographic, and pharmaceutical are on a metric base. But the metric system proves impractical for other sectors of our society when consideration is given to 1) the complete embodiment of the customary (inch, pound, gallon) system in our way of life, in our language and in our communication with one another; 2) the difficulty of converting a highly technical manufacturing society, with its interlocking structure of inch-based standard fabricated materials and components; 3) the virtual impossibility of divesting ourselves of the multitude of customary designed products woven into the fabric of our day-to-day lives, with the result that a dual system of non-interchangeable parts or components may be with us for 50 to 100 years or more, in turn requiring

¹ A preliminary draft of the U.S. metric study report estimated over \$60 billion in direct costs. This was deleted in the final version.

a bilingual measurement language during this entire period; 4) the possibility that 1 and 3 may lead to an outraged and resentful populace, necessitating forced abandonment of any "coordinated" government program midstream (with further disastrous economic consequence); 5) the uncertainty and unproven significant or tangible benefits which might accrue to any specific segment of society (with the exception of some multi-national concerns); and not least, 6) the spectre of a foreign trade deficit which would easily exceed \$10 billion per year upon completion of the conversion program.

These conclusions are the result of nearly three years intensive investigation of the pros and cons. "Let's Go Metric" is akin to the "grass is greener" syndrome which, one discovers as one wanders into it has potholes and deceptive patches of quicksand. The degree of support for converting this country to the metric system varies inversely to the degree to which the ramifications attendant to such a change are fully thought out. When initially confronted with the hypothesis, nearly everyone agrees it would be a good thing for the country. However, if the question leads to discussion, some doubts and reservations surface as to the practical difficulties of accomplishing such an undertaking. Then, if in-depth investigations are undertaken, a complete reversal in opinion occurs, not so much from the massiveness of the undertaking, but rather by bringing into focus the basic points noted above.

FOREIGN TRADE

Congress had one overriding concern in authorizing the Department of Commerce to conduct a three-year study and that was an economic one; "Would a metric America pave the way for continued dominance in technology and total worldwide trade?" It is true that a one measurement based world would facilitate international trade by creating a worldwide interchangeability of parts and components. The question then arises "For whose benefit and at whose expense?" Before Congress opts for a metric America, it had better realize that the United States would lose heavily to other technological nations in the scramble for export markets, which, incidentally, includes a very nice slice of our own trillion dollar economy. The notion that "going metric" will provide a panacea for our future economy is a delusion which must be countered with reality.

We need but look to our neighbor Canada² for a textbook illustration. Both countries produce to the same inch-based standards which, of course, facilitates foreign trade for those manufactured products which require precision interchangeability of parts and components. In 1964, the U.S. enjoyed a \$700 million favorable balance of trade, \$4.9 billion exported to Canada compared to \$4.2 billion in imports. By 1969 the figures had expanded to \$9.1 billion in export and \$10.4 billion imports for a favorable Canadian trade balance of \$1.3 billion. (In 1970, the Canadian advantage was even greater, over \$3 billion.) The increased trade was in MSS³ manufactured

² Canada has issued a white paper avowing intent to go metric. The final decision is predicated on whatever the U.S. does. As one statesman remarked, "When a mouse sleeps next to an elephant, it keeps one eye open to move at the same time as the elephant." In a one metric world, Canada would gain by being able to compete in worldwide metric markets while retaining its favorable export trade with the U.S.

³ MSS means "measurement standard sensitive." If the measurement standard is changed, the size or contour of the part or component is altered which, in turn, requires modification in design throughout the entire manufacturing chain of those products requiring assembly and interchangeability of parts. (Screw thread standards for nuts and bolts are the most obvious

products, for the most part aircraft and automobiles. I fail to follow the logic which argues that if both countries were metric, the favorable balance of trade would revert to the United States. Yet, this fiction has continued unchallenged.

During the Senate Commerce Committee hearings relating to metric conversion held in 1967, on page 54 of the November 15 report, for example, we read the following: "A recent study estimated that the United States is losing between \$10 and \$20 billion in foreign trade every year because she is not on the metric system."!! and the statement continues, "This export market would accrue to us as soon as we went metric!" This surely is a wild statement for if there is 10 or 20 billion dollars of business lying around—where is that shrewd Yankee ingenuity and sharpness which could small a buck a mile away? Well, a little detective work would have revealed that Yankee ingenuity had been at work. Yankee shrewdness had been on the trail, and Yankee know-how had persevered to the tune of almost 10 times that amount. And this was accomplished without a metric shot being fired! (although, unfortunately, this production did not accrue to our export account). I am referring, of course, to the multi-national company phenomena.

MORE PROFITABLE

In 1958, while with the Business and Defense Services Administration (now Bureau of Domestic Commerce) I wrote a proposed position paper titled "Is the United States Pricing Itself Out of World Markets?" The gist of this paper presented the argument that instead of engaging in export trade it was more profitable in many cases to establish overseas manufacturing plants and capture that market on-site and at the same time export to other parts of the world (including the United States) from that location. Higher U.S. production costs made this possible and, I reasoned, if that trend continued, it would create a serious deficit in our foreign trade markets. (The paper was quietly buried as too touchy a political issue.) I claim no prescience for I never dreamed the extent to which this trend would mushroom some 12 years later.

Within the past three years, the multi-national phenomena has completely changed the world trade scenario and as a by-product scotches once-and-for-all the chestnut that if the United States converts to the metric system it will increase our export thereby enabling us to maintain a high favorable balance of trade. Consider the following: 1) The U.S. multi-national companies in the years 1969 through 1971 have more than doubled their overseas investment in foreign plant so that it now exceeds \$100 billion; 2) The Texture of that investment has changed, currently exceeding 50% in manufacturing plant compared to one-third in 1957; 3) The product of these overseas affiliates now exceeds \$220 billion, of which half, (or over \$100 billion, represents MSS products). Most MSS products are produced to inch-based standards and due to the vagaries of history now provide insurance from calamitous inroads to our economy from metric standard based products. To convert this capability to metric standards would destroy whatever technological superiority and economic advantage we enjoy.

To supply the overseas facilities over \$1 billion a year of inch-based standard parts and components are exported from the U.S. Added to this is nearly \$2 billion in basic

example.) The altering of the part to accommodate the new standard is referred to as a "hardware" change. Merely designating the original item in metric terms instead of inch terms is referred to as a "software" change. A speedometer showing kilometers per hour instead of miles per hour is an example of a software change.

production machinery and equipment for new plant. In an all metric world, most of this export would disappear for it would be cheaper to purchase from on-site sources already tooled up and producing to metric standards.

DEFICIT INCREASE

This same result holds for any MSS product whether or not produced by a multi-national. For example, the interim metric study report titled *International Trade* noted (P. 62), "If the U.S. adopts ISO (metric) standards for (industrial) fasteners, it trade deficit will grow sharply because the competitive advantage will swing further to foreign producers who will have had production experience with most of these standards, whereas U.S. producers would have to acquire it." Illustrations of this nature are ignored and swept aside by those who, having but one objective, to "Let's Go Metric," do not want to be confused by the facts.

It is no problem to develop a rationale and draw charts to show that our foreign trade deficit would grow to \$10 billion yearly following any 10 year transition period. In making projections, only MSS products need to be considered.

Assume that by 1985 Congress has given the green light and the 10 year conversion period has been completed. According to the *International Trade* interim metric report MSS product export in the 5 year period 1965 through 1969 increased from \$9.5 billion to \$13.9 billion. Using that rate of growth, by 1985 a straight line projection shows that the increase would be about \$14 billion for a total of about \$28 billion per year. If half of this increase is lost because of loss of competitive technological advantage, we are out \$7 billion a year. Added to this would be loss of a portion of the current \$14 billion. If we lost half of this (which includes the current \$3 billion to multinationals) we have another \$7 billion for a total of \$14 billion!

On the import side, a similar projection can be made. Using the same time frame 1965-1969, import of MSS product increased by \$3.4 billion from \$2.6 billion to \$6.0 billion. At this rate, imports would grow to \$16 billion by 1985. The extent to which this import would be greater due to loss of technological superiority on the domestic front and overseas lower cost is anybody's guess. It could amount to another \$8 billion a year. This total added to the \$14 billion in reduced export indicates a swing of \$22 billion a year by the time this country has completed its "coordinated" conversion program! These data are shown in the following table:

FIGURE 1.—MSS PRODUCT

	[Dollars in billions]			
	1965	1969	Status- quo 1985	All metric 1985
Export.....	9.5	13.9	28	14
Import.....	2.6	6.0	16	24
E/I balance....	+6.9	+7.9	+12	-10

Instead of a favorable U.S. trade balance of \$12 billion in MSS product there would be a \$10 billion deficit, the swing of \$22 billion noted above.

I know that these projections can be attacked as unscientifically developed. Economists are always disagreeing with one another on specifics even when they agree on generalities. There is no question, however, that the direction of the import/export gyrations pursued here is correct. The assumptions and rationale leading to a potential \$22 billion loss in foreign trade are on firmer ground than those used in the U.S. metric study to show that there would be a net gain of \$1 billion a year in export trade and no increase in imports as a result of metrication.

These were based on off-the-cuff opinion of those surveyed. What all this proves is the desperate need, if Congress still has leanings to pursue the metric siren, to first authorize an in-depth study by a prestigious economist who could look impassionately and objectively at the issue and not bias the results for some self-serving objective. Unquestionably, he would employ highly qualified economists and industrial technicians to assist him to come up with conclusions and recommendations which could bear close scrutiny. Unfortunately, however, based on past history, that would not quell the debate. That can only be accomplished by shedding light on other complexities of the metric maze, mostly of a social nature, and debunking a number of metric myths which have been widely circulated.

SMALL BUSINESS IMPACT

The Manufacturing Sector.—For many manufactured products, the hardware change would not be a factor; only the measurement language which describes it needs to be changed; e.g., screw drivers, novelties, furniture, and even complicated mechanisms produced solely for domestic use. Yet, at some point in time, as standard parts and materials are predominantly manufactured to metric standards every manufacturer who incorporates standard parts in his product will be faced with the hardware conversion. This would result from customer specification, higher cost of nonmetric standard parts, and the scarcity of sources producing customary standard materials or components.

Any U.S. industry (inch based) that now has a worldwide competitive advantage (or domestic for that matter) because of technological superiority (thereby making it difficult or impractical to compete on a metric base) would find its competitive advantage scuttled if that industry had to convert. An example would be the U.S. oilfield equipment manufacturers who enjoy a viable worldwide market produced to inch-based standards. The software change which would occur as metric measurement language became universal would not affect their markets—it is inconceivable that they would voluntarily make the hardware conversion to metric-based standards. Yet, as conventional sources of customary standard produced materials and components dried up, they would be forced to make the hardware change thereby opening the door to direct worldwide foreign competition.

Domestically, the technical aspects of hardware conversion alone would create practical difficulties notwithstanding import implications. For some small businesses, this would be catastrophic, for some severe, and others moderate or trivial.

Commerce Secretary Stans in his report to the Congress recommended that any changesides it's easier" just won't go over. The small manufacturer finding himself at a competitive disadvantage with the larger manufacturer may not agree with this recommendation, particularly since from his point of view, he is being forced to convert at no ostensible economic advantage to him.

THE LITTLE MAN

Consider a small manufacturer of, say, less than 10 employees having one special production machine, or one each of several types of equipment. As metric production increases, he will be receiving more and more inquiries or orders to produce to metric specifications, at the same time, his inquiries or orders based on customary standards will be declining. How can he produce to both standards on the same machine? If he employs dual dimensions or dual read-out mechanisms on the equipment, what potential errors or reduced production capability would accrue by the necessity of his employees being forced to work under a bilingual measurement language? (The larger concern can separate his employees into two

groups, those working solely in metric, those solely in inch.)

In the December 1970 issue of *Professional Engineer* in an article titled "What To Do When Metric Comes," I described how products could be produced to both customary and metric standards in the same plant.—But this capability envisioned two assembly lines, one using the older inch-based equipment to produce the product to customary standards and dimensions, the other line using new metric designed or existing machines modified to produce to metric standards. The small concern has neither the flexibility, the facilities, nor the capital to do this. More significantly, some of the equipment may not lend itself to inexpensive adaptation to produce in both measurement languages.

The alternatives are not efficient solutions and this places the small operator at a competitive disadvantage. The use of conversion charts opens the door to confusion, error, lost production time, and unhappy customers as those who have tried it well know. Dual dimensioning of shop drawings are expensive and time consuming and he cannot expect the customers to furnish them. They also open the door to confusion and error, for such drawings have proved to be cluttered and difficult to read. The customer is more apt to turn to a supplier who can produce directly to metric standards or specifications. While this may create opportunities for larger concerns or entrepreneurs, it is no consolation to the small concern suffering from loss of business. These observations point up the necessity of a large scale government assistance program in any government conversion plan.

The Non-Manufacturing Sectors.—While the manufacturing community would be faced with the greatest financial burden of any conversion program, there are several non-manufacturing sectors that would be faced with practical difficulties of varying degree of impact with the greatest impact falling on the smallest businesses. This, and the possibility of serious repercussions with political implications if a premature metric conversion is attempted at the retail/consumer level, provide the basis for my contention that such a program should be delayed for as long as 10 or 20 years after the manufacturing industry has metricated.

With respect to the practical difficulties, consider the small delicatessen or independent grocer. How does he convert his weighing devices concurrently with the large chain stores and what costs are there? Will the supplier of the replacement dials or drums on the scales have such replacements on hand on time? What scales need to be replaced or discarded because of the impracticability of converting or calibrating to the new units of gram or liter? What about pricing his stock which may be in pounds and quarts but which he now must sell by the kilo or liter—or conversely, the new stock in kilos or liters comingled with pound/quart stock? The large concerns can phase these in or out at his central supply areas, but the small operator does not have such flexibility. All these problems need to be fully investigated and some form of assistance is indicated, particularly since the change stems from government dictate rather than by freedom of choice.

Service Industries.—There are two more categories of small businesses which face serious problems in any national metric conversion plan: 1. Repair services; and 2. Parts suppliers.

1. For the small service or repair shop with limited resources, the problem of stocking a minimum number of popular parts in both metric and inch-based sizes would become intolerable, not only with respect to financing, but with respect to space. Then too, there is the problem of communicating with the consumer. When a housewife calls up and says "my washing machine stopped"

and the repairman determines it is a certain part—does he take a metric or inch-based part for the service call? How does he communicate with the housewife to get the proper identifying model number to resolve the question?

ESTIMATE

Questions similar to the above are reviewed by Henry N. Osteberg of Sears, Roebuck and Co., in the interim U.S. metric study report titled "The Consumer." After looking at the magnitude of the problem, he estimated that the cost in additional metric tools alone for his company could represent an outlay of \$2 million not to mention the cost of revising service manuals and other required educational materials. He then looks at the problems connected with repair parts inventory, internal company education and consumer education and concludes that even 20 years is not an unrealistic conversion period to permit an orderly control of repair parts inventory. He considers the external problem of communicating with the customer "a problem of far greater magnitude" for "there is no economic incentive for the customer to learn a new measurement language" he further anticipates "attitudes of apathy and even resentment" and concludes that "Above all, let's not be stampeded by a 'now is the time—let's go!' attitude."

Now Sears is a large organization and if they anticipate such problems with all their capabilities of organization and control to segment the difficulties, what about the small businessman who has no such flexibility? Consider, a small garage mechanic; in addition to duplicate sets of wrenches, taps and dies, and so on, what about the aggravation and cost resulting from stripped threads, rounded nuts, broken keys and similar failures stemming from the incompatibility of the two fastener systems and the ease with which the wrong type can be selected in making a repair, not to mention the added inventory and difficulty of keeping that inventory from being comingled?

2. This latter observation leads us to the parts supplier most of whom are small businesses. Anyone who has had occasion to visit a parts supplier is aware of the multitude and variety of items in stock, not to mention the investment such stock represents. Now compound this situation with a duplicate counterpart of many of the items to metric specifications. Does he have the space? Can he afford it? What about inventory control and communicating with his clientele? This is really pertinent today with the increasing irresponsibility of hired help in delivering the correct size or model to the customer causing still further delay and costs, not to mention frayed tempers of all concerned: the repairman, the supplier, and the customer.

THE SOCIAL CHANGE

While the manufacturing sector of society would bear the brunt of the burden in cost, delay, and loss of business, the social change attendant to metric conversion will be much more difficult to bring about. This fact is well understood by those who would be on the firing line but is blithely played down by those deliberately attempting to give out the impression that there is public clamor to "go metric."

The element of *divesting* is the key. This principle is overlooked by those who have been abroad and laud the metric system for its simplicity when they return. They are correct in their conclusion based on their experience for they were in an environment completely oriented to metric language and products. There were no inch-based measurement phenomena all about them to block the mental adjustment to metric. The analogy to learning a foreign language is "a propos" here for it is universally recognized that one has to be immersed in the language environment in order to really "learn" it and "think" in it. Their enthusiasm and urging to "go

metric" would be in order if we could get rid of the inch-based ambience in which we live.

Illustrations are endless. The water meters are in gallons and gas meters are in cubic feet. I agree that the solution to just not change them is the correct one but why embark on metric conversion in the first place if we intend to keep the old units anyway? More awkward situations exist in many other routine facets of our lives. The thermostatic controls in the millions of homes—new or replacement thermostats would have Celsius readings instead of Fahrenheit. It may take 50 years or more before the Fahrenheit style controls disappeared and all the while people will be forced to accommodate to and use two systems of temperature readings instead of one. (There is also the practical problem of the necessity for half-degrees in the metric scale for one degree Celsius is nearly 2 degrees in Fahrenheit, 1.8 to be exact. At 70° Fahrenheit a one degree change in setting may be just right for the comfort desired, whereas a one degree Celsius might be too much.) The 9x12 rug, now 2.7x3.6 (meters) would still be there, as would the 8 foot high ceiling, a quart of milk would be .946 liters, a pound of butter 454 grams, and 176 miles between 2 cities would be 283 kilometers. When one went to buy an 8 foot board, it would be a different length under metric standards. What size do you order? And of course, there is always the nuts and bolts. Just what style or type do you buy so that the replacement will mesh with the old?

The point is that none of these will just be discarded and their customary designation must be retained for many years. The pro-metric enthusiasts shrug off these truths as mere temporary annoyances. They know the public will take them in stride. Well, they are not temporary and I'm not so sure the public will take them in stride. Inevitably, citizens will ask the questions, "What am I gaining from all this?" "What's in it for me?" The flippant answers, "It's good for you" and "it's good for the country" and "besides it's easier" just won't go over. The latter "it's easier" would be infuriating to anyone not familiar with metric units. Nothing is easier when it's new and strange.

DELUSION

The ease with which England converted to decimal currency from its awkward pound, shilling, pence system is frequently cited as evidence that metric switch-over would be a cinch. This conclusion is a delusion, because the principle of divesting was operable. It was a simple matter to take one's coins and bills to a bank on a certain day, get rid of it, and receive decimal currency in exchange. Since everyone else did the same thing, everyone was immediately in a decimal currency environment and within a day or so, everyone stopped grumbling about the new fangled money and began saying "Why didn't we do this years ago?" The same euphoria would not result in a metric change, for the 9x12 rugs, the electrical outlets, the cooking utensils and the myriad of inch-based products would still be there.

This presence of inch-based objects explains also why children exposed to metric units in the schools year after year never learn to "think" metric. As noted on page 34 of the metric study interim report "Education" "the children come to think of the metric system as the one to use when they are doing science and the (inch) system as the one to use for all their other activities." For this reason, any premature massive educational effort to eliminate all inch-based references (and even fractions as one educator stated!) would not be successful. Not until the inch-based units can be dropped from our everyday transactions, can a truly metric oriented educational program succeed.

Another area of misunderstanding relates to the practicality of measurement units. The inch based customary system developed along practical lines. As certain units become

obsolete, they were dropped. Mr. Blanton C. Wiggin, President of Advanced Instruments, Inc., has noted⁴ that "Perches, pottles, poles, puncheons, peppercorns, palms, packs, pokes, and pennyweights have passed from the scene." To denigrate our system as full of "barleycorn" is ridiculous. (Note: An inch at one time was defined as the length of "three barleycorns round and dry when laid together.") An inch is defined by law as exactly 2.54 centimeters and either can be made as accurate as instruments will allow. While the scientist in the laboratory may be ecstatic at the constancy of his dimensions, there being 9,192,631,770 cycles duration of Cesium 133 in one second, I think the run-of-the-mill citizen, the man or woman in the street, is satisfied that there are 60 seconds in one minute, 60 minutes to the hour, and so on.

OVERLOOKED

What is overlooked is the concept of measurement units as a set of tools, just as the mechanic has a variety of tools for specific purposes. The same is true for measurement units. When I drive 220 miles to New York City, I do not correlate the miles to its inch counterpart of 13.9×10^6 inches, I think of it as miles. I think of my dining room rug as 9×12 (feet) and am satisfied. Here again, illustrations are endless. To get rid of these tools for the sole reason that the new set has a decimal relationship doesn't add up, for the new set won't be used in normal living because of that relationship. Where a decimal relationship is desired in our current system, it is used. The decimalized inch is used in shop drawings and, as every housewife knows, the weighing scales at the market show the decimalized pound on the meat she purchases.

On the other hand, the metric units have their flaws too. While the centimeter would certainly prove to be a useful day-to-day measurement tool in the home, there is no handy metric counterpart to the foot. The 30 centimeter ruler is within a quarter inch, and I suppose it would be given some easy name. The same problem exists for our gallon, there is no close metric unit of volume.

What this whole section boils down to is this: Will the man or woman in the street go along with the change? I believe that when the housewife, mechanic, trades people, service people, i.e., over 98% of the citizens, realize what the metric switch will mean to their routine way of life in the kitchen, the grocery store, department store, service shop, and the rest—a slow burn will develop which will grow in intensity when they realize they will be stuck with two systems of measurement for years upon years, and, more infuriating, it has been thrust upon them by a bureaucracy which seems to be insensitive to their feelings. After all, from their point of view, there is no apparent advantage and many obvious disadvantages—and the system is being forced on them. They haven't objected to the inch-pound system, they see nothing wrong with it, they have no objection to manufacturers using metric but why bother them with the change?

I would not want to be a politician facing millions of citizens with their hackles up clamoring for a reversal of any decision to metricate particularly if industry was well down the road to conversion. Nor would I want to face the unions representing the million or so laborers who realize that their jobs have disappeared through the massive flood of imports as a result of the "coordinated national program."

THE U.S. METRIC STUDY

Following the submittal of the final metric study report and at the urging of my friends, I undertook to write a critique of that study,

but I soon dropped that project for I concluded the study was too contrived. Now that the horses are at the starting gate and the signal to stampede is about to be given, I must speak out.

I agree with Mr. Hannigan, Director of Research and Development of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers that the study was unable "to identify any major advantages . . . and the glaring lack of information regarding its impact on a trillion dollar economy."⁴ I have tried to fill in a few thoughts on that score. He also found the study "too narrow," I agree. "It is blatantly biased in favor of the conversion." This was no surprise, human nature being as it is. The NBS position was known when the study was placed there! "The recommendation to let the costs of conversion lie where they fall" will impose extreme hardship on those individual firms and organizations least able to afford them." True. Even before I had read his comments, I had submitted a paper to the House Small Business Committee describing this problem in some detail.

The best written part of the entire metric study was by A. G. McNish on pages ix through xxiv, Preface of the interim report "The Manufacturing Study" titled "Critique on Metrication Cost Estimates in Manufacturing." The critique is illuminating, thorough, and to the point. What is more illuminating is that the critique was necessary to begin with. In effect it is saying, "The cost study data are no good and should be discounted." I regret that my prediction that this would happen came true when higher authority changed the groundrules midstream, but I am amazed that a Government agency would go on public record in this fashion!

The charts on pages 100-101 of the final report will undoubtedly become a landmark in deception and the rationale behind them a classic in obfuscation. They are strictly gossamer—lines based on unsubstantiated facts drawn to support a predetermined conclusion. Mr. William D. Rinehart of the American Newspaper Publishers Association Research Institute must have sensed this when he stated, "The National Bureau of Standards has conducted a series of surveys to arrive at the statistics that are now being bantered about in an attempt to convince people that forced metric adoption is inevitable" and "The National Bureau of Standards chooses to ignore the facts in order to draw graphs to convince Congress that the American public, labor, and business are clamoring for forced metric." He really hit the mark with that shot!

The notion that going metric is "inevitable" as a reason for doing so needs to be examined. This prediction has been made for 200 years now, and it is as true (or untrue) now as it has been all along. I do not hold we should take the lead by following everybody else unless it is to our advantage to do so. Since it is not to our advantage, we should let nature take its course. After all, we became the world's mightiest technological nation and will continue to be if we stick with a winner. Even if it could be proven that going metric was inevitable, it would not justify the large bureaucratic empire which a "coordinated national program" would necessitate. (I am convinced that is really what is behind this whole maneuver.) After all, death is inevitable and that certainly does not justify a "coordinated national program of genocide."

I remember one metric enthusiast who argued that we should at least try metric conversion, and if it didn't work, we could always go back to the old system. This is the type of bureaucratic elitist who would be in charge of tampering with the most complex and sensitive technological society the world has ever known—willing to play Russian Roulette with our economy! The business community better wake up and

take a good look at what is going on here before it is too late.

The decision to commit the NBS to the three year metric study has proved to be a great disservice to that prestigious organization. The NBS is the world's peer in matters relating to weights and measures and standards and has a most talented cadre of physicists and scientists dedicated to that end. It is regrettable that the NBS charted courses into fields for which it was ill equipped and by employing questionable tactics may have sullied its worldwide reputation. The metric problem is primarily an economic and social one with the standards question but one, albeit important, part of the total picture.

A METRIC AMERICA?

For over a decade the NBS and responsible industrial elements have been urging the Government to support U.S. participating in international standard making activities. This is something which should have been done long ago and the current Congressional bill to do so should be passed forthwith. The NBS interim report on *International Standards* and its companion *Engineering Standards* provide excellent and detailed material on this vital but complex subject. The problem is not a metric matter but one of national self-interest. We need to participate for the selfish reason of encouraging continued use and further worldwide acceptance of those inch-based standards which are internationally recognized as the best in the world; the unified inch thread for one and many others.

Conclusion #3, p. 2 of the *International Standards* report notes:

"If the U.S. wishes to see the maximum amount of its engineering practices and standards included in the coming international standards, it must, without delay, take steps for adequate and effective participation in international standards negotiations."

This conclusion ties in with my observation that the multi-national movement with its overseas inch-based plant is the best insurance we have to keep a lead in technology and in world markets. I believe that the thread in conclusion #3 should have been pursued for this reason. This would have been consistent, also, with one of the mandates of the original act "to study the feasibility of retaining and promoting by international use of dimensional and other engineering standards based on the customary measurement units of the United States." Congress should get on with it.

So far as the texture of our society is concerned (in the measurement sense) the situation for many years will be about as it is now—with a slow evolutionary increase in metric measurement use. The analogy of a bilingual language to illustrate this is in order. Technological societies all over the world have come to recognize the English language as vital to them. Accordingly, English is taught in the schools in Japan, Germany, and the rest. This does not mean that the German language nor the Japanese language is discarded. Nor does it mean that all Germans or all Japanese speak or even understand English. They have been exposed to it and, in their livelihood the use of English is necessary, they have a ready foundation to quickly build on and succeed in their endeavor. That segment of population is truly bilingual. Yet when they return to their homes or shop, they have no obstruction in thinking and communicating in their native tongue.

The same is true in the U.S. with respect to metrics. Metric measures are taught in the elementary schools which is as it should be. (Where it is not taught, it should be instituted at once.) This provides a foundation for building a metric facility if it is necessary in connection with one's livelihood—the chemist, scientist, and technicians in those

⁴ Congressional Digest, December 1971, "Should the United States Adopt the Metric System?—Pro and Con."

industries working with metric units. (These incidentally, represent less than 10% of most working forces in those industries.) All of them have a facility and expertise in "thinking" metric on the job which poses no problem once the initial period of adjustment is made. In the measurement context, they are bilingual. It is understandable that they are enthusiastic about the metric system, it is so much easier and useful so far as their livelihood is concerned. These same scientists, immersed in metric all day, have absolutely no block in stopping at the store on the way home to buy a pound of meat, a quart of milk, or perhaps several yards of cloth. The facility of metric usage on the job is not a persuasive enough justification to justify the trauma which would ensue if an attempt to force it on society in the home and in the market place.

If, despite all the arguments brought to bear against it, Congress should decide to take the plunge, it should place any responsibility for carrying out its mandate in a separate entity—whether it be a Commission, Agency, or whatever—and that entity would draw upon the recognized and established Government arms—Department of Defense for military, NBS for standards, and so forth—for whatever is needed to accomplish its mission. However, as for the basic question "A Metric America?" when the facts are in and evaluated, there can be but one conclusion, "This is a decision whose time has not come!"

THE EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR—
DR. WILLIAM LEE SMITH

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1972, Dr. William Lee Smith will be honored by the Phi Delta Kappa Chapter of Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. The occasion will be a dinner to present the Educator of the Year Award. Following the dinner, the gathering will hear statements by Dr. Louis A. Toepfer, president of the university; Dr. Paul W. Briggs, superintendent of the Cleveland Public Schools; and Prof. Dean F. Berkley of Indiana University.

I cannot think of anyone who deserves this important recognition and tribute more than Dr. Smith.

A former Cleveland, he has served as Associate Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare since March 1971.

As Associate Commissioner of Education, Dr. Smith has had to formulate national policy in the field of educational personnel development. He is also responsible for programs to improve the quality of teaching in this country and to broaden training and retraining programs for teachers.

Dr. Smith was born in Boston. One of his earliest educational experiences was as a social group worker in a settlement house. He later became a social studies teacher and vocational placement counselor in a technical high school. Following that, he served as principal of the largest junior high school in Cleveland, Ohio. He then became the executive director of the PACE Association, an organization designed to encourage inno-

vative techniques in the Cleveland Public Schools. In 1969, he joined the U.S. Office of Education here in Washington, D.C., where he has been ever since.

Dr. Smith is an energetic and extremely capable man who, during the time of his residence in Cleveland, made a substantial contribution to the city. He has always been tirelessly devoted to improving the lives of urban residents. Among the capacities in which he served in his spare time, he was chairman of the education subcommittee of the Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunities; a member of the advisory committee on consortia for the Greater Cleveland Commission on Higher Education; member of the Cleveland executive board of the Boy Scouts of America; chairman of the curriculum review and evaluation committee of the Cleveland public schools; a member of the board of trustees of the Urban Community School; a member of the mental retardation committee of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland; and member of the NAACP and the Urban League. He also served as president-elect of the Greater Cleveland Schoolmaster's Club.

Bill Smith is, without question, the educator of the year. I urge my colleagues to join me today in congratulating and thanking a man who has given of his time and energy to insure that all American children receive the finest educations possible.

THANK YOU, KENNETH CHARD—
YOU RESTORETH THE FAITH

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article which appeared in the Keene Evening Sentinel of Keene, N.H., on February 29, 1972. I have always felt that the good in the younger generation far outweighs the bad, but good deeds are frequently done with modesty and little publicity. It is indeed heartwarming to see at least one good deed recognized.

The article follows:

FAITH RESTORED

This is a story about how one man learned that, images to the contrary, there are quite a few good young people in this world.

Hartford Times columnist Bill Ryan and his family were attempting passage on Route 12 between Keene and Troy during the great snow of two Saturdays ago.

When one of his snowtires developed a bubble that threatened to burst and strand the Ryans in drifting snow, he pulled into a tiny filling station.

The one attendant was a young man who seemed to have more than he could handle among the several motorists seeking aid and refuge.

Ryan, not wishing to add to the attendant's chores, hesitated to ask if he could change the tire. Perhaps it would hold up. But probably it wouldn't, so he asked, and the young man said, "Oh, sure."

"Between the other emergencies, he changed the tire," Ryan wrote last week in his column. "You could hardly see him while

he was doing it because he was covered with snow and the snow was drifting all over the car."

The attendant finished his task and in the process suggested that he make reservations for the Ryans at a nearby motel where they could wait out the storm. This he did, then filled Ryan's gas tank. The bill was \$5.20.

"How about the tire?" Ryan asked.

"Oh, that's all right," the attendant said. "Everybody should do some good deeds once in a while."

Two long, long miles later, the Ryans reached their motel.

"When we got there I started to think," Ryan wrote later. "The kid had said he was a sophomore at Keene State College, and that he only worked weekends at the gas station, from six in the morning to ten at night. I called New Hampshire when I got back to Hartford and got his name, something I had forgotten in the rather hectic day of Saturday."

"His name is Kenneth Chard. Thank you, Kenneth Chard. You restoreth the faith."

WILLIAM B. PAPE

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Connecticut have lost a great journalistic crusader. Indeed, we have lost a man of complete integrity and towering stature—our beloved friend, William B. Pape, the publisher of the Waterbury Republican and the Waterbury American, who passed away on March 4.

Bill Pape, who continued the family tradition of publishing excellence handed down by his father, was a dedicated and devoted servant of the people, as well as a diligent and effective proponent of accurate, honest news reporting.

The coverage of his newspapers extends far and wide. They are widely read and well respected throughout my sixth district, as well as in the Waterbury area.

A man of many interests and countless friends and admirers, Bill will long be remembered and sorely missed. For the interest of my colleagues, both an editorial and article about this remarkable man which appeared in the March 4 issue of the Waterbury Republican follows:

WILLIAM B. PAPE

If it is possible to sum up the life of William B. Pape, publisher and editor of these newspapers, in a single sentence, it would have to be: He had complete integrity.

He rarely used the word in connection with the operation of the newspapers, but his every suggestion, his every deed was governed with that in mind. He wanted his newspapers to present the news as honestly and fairly as possible.

Mr. Pape published a family newspaper and he wanted everyone on the staff to keep that in mind at all times. No newspaper can avoid publication of material that some will consider offensive at some time, but he did not want sensationalism to be the justification for a news judgment.

He refused to publish many types of advertising that can be seen in newspapers of great prominence daily, either because he did not feel they were in good taste or be-

cause they were misleading. Even though his introduction into the newspaper field came during a time when personal invective was common place on editorial pages, he preferred critical comment which avoided the sharp personal attack.

Mr. Pape ardently followed the policy established by his father, the late William J. Pape, in fighting for good government. He vigorously backed the Waterbury Taxpayers Association which served as a watchdog on city government and was most unhappy when it was absorbed by the Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce. Only recently as the Chamber has become more vigilant in working for efficient local government did he relent in his opinion.

He insisted that every man should have an opportunity to have news items published. He felt that the extremist would eventually lose public support because of exposure.

Throughout his lifetime he fought secrecy in government. He felt the federal government overclassified documents with no justification for so doing. On the local level, he urged court action if all else failed in revealing to the public the business of government. He felt secrecy was used to hide wrongdoing or would, if permitted unabated, encourage wrongdoing.

He did not restrict his governmental concern to writing editorials or having them written. He personally attended meetings and voiced his opinion on the need for improvements.

Editorial objections to some governmental actions on occasions brought criticism that the paper was un-American. With great pride he would write the critic that he was a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. But he never let his pride in his country be a veil to cover up improper actions by officials.

During the past few years when he devoted almost all of his time to the newspapers and less to some of his other business interests, he took particular delight in sitting in on the daily editorial conferences at which policy was established. Only the most urgent of outside business would get him to skip these meetings.

One of his rigid policies was that every column and letter on the editorial pages had to be signed. No pseudonyms were permitted. The only exception involved the editorials. He opposed legislation which would require that editorials be signed with the explanation that they are the opinion of the publishers and not any individual editorial writer. A statement to that effect is carried at the top of this editorial page daily.

Aside from honesty and efficiency in government, one of his favorite topics involved the railroads. He deplored the decline in rail service. While he acknowledged the inefficiencies in newspaper production in the old railroad station because of the design of the building, he never regretted its purchase and the salvation of the structure, including its tower, as a landmark.

Mr. Pape never sought the limelight. He suggested that others pose for pictures and stepped aside as frequently as possible. He insisted that the Pape family be given no special consideration.

He was always concerned with accuracy. He went far beyond the obvious—the headlines and major news stories—to the two and three-line “filler” items which set forth statistics he felt could not possibly be accurate. He was never one to hide an error. If it was made, he wanted the correction prominently labelled.

Mr. Pape was distressed when the newspapers were late in being printed and insisted on detailed explanations of the cause. The failure of papers to be delivered also caused him concern.

His memory was uncanny. He could recall persons, places and events, particularly in Waterbury history, that amazed everyone. Staff writers would often question him if

they were unable to find the necessary background in the files. It was rare when he could not produce the information needed.

Most of all, Mr. Pape was a gentleman. His dealings with everyone—employee, customer, salesman, friend, even political foe—were always conducted with the utmost of propriety.

The Pape family, his wide circle of friends, this city, and especially these newspapers will miss the gentlemanly example of integrity and humility which he set.

WILLIAM B. PAPE DIES; WATERBURY PUBLISHER (By Clark Johnston)

William Bolton Pape, 72, publisher of The Republican and The American, died shortly after midnight at Yale New Haven Hospital after a brief illness.

A quiet and kindly man, he was a forceful and outspoken publisher.

In recent months he had not been feeling well and stopped coming to work on Feb. 3. He entered Waterbury Hospital Feb. 22 and was transferred to Yale New Haven Hospital on Feb. 28.

Although hospitalized, Mr. Pape kept in touch with affairs of the newspapers and even drafted an agenda for the annual meeting of Eastern Color Printing Co. of which he was board chairman and assistant treasurer.

In June, 1968 Mr. Pape became seriously ill. The ailment was diagnosed as Rocky Mountain spotted fever, but he recovered and resumed his activities with undiminished vigor.

Mr. Pape became publisher following the death of his father, William J. Pape in 1961 and continued the tradition of crusading journalism which had been a hallmark of the paper.

A citation in memory of William J. Pape made by the New England Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi journalism society said Mr. Pape “held that the public doesn’t demand that a newspaper be right all the time, but it does expect that the newspaper will have guts.”

EDITORIAL GUIDE

The son concurred with the philosophy of the father and kept it as the editorial guide of The Republican and The American.

Mr. Pape’s presence was felt in local and state legislative councils where he appeared both as a newspaperman and a private citizen to support causes he believed were in the best interests of the people and to oppose vociferously those he felt were harmful to the public.

He battled at board meetings and in the courts to protect the right of the people to be fully informed on the public’s business.

Frequently he initiated or staunchly supported investigative reporting designed to keep public officials on the “straight and narrow.”

A broad-gauged individual intellectually, Mr. Pape did not confine his activities to publishing and civic affairs but had wide personal interests.

He was an avid and competent target shooter and had an interest in watches and clocks, wine, old railroads, and the history of Waterbury and the state.

Undoubtedly because of his long affection for and attachment to the Navy, he had an abiding interest, as a civilian, in ships of all kinds, particularly those of the older variety such as paddle and side wheelers and old steam launches.

He took what was to have been one of the last trips up the Mississippi on the Delta Queen before she was to be forced out of service a few years ago because of an inability to meet new safety regulations. However the ship got a reprieve from the government and still plies the waterways.

Mr. Pape was also interested in covered bridges and would try, on his infrequent va-

cations to zero in on an area that had many of them. He was also a collector of old prints, particularly maps, and had a house full of them including some stacked in the attic because there was no more available wall space for them in his home.

Although he relinquished some of his responsibilities at the newspapers and at The Eastern Color Printing Co. in the late 1960s, he did not slow down, but took on the title of editor of both papers and became even more intimately involved in the daily editorial production.

Mr. Pape was born July 21, 1899, in Passaic, N.J., son of the late Julia Bolton and William Jamieson Pape, who came from Passaic in 1901 as co-purchaser of The Republican.

It was the first step in the long career which saw the eventual purchase of The American and The Waterbury Democrat and the founding of The Eastern Color Printing Co., a firm which printed the first modern comic books.

ANNAPOLIS GRADUATE

Mr. Pape was graduated from Crosby High School in 1918 and the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., in 1922. He was commissioned an ensign and served at sea for five years when he resigned.

He joined the Naval Reserve in 1929 and was recalled to active service in 1941. When released from active duty he remained in the reserve and at the time of his death held the reserve rank of lieutenant-commander retired.

One minor but nagging aggravation during his active naval career irritated him each time he thought of it for the rest of his life—he was traded for a banjo player.

It wasn’t that he was anti-banjo players per se, it was just the circumstances under which the swap was made because it stymied his carefully laid plans to win back for the United States a Navy trophy cup won by a challenge team of Argentinians in the country to pick up a warship and sail it home.

When the Argentine Navy personnel arrived here to take possession of their ship, they immediately challenged the Navy to a shooting match. Surprised, the good sports in the Navy accepted but didn’t have time to round up a team of their crack shots and so they lost to the South American “ringers.”

Mr. Pape, at the time, was serving on a battleship which was ferrying Gen. John J. (Blackjack) Pershing on a good will tour of South America.

Feeling the United States ought to try to win back the trophy on the same terms the Argentinians had won it, Mr. Pape pulled a few strings with the Navy’s Bureau of Navigation and soon top Navy marksmen were suddenly assigned to sea duty on one specific battleship.

However, he didn’t count on the chaplain on the battleship shooting him down with a claim he needed a banjo player for the ship’s musical aggregation. The requisition was dutifully, and promptly, put through and as the man with the banjo—a classmate—was piped aboard, Mr. Pape was transferred to a destroyer so that the ship’s complement would be evened out.

His crackerjack crew of marksmen “ringers” were bereft of a leader and the anticipated challenge in Argentina never came off.

During World War II Mr. Pape traveled five days a week to Selective Service Headquarters in Hartford where he was in charge of the industrial deferment section, deciding who was needed on the home front for the war effort and who could be spared for active service.

Nightly after his return from Hartford, Mr. Pape would go to the color plant and review the day’s activities and he also spent Sundays there. It was recalled that he never missed a day.

The color firm, which began informally in the basement of the newspaper plant on Leavenworth St. in 1922, initially concen-

trated on printing newspaper supplements. The color plant was incorporated in 1928 and finally moved to its own building in 1939.

Mr. Pape and George Janosik, who was then head of the company's New York office, conceived the idea of collecting newspaper comics in booklet form and printing them in color.

They attempted vainly to sell the idea to Dell Publications which rejected the notion because there didn't appear to be much future in comic books, particularly as far as advertising was concerned.

START OF TREND

However, the two persisted and finally decided to try the scheme in Waterbury at Eastern Color, thus starting the modern comic book down the road to success and into history. The first was "Famous Funnies."

In 1931 Mr. Pape became a member of the headquarters staff of the Connecticut Naval Militia. A crack rifle shot, he often served as a member of the naval militia team representing Connecticut in many rifle matches.

He also served as coach of the Crosby High School rifle team from 1928 to 1941, leading that group to state championships.

In 1965 Mr. Pape received a 35-year medal of the Governor's Foot Guard at special ceremonies at Camp Dempsey, Niantic. He had been on the staff of the Second Co., Governor's Foot Guard and served as a rifle team captain. He had been in charge of rifle training among the Foot Guardsmen.

He held his Naval reserve commission for 43 years, 14 of which were on active duty. He was a member of Cpl. Coyle Post, American Legion continuously for over 40 years and was a member of the Military Order of World Wars, New Haven chapter, and of the Naval Order of the United States, New York Commandery, both for over a quarter of a century.

He was for six years naval aide on the staff of Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin and a member for 45 years of the Second Company, Governor's Foot Guard. He had also held a commission in the Connecticut Naval Militia and was a life member of the Retired Officers Association.

Over the years he was a familiar figure at the National Matches at Camp Perry in Ohio and he participated in many matches at the Regiment Armory in New York.

His deep involvement in shooting on the unpaid amateur but professionally skilled level was reflected in an editorial position defending the right of the people to bear arms and his opposition to legislation which he felt unduly intruded on the public's constitutional guarantees in this area.

RETURNS TO CITY

After his active military service in the 1920s, Mr. Pape returned to Waterbury and to The Republican and The American.

Following an apprenticeship in all departments in the newsrooms of the papers, Mr. Pape became an administrative head of The Eastern Color Printing Co. to which he devoted much of his time for many years.

However, during the late 1930s he temporarily moved back into the news field, actively participating as a reporter and strategist in his father's investigations of the Democratic regime in City Hall headed by the late Mayor T. Frank Hayes.

His knowledge of mathematics in general, and financial operations in particular, was invaluable in the probe as he personally checked municipal books and ledgers for discrepancies which would be immediately apparent only to someone who knew what to look for.

He also understood things to which people could relate. Complex stories about the theft of millions didn't seem to stir the public much, but once in examining municipal ledgers he came across an item he felt would excite public interest.

The comptroller had charged cigars and

mineral water for political affairs to the city and the taxpayers were paying the bill for the comptroller's openhanded largesse. The public was decidedly not amused and began paying more attention to the newspapers' expose.

At times over the years of investigation which eventually led to the municipal conspiracy trial, other news executives despaired of finding the key which would unlock the closet of illegalities at City Hall.

But they were spurred on by Mr. Pape, who kept himself and others at the tiresome task of digging deep into the city's books.

Eventually the investigations resulted in the trial and conviction of the leaders of the conspiracy.

A by-product for The Republican and The American was the Pulitzer Prize, the coveted journalism award for responsible public service to the community. It was the first and only one awarded a Connecticut newspaper.

WAY WITH FIGURES

His way with figures showed up annually on election night. For years office clerks operating speedily on adding machines to bring forth as quickly as possible the election returns.

Mr. Pape accepted the machines but he didn't give them his unreserved trust. Every figure from every voting district for every candidate in a city, state or national election was personally checked by the publisher before it went into the newspapers.

He was concerned not only with the mechanical aspect of adding one plus one, since he also checked the cards from the polling stations to make sure the vote was logical.

If a vote for one or two candidates seemed lopsided, he had the reports rechecked to make sure there weren't errors in transposing figures in the count.

One year computers were brought into play but Mr. Pape used them only as a backstop. They were beaten in reporting the results by both the adding machines and by Mr. Pape, who still went over every result to make sure it was right.

The depths to which an unchecked and irresponsible government can sink were deeply impressed on Mr. Pape's consciousness.

He always, even with modern city and state government officials, kept in the back of his mind a bit of reserve which acknowledged the frailty of a man in high positions.

His knowledge of municipal affairs was specific and detailed. More than one reporter, innocent of what happened 20 or 30 years before, got a briefing on the ramifications, not apparent on the surface, which might lead to unpleasant possibilities.

NO INTERFERENCE

Reporters, always concerned that the boss upstairs may interfere with unfavorable items concerning friends of the publisher, never had a worry where Mr. Pape was concerned. The rule was: If it happens, report it regardless of whether the "boss" looks good or not.

A standing rule was that if a member of the Pape family ever got involved with the law, it should be printed.

The "Boss" was a victim of his own rule and followed through.

Once, while driving, he hit a parked car. There was no one around so he (1) left a note identifying himself as the culprit; (2) notified the police of the accident and (3) called the newspaper to make sure the story appeared in the paper.

It was not a grandstand play, for the rule applied always to himself and to any member of his family.

He frequently appeared at city board meetings, especially the sessions of the Board of Aldermen, most often while he lived in Waterbury on Farmington Ave. but also occasionally after he moved to Woodbury.

Normally, he identified himself as "W. B. Pape, printer," or when he lived here as "voter," and after he moved to Woodbury, as "taxpayer."

The aldermen didn't need a clue to the fact he ran the city's papers, but neither did he feel it necessary to try to impress them with his position.

"LIKE IT IS"

He said his piece. If someone argued with him, attacked him or tried to make his position uncomfortable, the reporter heard it and printed it "like it is."

Mr. Pape, as a news subject, never told a reporter how to write the story. Regardless of whether the story made him look good or embarrassed him, the report was to be factual and every reporter knew that if he tried to soften a criticism he would hear about it.

Some of Mr. Pape's political enemies knew the prime way to get their point of view across was to try to link him with the opposition. They knew an attack on him would be printed.

On one occasion, Mr. Pape, some days after a story appeared, remarked ruefully to the reporter who wrote it that his wife had seriously recommended he temper his remarks in the future and get home a little earlier. There was no hint there should be any curbs on reporting and there was none.

In 1962, Mr. Pape, the guiding light of the Waterbury Taxpayers Association and the man who made editorial policy, concluded that Waterbury ought to have civil service. The battle was on and it was bitter.

CLASHES WITH BERGIN

The late Mayor Edward D. Bergin, an articulate opponent of civil service, was in office. The relationship between Mr. Pape and Mr. Bergin was anomalous. They respected each other but were unable to agree on almost anything.

Both dedicated, one a complete politician who believed the political way is the only practical way to run a government; the other, remembering the turbulent days of the 1930s, had a natural suspicion of politicians.

It was inevitable that the two strong-minded men would clash—and this they did time and again.

While Mr. Pape, charged into the battle supporting civil service, Mr. Bergin fought it with equal vigor. Mr. Pape made it plain that his opponent was to have his say fully and fairly.

One reporter was assigned to report in extensive detail Mr. Bergin's objections to civil service, primarily the attacks on the papers and Mr. Pape. The order was that the assaults would be reported in full so that the readers would have every opportunity to digest the arguments of both sides.

Neither Mr. Pape nor Mr. Bergin lost his perspective during the running fight. An ambitious campaign button printer sent to Mr. Pape a sample button which could be worn advocating civil service—or anything else for that matter.

It was a round yellow button with the word "yes" on it. To prove his impartiality, the manufacturer also sent the publisher an equal number of round yellow buttons with the word "no" on them.

GIVES BERGIN BUTTONS

Mr. Pape declined the commercial, chuckled and distributed the "yes" buttons to his backers. He then sent Mr. Bergin the same number of "no" buttons so the then mayor would have "equal time" on people's lapels. Mr. Bergin cheerfully and openly acknowledged his opponent's gesture.

Civil service as a governmental way of life won. Mr. Bergin was defeated but the relationship continued. It was an uneasy truce between two men who liked each other, found themselves on opposite sides of a philosophical fence and never could discover a way to establish a working entente cordiale.

Each felt he had the measure of the other,

each was sure he knew what made the other tick, but they never melted their information into a working relationship.

This was not unique. Time and again well meaning state legislators, local aldermen, police commissioners, members of the Board of Public Works and the City Plan Commission faced formidable opposition from the publisher.

Mr. Pape had several things going for him when he met a hostile audience, particularly of legislators. He had collected his facts and he was usually imperturbable.

Those trying to throw him off stride had difficulty because he could overlook the cutting remark designed to demolish him; he was convinced he was standing on principle and thus couldn't be shaken in that direction and, finally, he was hard of hearing and missed the thrust of some of the rebuttals.

RESPECTED BY REPORTERS

Reporters had a deep respect and affection for him because he always refused to disown a story that might embarrass his friends. A specific reporter, or the staff in general, might get a note that things weren't going right and that a more careful assessment was in order. But he would never publicly downgrade a story or a reporter.

Mr. Pape was always willing to defend the public even when the public itself wasn't aware its rights were in jeopardy and needed defending.

Any time public officials tried to conceal their activities, hide the minutes of their meetings, or close records to reporters, Mr. Pape was willing to go to court.

The newspapers went to court to pry open the minutes of the Torrington Board of Education in 1950; to force disclosures from the Thomaston Sewer Commission in 1968; to defend the right of a student reporter to look at the police blotter in Waterbury and to demand, through Eastern Color, a revaluation of the city which the politicians had ducked for years.

Whether the actions were taken in the corporate name of the newspapers or on behalf of The Eastern Color Printing Co., Mr. Pape was the man who ordered the litigation and assumed responsibility for the results.

His presence was felt both physically and through the editorial columns of the paper. He was a familiar figure on the downtown streets.

If it was possible to walk to a destination, Mr. Pape did, and this habit made him available to anyone who wanted to stop him on the streets with a complaint, a compliment or a news item.

Mr. Pape was nothing if not meticulous in the operation of both the newspapers and the printing plant and he checked almost everything from workmen's compensation reports and telephone bills to the massive complex presses which spewed the millions of pages of color supplements, comic books, catalogues and other materials.

UNDERSTOOD MACHINERY

It was widely felt at Eastern Color that although he was not trained in the field, his understanding of the machinery was as detailed as that of the experts whom he hired to keep the presses running smoothly.

One who watched him over the years said he was "clever in searching out mechanical problems" and finding solutions.

Although it was his father who initiated a pension system for employees, it was Mr. Pape who worked his way through the complex insurance structure involved to produce the package eventually adopted in 1943 for employees.

In the 1950s when William J. Pape reduced his working schedule at The Republican and The American, William B. Pape began spending more time at the papers and less at the color printing company.

Long assistant publisher of the two newspapers, Mr. Pape formally became publisher following his father's death. Later his son, William J. Pape, II, became active in the papers' business affairs and was elected assistant publisher.

The elder Pape relinquished the presidency of the Eastern Color Printing Co. in February, 1968, to his son, Richard J. Pape. Mr. Pape then became chairman of the board and assistant treasurer of the company.

He was putting younger members of the family into positions of responsibility which he had held for many years.

BOUGHT RAILROAD STATION

Acquisition of the Railroad Station on Meadow Street as a plant for the newspapers was a source of pride and satisfaction to him. He and his father were in complete agreement that the Waterbury landmark ought to be preserved.

When the then New Haven Railroad announced it was going to sell the station the Papes feared a buyer might deface, downgrade or destroy the station and its famous tower, and they immediately stepped in to purchase it.

The failure of the tower clock to work properly annoyed him and the silence of the bell caused him further distress. He had the clock faces, hand mechanism and bell striker replaced in 1963 and went further to have the tower illuminated so it can be seen from many points in the city. It is clearly visible on the darkest night from the highway interchange.

A complete railroad buff, Mr. Pape participated in special railroad events, invited fellow fans to climb the tower and possessed a collection of old railroad schedules that would make any aficionado envious.

He was one of the founders of the Waterbury Taxpayers Association and remained its secretary from 1947 until it was absorbed into the Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce.

The association served as a watchdog on state and municipal government with a full-time professional director knowledgeable in governmental finance who attended board meetings, criticized city and state actions and made recommendations to the association for improvements in government.

Basically, it was an outgrowth of the scandals of the 1930s and it showed the concern Mr. Pape and other civic leaders had in municipal affairs.

WIDE INTERESTS

There were few areas of the way of life of Waterburians where Mr. Pape failed to make his presence known from the Republican Party to the Young Men's Christian Association and the Eastern States Exposition.

He was a member of the Waterbury Hospital Corp., a trustee and director of the YMCA and former chairman of the "Y" board and served on various committees, acting as chairman of the insurance, executive and finance committees.

The Community Workshop, Inc., was of concern to him and at the time of his death he was its secretary. He served as trustee of the Eastern States Exposition, director of the Waterbury National Bank, Waterbury Savings Bank, the Greater Waterbury Industrial Development Corp. and was a member of the Industrial Development Committee of the Chamber. He was a life member of the National Rifle Association.

Education was a special interest. He served as a member of the board of managers of Waterbury Higher Education, Inc., and the mayor's Educational Advisory Committee and trustee of Post Junior College.

His journalistic professional activities included the secretaryship of the Audit Committee of The Associated Press and membership on the Traffic Committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

He was also a member of the Connecticut Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, a journalism society.

He was a familiar figure at conventions of professional newspaper associations and meetings of the Associated Press and United Press International in Connecticut, the region and nationally.

Corporate responsibilities included the presidency of American-Republican, Inc., chairman of the board of Eastern Color Printing Co., vice-president of Paper Delivery, Inc., and Waterbury Motor Lease, Inc.

As a youth he had a newspaper route, but one winter he transferred it to his two younger brothers to take over a furnace route from the owner who wanted to take a Florida vacation. In those days, when furnaces were coal-fired, it was the custom to have someone come in daily to keep them properly stoked.

He was one of the founders of The Chase Building, Inc., the firm which bought the structure across Grand St. from City Hall from the Chase Brass & Copper Co. when the latter moved its executive offices to Cleveland, Ohio.

SOLD STRUCTURE

The firm rented space commercially and eventually sold the structure to the city to serve as an annex to City Hall. The mayor's office and others were moved to the annex to make room for the expanding Circuit Court in the old City Hall.

Survivors include his widow, the former Helen Cronan, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Patrick J. Cronan; three children, Mrs. Charles E. Poindexter, the former Brenda Pape; two sons, William J. Pape II, who is married to the former Patricia Moran, and Richard J. Pape, who is married to the former Cherie Moran; a brother, Brig. Gen. Robin B. Pape, USA (ret), Silver Spring, Md.; a sister, Mrs. Wilder J. Greeley, the former Benita Pape, and five grandchildren.

A third son, Roger, died in a boating accident in 1960 near the family's summer cottage in Madison.

A TRIBUTE TO YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, because I was out of the city during the early part of last month, I was unable at that time to join with my many colleagues in a special tribute to the international teenage student exchange program, Youth for Understanding—the largest and fastest growing organization of this kind. YFU is also one of the three teenage exchange programs officially recognized by the State Department.

This program was instituted by Mrs. Rachel Andresen in 1951 on a very limited scale between the United States and Germany since, as Mrs. Andresen very wisely and accurately surmised, the German youth of the post-Hitler era needed a new perspective which could be meaningfully and effectively enhanced by a stay of approximately 1 year with an American family.

Since those early years, students now enjoy these broad cultural and sociological experiences in exchange with 44 countries from Argentina to Yugoslavia. There are currently 3,500 foreign students and 2,500 American students in-

volved each year in these countries. Summer programs are also in operation, extending the opportunity to a substantial number of young people for a shorter period of time.

The personal contact and close association provided by these exchanges play an extremely important role in furthering international understanding and goodwill. For this reason and because of the additional positive results this program is capable of yielding, I believe YFU deserves the commendation and continued support of both the Congress and the American people.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION I: THE INEQUITIES OF THE PHASE II RENT GUIDELINES

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, since phase II began in mid-November 1971, a confused Price Commission has issued at least three sets of guidelines for rent increases. Each of these was imperfectly drawn, but the final guidelines issued on December 30, 1971, contain a glaring loophole which makes a mockery of any claims to equity and effectiveness by the economic stabilization bureaucracy.

Specifically, the December 30 guidelines permit landlords, when leases are being signed or renewed, to raise rents by a percentage equal to rent increases imposed just before the wage/price freeze of August 15, 1971, was announced. Thus, if a landlord increased a single tenant's rent by 30 percent on August 1, he is perfectly free to raise all others by that amount as their leases come up for renewal. The impact of the rent guidelines then, is to reward landlords who imposed inflationary rent increases last summer, while subjecting thousands who rent their homes or apartments to rent hikes of 20, 30, 40 or more percent.

The Price Commission, which takes care that applications for price increases by huge corporations are expeditiously handled and approved, has made no move to remedy the gross inequities of its rent guidelines. The legitimate needs of thousands of individual American wage earners are shunted aside so that the stabilization bureaucracy may make phase II as smooth as possible for big business.

Last week, a number of us in the House sent a letter to the Chairman of the Price Commission, protesting the glaring loopholes in the rent regulations and urging a totally new set of guidelines. We believe that no rent raises except those "occasioned by real estate tax increases" be allowed and that "this ban should be retroactive to November 15." I urge those of my colleagues who did not join in signing this letter to add their voices to the call for immediate reform of the Price Commission's rent guidelines.

Finally, I include at this point in the RECORD, the press release containing the full text of our letter to Chairman Grayson of the Price Commission:

CONGRESSMEN URGE PHASE II BAN ON RENT INCREASES

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 3, 1972.—A bipartisan group of Congressmen representing different sections of the nation have called upon the Price Commission to ban all rent increases retroactively to November 15 with the exception of those made necessary by real estate tax increases.

In a letter to Price Commission Chairman C. Jackson Grayson, the Congressmen said that they are opposed to the "glaring and unjustified loophole in the Price Commission's regulations on rents which allow a landlord to increase rents by 20, 30, or even 40 percent." The Congressmen charged that the regulations perpetuate inflationary rent increases that were taking place before the Phase I freeze on wages and prices.

The following is the text of the letter:

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAYSON: We are writing to express our concern over what we consider to be a glaring and unjustified loophole in the Price Commission's regulations on rents which allow a landlord to increase rents by 20, 30, or even 40 per cent.

The "average transaction" rule promulgated by the Commission allows a landlord to use, as a basis for computing rent increases, the average rent increase transacted by him during the base period in 1971, the 30 day period immediately prior to the Phase I freeze on wages and prices. No matter how high or exorbitant this average increase may have been, the landlord is free to pass it on to his tenants under Phase II regulations. Beyond this, the regulations permit him to tack on an additional two and one-half per cent increase.

The fundamental problem with the "average transaction" rule is that it uses as a base period the time when inflation in this country was at its greatest. Rather than attempting to curb these high rates of rent increases, the regulations of the Price Commission have codified and institutionalized them. Certainly one of the most essential elements in determining the cost of living is what people have to pay to keep a roof over their heads. By allowing landlords to charge the same average increases under Phase II as they did when there were no controls at all, the Price Commission is perpetuating inflation.

We propose that no rent increases be allowed under Phase II except those occasioned by real estate tax increases. This ban should be retroactive to November 15 to remedy the many inequitable rent increases that took place after the Phase I freeze and under the existing controls.

This Phase II ban would not only help to curb inflation, but it would also make administration of enforcement of the controls considerably easier.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. DOW,
Member of Congress.

COSIGNERS

Bella S. Abzug of New York.
Herman Badillo of New York.
James A. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts.
Shirley Chisholm of New York.
John Conyers, Jr., of Michigan.
Ronald V. Dellums of California.
Sam Gibbons of Florida.
Seymour Halpern of New York.
William D. Hathaway of Maine.
Henry Helstoski of New Jersey.
Edward I. Koch of New York.
Norman F. Lent of New York.
Harold D. Donohue of Massachusetts.
Mike McCormack of Washington.
William Moorhead of Pennsylvania.
John Murphy of New York.
Charles Rangel of New York.
Thomas Rees of California.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York.
William Ryan of New York.
James H. Scheuer of New York.
G. William Whitehurst of Virginia.

Lester L. Wolff of New York.
Jim Wright of Texas.
Jonathan Bingham of New York.
Dominick V. Daniels of New Jersey.
Those signing identical letters were:
Joshua Eilberg of Pennsylvania.
Jonathan Bingham of New York.
Bertram Podell of New York.
Harold Donohue of Massachusetts.
Arthur Link of North Dakota.
Dominick Daniels of New Jersey.
Charles Diggs of Michigan.

OPEN COURT—READING ACCOUNTABILITY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a problem which has plagued our public schools, and particularly the public schools in large urban areas, is the fact that children are not learning such fundamentals as reading, writing, history, and arithmetic.

In many instances, children are promoted from one grade to another regardless of their performance, a situation which has led to the call for "open universities," meaning universities in which those applying for admission are admitted regardless of their ability and training.

One plan which has had dramatic results in teaching children to read is that of the open court accountability plan. The first of its kind in the Nation, it will be extended to include the second grade beginning in September 1972. The guarantee coming with this plan is that schools using the open court program would be refunded 10 percent of the price of the program for each month below grade level at which the class was rated at the end of the school year.

Mr. Blouke Carus, president and publisher of open court, said:

We believe accountability is fundamentally sound; schools deserve to receive full value for funds spent on curriculum material.

Discussing this plan, Hope Justus of the Chicago Tribune noted that:

The program uses an intensive phonics approach to reading. Students first learn 43 sounds. They build these into words, then sentences, and on to paragraphs and little stories. The textural materials are not hard-cover readers, but colorful combination reader-work-booklets based on children's classics, folk tales, and poetry.

"One of the major differences," said Jerry Lebo, head of teacher training for the company, "is our method in which everything a child does he sees, he says, he hears, and he writes." Open court calls its offering a correlated language arts program, instead of just calling it a reading program.

Miss Justus notes that:

I found a surprising degree and unanimity of enthusiasm among teachers at all types of schools. Principals consistently reported generally rising if not spectacularly improved test scores.

A school system in which the teacher receives the same wages and advancement regardless of whether or not chil-

dren learn is one which provides no incentive for achievement. This program may be part of the answer to the failing educational standards in our inner cities.

I wish to share Miss Justus' article, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of December 17, 1971 with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 17, 1971]

ONE READING PROGRAM FOR ALL

(By Hope Justus)

If the people at Open Court Publishing Company in La Salle, Ill., have produced what they believe they have and are beginning to document, "Open Court" may soon become a household word among teachers and school board members.

Open Court has developed a reading program that works—with Spanish-speaking children, in inner city schools with high pupil turnover, in the schools of affluent suburbia, and in city schools with suburban settings.

Skeptical?

So was I. I am well aware of the cardinal saying of in-vogue reading thinking: No one approach to teaching reading is successful with every type of child.

THEY'RE TALKING NOW

But that is the kind of thinking which has led the Chicago public schools to employ nearly 50 different reading programs. That approach hasn't seemed wildly successful either, so I swallowed some of my skepticism and went to an Open Court briefing for the Chicago press and local educators.

"We didn't want to make a lot of noise until we felt sure about what we had," M. Blouke Carus, the company's publisher, said.

But after five years of development and four more years of evaluation, company officials are starting to trumpet.

The program uses an intensive phonics approach to reading. Students first learn 43 sounds. They build these into words, then sentences, and on to paragraphs and little stories. The textual materials are not hard-cover readers, but colorful combination reader-work-booklets based on children's classics, folk tales, and poetry.

So what's so different? Perhaps not all that much so far.

"But one of the major differences," said Jerry Lebo, head of teacher training for the company, "is our method in which everything a child does he sees, he says, he hears, and he writes."

Most programs, Lebo maintained, either teach these skills separately or postpone one—usually writing—for later development. This is why Open Court labels its offering a "correlated language arts program," instead of just calling it a reading program.

By introducing writing early, the program turns much of the child's own work into "text" materials. For example, what a child writes working independently may become his spelling and penmanship lesson for the day.

A PROGRAM FOR PLANNING

Another difference from many programs is that Open Court trains teachers to use the program before beginning in any school, provides additional training and discussion time after it has started, and sends its own consultants to observe classes and give follow through help.

The company has grown confident enough to offer a written guarantee of success with 1st and 2d grade materials. At the end of the school year, the company will refund 10 per cent of the program costs for each month below grade level at which a class using the materials is rated.

The school selects one of several nationally standardized tests evaluation before and after the course.

It was here that my skepticism shot up again. In what kind of schools were they operating? Under what conditions? A common fault with fancy performance contract arrangements is that they don't approximate the classroom realities under which the average teacher must work. They may, for example, specify attendance levels which must be maintained or exclude from the contract guarantee students who enter the program late.

But Open Court was different in this respect, too. Operating in all 50 states and several foreign countries, Open Court can cite several studies to document success in classrooms where English is a second language for many students—both in inner city and affluent schools.

What about pupil mobility? Would they make the guarantee to a school with, for example, 50 per cent pupil turnover in a year? "Yes, we are willing to absorb that," a company official said, unblinking.

NO REFUNDS YET

The company began offering the 1st grade guarantee in 1969 and so far has not given any refunds.

I went away impressed enough to want to do some checking with Chicago public schools using Open Court.

I found a surprising degree and unanimity of enthusiasm among teachers at all types of schools. Principals consistently reported generally rising if not spectacularly improved test scores.

When the customers sound as much like the company's public relations team as was the case here, something is happening that is worth watching.

PAROLE BOARD A STARTING PLACE FOR PRISON REFORM: COSPONSORS NEW LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the prisons of America offer a spectacle of complete despotism. In fact, our entire system of justice, from the police, through the courts, to prison and eventually parole, is testimony to our failure to render and mete out justice according to our own standards. Somewhere midst this enigma called the penal system, a beginning must be made to reform and restructure present institutions. The Federal Board of Parole, that puzzling anachronism, is as good as any place to start. Long ignored because of public ignorance and bureaucratic boredom, the Board of Parole has moved in mysterious ways while hiding under the cloak of secrecy and obscurity. As presently structured, eight men, with the assistance of a small group of examiners, are charged with deciding some 20,000 separate applications for parole each year. In the absence of specific guidelines, decisions are made arbitrarily and are absolute. Results are not published, and hearings are brief. Inmates must appear before the Board unrepresented by counsel and without the protective guard of the public eye. In short, the Board is the inmate's judge and jury.

The immense discretionary powers of the Board frequently permit it to overstep the boundaries of parole cases and to enter the political arena. Though in fact a part of the judicial procedure, the

Board can also be viewed as exercising the kind of power which causes it to be considered a part of the executive branch. A flagrant example of its political behavior occurred when for a while parole was uniformly denied to war resisters. Because of the administration's hostility to the resisters, the Board denied them parole while routinely granting it to others guilty of serious crimes of violence. This is the Board's real power and its potential danger to justice.

Though long concealed in the shadowy recess of the Federal bureaucracy, the workings of the Board recently came to light when 20 inmates instituted a class action suit demanding certain due process measures in the parole procedure. Congress itself has begun to take interest in the issue of penal reform. A House Judiciary Subcommittee is presently hearing testimony on the arbitrary and unconstitutional practices of the Board. The bill presently before it, H.R. 13118, which was introduced by the subcommittee chairman ROBERT KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin and cosponsored by myself and Representatives RYAN and MIKVA, would correct many of these unfair practices. It would establish an independent Board of Parole, separate from the Justice Department. It would provide for fair and equitable Federal parole procedures. The burden for a prisoner's release would be shifted from his shoulders to the Parole Board which would be required to release him on finding in favor of parole. Present law permits denial of parole even after a favorable decision. The bill also sets out factors which the Board must consider in determining whether to release a prisoner; present law has no such comparable provision. If parole is denied, the Board will have to give good and particular reasons for doing so.

Other previously omitted procedural requirements are written into the bill: a time schedule is set for hearings, the right to counsel is guaranteed, and materials used by the Board must be made available. Finally, the bill would establish a National Parole Institute, and provide assistance to the States for the operation of fair and adequately staffed parole systems. While such legislation is certainly a beginning, it is only a small, first step on the path to comprehensive penal reform.

Beyond the level of administrative procedure, the fundamental obstacles of class and race compound what is already a very complex problem—rehabilitating convicted felons. The present system has shown little success in reducing the rate of recidivism. Sweeping reforms must be instituted to synchronize the workings of corrections and parole, making their goal—rehabilitation of inmates—take on real meaning. Too often rehabilitation is a meaningless term regarded cynically by those who are supposed to bring about rehabilitation.

More direct routes must be found for involving the community as well as parole officers in prisoner rehabilitation and return to society. Use of extensive counseling services, half-way houses, and former inmate self-help organizations could substantially reduce the frustrations and sense of alienation which

former convicts experience after leaving prison.

The House hearings on parole have brought home the stark realization that penal reform must be coupled with reforms of the broader society in which we live. Race, class, and poverty must be fought along with prison problems, for they are the conditions which create crippling environments and pave the path to prison.

ROGERS INTRODUCES HEART, LUNG, BLOOD BILL

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to increase and coordinate our national resources in an accelerated effort to attack the Nation's No. 1 killer—heart disease.

This legislation also puts a priority on solving the problems related to lung and blood and their related diseases and I am confident that this legislation will bring about a significant reduction in death and illness from these diseases.

I am pleased to note that eight members of the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment have joined with me and that Senator KENNEDY has 13 of his colleagues supporting a similar bill in the Senate. Joining with me are Mr. SATTERFIELD of Virginia; Mr. KYROS of Maine; Mr. PREYER of North Carolina; Mr. SYMINGTON of Missouri; Mr. ROY of Kansas; Mr. NELSEN of Minnesota; Mr. CARTER of Kentucky; and Mr. HASTINGS of New York.

Unlike cancer, we can predict and prevent heart attacks and strokes in many cases. If this legislation is fully implemented, I feel confident that we can substantially reduce heart disease as the Nation's No. 1 killer within the decade and great progress can be made in the 5 to 7 years after its implementation.

I will not go so far as to predict a cure for cardiovascular disease, for we are not that far. But I am extremely heartened by the progress that has been made in this area by the National Heart and Lung Institute.

More than 1.2 million Americans suffer heart attacks each year, of which more than 500,000 die. And more than 200,000 Americans die of stroke each year.

The work which we have already done in the area of predictability and prevention indicates that if the provisions of the bill are established, we can reduce these statistics by as much as 30 percent within 5 to 7 years and by the end of the decade, some experts forecast reductions anywhere from 30 to 80 percent.

Taking even the most conservative estimate, you can see that this would have a tremendous effect on one of our greatest health problems.

The greatest fault thus far has been a lack of funding, manpower and priority. I think this legislation will remedy all three of these deficiencies.

CXVIII—499—Part 6

The bill provides for increased funding from the present level of \$232 million for this year, to \$1.2 billion over the next 3 years. At a minimum, an increase in manpower of more than 100 is vitally needed to boost the manpower National Heart and Lung Institute to 700.

The manpower situation in the lung and blood division is appalling. Emphysema is the fasting growing killer in the land. Yet the lung division had only one senior doctor before January of this year. Now there are only three. Most divisions should be staffed by about 40 people. And in the blood division we have only one senior staffer and only four other employees.

We have about \$21 million for lung and \$30 million for blood, but, because of the almost total lack of in-house capabilities, these funds are going to grant and contract awards.

Lung problems contributed or directly caused almost 90,000 deaths in 1970.

An estimated 10 million Americans suffer from chronic respiratory diseases, 1 million from emphysema, 4 million from chronic bronchitis, and 5 million from asthma. Social security payments to these people run in excess of \$90 million annually.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently conducted its nationwide "Voice of Democracy" oratorical contest in which more than 500,000 young men and women in over 7,000 of the Nation's high schools participated. The theme this year was "My Responsibility to Freedom." In Virginia, our statewide winner was Miss Phyllis McBee, of Hopewell, Va.

Not only am I proud of Miss McBee's achievement, because she was one of my constituents, but also because of the fine message which her speech conveys. We hear a great deal today in criticism of some of the activities of our youth, therefore, I feel that it is incumbent upon us to give credit where credit is due to those many outstanding young people who continue to hold forth the high ideals of democracy. She sets forth in clear terms, not only the privileges of citizenship, but also its responsibilities. I commend her speech to the reading of the Members of the House:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

America was formed as an independent nation, one built, not for glory, but for democracy. When our forefathers fought for their freedom, they risked their lives. Patrick Henry's rousing "Give me Liberty or give me Death!" was typical of the feelings of the gallant men who founded the United States of America.

The men who were the first Americans had the responsibility of fighting for their freedom. When they gained it, they had the responsibility of seeing that it worked. I also have the responsibility of making freedom work. I treasure my freedoms, use them, and sometimes even take them for granted. I try

to remember that laws I may not like are necessary so that I can enjoy my own freedoms.

I am an independent individual, but being free isn't all fun and games. To be able to enjoy my own freedoms, I can't step on those of others. Having the right to protest and the right of free speech doesn't mean that I have the right to smash windows, create a riot, shout obscenities at my neighbors, or libel my chosen representative to the government. There is a wonderful idea in our Constitution which is that we can do almost anything that won't hurt anyone else. Riots and laws restricting freedom not only hurt me, they hurt many others. Freedoms, when abused, are freedoms no longer. My first responsibility to freedom, then, is to understand what freedom involves. People do not realize the price that was paid for freedom: Bloody feet wrapped in rags to keep out freezing cold, scant food to feed starving stomachs. Lives given for the cause of freedom. Have these sacrifices been made in vain? Do I, as a responsible citizen, have the right to think my country owes me anything? What indeed have I ever done to deserve all the freedoms and privileges I receive—just because I am a citizen? Maybe we all should think about this once in a while and think deeply about President Kennedy's statement "It's not what your country can do for you, it's what you can do for your country." If everyone thought first of his country and the Golden Rule, we'd have taken a giant step toward true peace—we'd all be working toward a better America. I should also ask myself how I'd feel if my freedoms were taken away. Another responsibility, then, is to myself. That means that I must be reasonable and fair-minded in my actions as a citizen.

Mixed with my love for my country is a feeling of devotion and pride. Though sometimes my faith in the government is shaken, the necessity of freedom is always present. I am willing to lend a helping hand in preserving and protecting it. I was born with freedom as my heritage and I hope to die leaving the heritage of freedom to the people coming after me.

It has always taken blood and courage, war and faith to make a nation free. The purchase price of freedom is always high, but is never paid with regret. Our nation was forged in the fires of revolution, hammered by stern blows of Fate, shaped with hope, and tempered with despair. My responsibility as a free individual in a nation created for freedom, lies in maintaining that freedom. Whether it is making laws or obeying them, fighting for freedom or defending it, the work must be done and must be done by all. . . . Freedom is not free.

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular personal privilege and pleasure to join here with my colleagues in commemorating the origin of Lithuania's declaration of independence. This year we mark the 54th anniversary of that very special historical event.

Back on February 16, 1918, after more than a century of Czarist Russian occupation, the people of Lithuania declared their independence.

However and unfortunately, they were permitted to enjoy the rights and privileges of a free people for little more than two decades.

Lithuania was deprived of her hard-won, long-sought independence when the Russian Army illegally occupied Lithuania at the outset of World War II. Except for a very brief period of Nazi domination, the Soviet Union has continued to unjustly occupy Lithuania right up to this very day.

Throughout this long period, the people of Lithuania have bravely suffered almost inconceivable hardships and cruelties from Russian persecution, assassination and slavery.

Nevertheless, the valiant people of Lithuania have never given up their persevering struggle and desire to be free again.

Despite the inhuman treatment of their Russian captors, their stalwart ancestors have remained steadfast in their commitment to their faith, their culture, their language and their ideals.

In doing this they have become an inspiring example to the whole world in their unconquerable resistance to repression and tyranny.

Although, today, we express common grief that Lithuania is not free, we are bound to recognize and to applaud the heroic spirit which still burns within the Lithuanian people.

It is this undaunted spirit of a great nation that prompts us to speak out against their continued slavery.

We, as citizens in a nation "conceived in liberty", should not and cannot remain silent while the freedom loving people of Lithuania and other small nations remain the persecuted captives of Communist imperialism.

That is why both as a Representative in Congress and as a private citizen who knows the virtues of the Lithuanian people I believe we must continue to publicize in every way that we can the terrible cruelties being visited upon the Lithuanian people. We must continue to emphasize that the Russian occupation is illegal and unjust.

We must keep reminding ourselves, our fellow Americans, and all the citizens of the free world that the Lithuanian people are being held as slaves by a powerful nation that issues words of freedom but whose forceful actions make a mockery of those words.

If we ignore what we know to be the truth about Communist hypocrisy, we will be abandoning the principles of our own national birth and jeopardizing our own freedom.

Our common obligation is to stir the conscience of the world through our own Government and the United Nations to act against tyranny and to preserve hope in the minds and hearts of the valiant Lithuanian people.

This commemoration is helpful in our just cause. It serves to renew our own dedication for the achievement of liberty in Lithuania and to demonstrate to her people that they do not stand alone and forgotten.

Let us pledge ourselves to use every resource and influence that we possess to restore to Lithuania her rightful freedom.

I am sure that if we persevere in our united efforts the day must and will come when Lithuania will regain her liberty

and again take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

So, in spite of our sadness, on this 54th anniversary of Lithuania's independence let us look confidently to a brighter future because we all know that freedom cannot be forever denied to the courageous Lithuanian people who have ever remained immovable in their allegiance to the heroic traditions of their country and the tremendous faith of their fathers.

DRUG FIGHT AIMING FOR THE WHOLESALEERS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the President's new initiative to fight drug abuse will go a long way to cure this scourge that is sweeping the country. We all know how vital Federal legislation and Federal law enforcement is if we are going to effectively deal with the narcotics problem. But all these programs will be meaningless unless we are able to attract highly talented and dedicated people to carry out the thrust of Federal efforts.

One such individual, U.S. attorney for the eastern district, Robert A. Morse has spent a good part of his professional life dealing with drug traffickers. His experience in law enforcement is most important because as U.S. attorney for Brooklyn, Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties he will be the main thrust behind the new Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement.

As the youngest man ever to hold the job of U.S. attorney, Mr. Morse is a dynamic and thoughtful man who takes his responsibilities seriously.

Last Sunday, the Long Island Press, one of New York City's finest newspapers published a most interesting and informative article, which I believe captures the personality, dedication and forcefulness of Mr. Morse. The article outlines some of the ideas and innovations Mr. Morse has implemented since he accepted the position last summer. His accomplishments are most impressive considering the short time he has been in office.

At this time, I would like to insert that article in the RECORD so that my colleagues can get a glimpse of this most talented and energetic U.S. attorney.

The article follows:

DRUG FIGHT AIMING FOR THE WHOLESALEERS (By Seymour Marks)

The new nationwide crackdown on dangerous drugs, working through an independent agency created by the President a few weeks ago, will not throw its heaviest weight against the major international suppliers, nor the little street corner pushers.

It will cut its biggest swath right down the middle—the big wholesalers who are the transmission line between overseas sources and domestic little men who peddle "nickel" (\$.50) and "dime" (\$.10) bags.

So says the new U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District, Robert A. Morse of Brooklyn Heights, the youngest man (42) at his ap-

pointment last August ever to hold the job.

And he ought to know, because New York City will be one of nine headquarters cities for the new Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement, and much of its work will center in the metropolitan counties.

Morse, whose federal domain covers Brooklyn, Queens, Nassau, Suffolk and Staten Island, will play an important role in the battle, because his assistants will prosecute many of the cases originated by the national team.

We've been hearing about narcotics crack-downs for years—how does the new one differ?

"It's an infusion of manpower at the middle level," explained Morse. "The Department of Justice concentrates on the larger drug rings. The little pusher is for the locals. That leaves the middle-level big wholesalers."

"No sooner have we stopped one major international source, let's say by signing a treaty with Turkey, than a new source pops up in Asia. The middle-level transmission line remains the same. We expect the new teams to make a big dent at this level."

Morse, a moderately-short, chunky man with grayish hair that is short by the current vogue, but long by old "butch" haircut standards, has placed his faith in a staff of 47 mostly-young assistants.

Typical of some of his top hands are his executive assistant, Edward Thompson Jr., 32, of Huntington Station, son of a state Supreme Court justice; his criminal division chief, Edward Boyd V of Garden City, who is only 28; his civil division chief, James Porter, 33, of Brooklyn Heights, and appeals chief, David Trager, 34, of Brooklyn.

The young U.S. attorney and his young staff have some youthful ideas about priorities. No. 2 on his worksheet, after the narcotics push, is ecology—pollution of navigable waters.

He feels that spotting a polluter and hauling him to court is not enough. The idea is to get the polluter to give his own business priority to projects and expenditures that will end existing pollution and eliminate its threat for the future.

As chief assistant to his predecessor, Edward R. Neaher (now a federal judge) for two years, Morse had plenty of opportunity to work out ways of achieving those ends in the fight against pollution. Now, as the chief, he can draw on that experience.

"We will soon announce that a national corporation will be spending \$7.5 million for rehabilitating a metropolitan oil terminal, and \$2,250,000 of that amount will be for anti-pollution devices to prevent oil leaks from tanks into the water," he said.

The announcement probably won't come from Morse's Brooklyn offices, but from Washington. The Justice Department likes to take its own due credit.

"We get that sort of thing done without legal action—just discussion," said Morse. "We sat down with the corporation's lawyer, sitting right there where you are, and we said, 'Counselor, what are you going to do about it?' We kicked it back and forth, and then the plan was evolved."

Morse works closely with city and state agencies, especially in connection with the tons of raw sewage still being dumped into surrounding waters by municipalities.

"We coordinate our aims with the city people," he said, "and often get them to change priorities—like showing them that building a sewer this year instead of next year might solve a great pollution problem. We get some important things done that way, without public furor."

Morse's background of private practice and public service in state, city and federal jobs has given him considerable leverage in that sort of coordinated planning with local government spokesmen.

A native of Brooklyn and a product of its

schools, he was graduated from Indiana University before earning his law degree at Cornell in 1952. Fresh out of law school, he clerked for a year in the office of State Attorney General Nathaniel Goldstein.

When Judge Walter Bruchhausen of Brooklyn was appointed by President Eisenhower to the Eastern District bench, young Morse was his first law clerk in 1953 and 1954.

Then he entered the Air Force for two years as a lieutenant in the Judge Advocate General's Office. He served his first hitch as an assistant in the Eastern District U.S. attorney's office from 1956 to 1959. From 1959 to 1970, he spent his time in a combination of public and private practice.

After the late James B. Donovan became vice president of the New York City Board of Education, young Morse, who had been associated with Donovan's law firm, became special counsel to the board for five years, directing a number of important investigations.

A lifelong Republican, Morse was Brooklyn treasurer for the Nixon-Agnew campaign in 1968. One of the President's first appointments in 1969 made Morse chief assistant to Neaher in the Eastern District.

He has been counsel to a number of human rights committees in Brooklyn, and a member of the Brooklyn Advisory Council of the New York State Commission on Human Rights.

He has served in various capacities the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, the Municipal Art Commission, the Brooklyn Academy of Music, and other local agencies and committees.

Morse lives alone in a Brooklyn Heights apartment—bachelor quarters he has maintained since he and his wife of 16 years were divorced in 1966. Their 18-year-old daughter, Deborah, is studying English and psychology at Clark University, Worcester, Mass.

Morse is given to quick-snack lunches in his office and to staying later than most of his aides. The last light burning in the U.S. attorney's fifth-floor suite in the Brooklyn courthouse is often in the chief's office, where he may be boning up on a difficult question of law, catching up on neglected reading, or discussing a problem with a handful of assistants working on a particularly important case.

DAVID F. TOOMEY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform this body of the death of a man from my First District in Massachusetts whose life was dedicated to serving his country, State, and family.

David F. Toomey, who died last week, was a former State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Most of his adult life was dedicated to serving the needs of the men who have fought this Nation's wars. After attending local schools in Greenfield, and playing football at Boston College, he courageously fought for his Nation in World War II. At such time he was awarded two Purple Hearts for his participation in the Normandy invasion and the Battle of the Bulge.

In 1952-53 Mr. Toomey served as State commander of the Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars and he continued in leadership activities in the VFW for a number of years. He was also commander

of the Lexington VFW Post and a member of the Arlington Post, Disabled American Veterans, and the Bedford American Legion.

Having had the opportunity to work with Mr. Toomey many times on local projects, I will miss the wise counsel and knowledgeable direction that only a man with such outstanding service and wisdom can furnish.

His passing is a tragic loss to his family and many friends. It is also a loss to people everywhere who admire courage and determination in their fellow man.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I submit for the Record the following article from the March 1 edition of the Greenfield, Mass., Recorder which details the life of this fine man:

FORMER MASSACHUSETTS VFW LEADER, TOOMEY DIES

David F. Toomey, 57, of 9 Spencer St., Lexington, formerly of Greenfield, died Monday in the Veterans Administration Hospital at Bedford after a long illness. He was a former state commander of the Mass. Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Toomey, remembered in Greenfield for his activity in athletics and who won all-state honors in football, was captain of the Greenfield High School team in the 1930's. He later played football for Cushing Academy and at Boston College, where his football career was cut short by injuries. He graduated from B.C. in 1938.

During World War II he served with the 35th Infantry, taking part in the Normandy invasion and the Battles of the Bulge. He was wounded at both battles and received the Purple Heart with two clusters. He was also awarded the Bronze Star, the Combat Infantryman's badge and a Presidential Citation.

In 1952-53 he served the Mass. Veterans of Foreign Wars as state commander. He was a past commander of the Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Post VFW, Boston. He was a longtime friend of former President John F. Kennedy, who had served that post as its first commander.

He was also a past commander of the Lexington VFW Post and a member of the Arlington Post, Disabled American Veterans, and the Bedford American Legion.

When he was state commander of the VFW he testified in Washington on the problems of former servicemen during a House Subcommittee hearing on Veteran's affairs at the request of U.S. Rep. Edith Nourse Rogers.

He was a charter member of the Lexington Lodge of Elks, a past grand knight of Lexington Council, Knights of Columbus; a fourth degree member of David I. Walsh Assembly, Knights of Columbus, Boston, and the Boston College Alumni Assn.

He had been employed as an insurance claims specialist with the Firemen's Fund-American Insurance Group.

Toomey was born in Greenfield on March 15, 1914, the son of David T. and Mary (O'Connor) Toomey. He was a graduate of local schools.

He leaves his widow, the former Anna Marcotte, formerly of West Chelmsford; four sons, David F. Toomey, Jr., of Dorchester, Kevin F., Brian A. and Sean J., all of Lexington; three sisters, Mrs. Margaret Molt-enbrey and Mrs. Mary Kersavage, both of Greenfield, and Mrs. Anna Bonvie of Berkeley; two brothers, Timothy J. and John J., both of Greenfield; three grandchildren and several nieces and nephews.

Funeral services will be Friday at 9 a.m. in Sacred Heart Church, Lexington.

Calling hours at the Louis J. Spencer Funeral Home at 52 Waltham St., Lexington Center, will be tonight from 7 to 9 and Thursday from 2 to 4 and 7 to 9 p.m. In

lieu of flowers donations may be made to the American Heart Assn.

IN SUPPORT OF CHAIRMAN HÉBERT

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in its March 6 issue, the Washington Post's "Letters to the Editor" column contained a letter from my very able colleague OTIS PIKE. For the benefit of my colleagues who might have missed Representative PIKE's comments on the joys and benefits of an "Ivy League" education, now considered in some circles to be vital to our national security, I am pleased to include Representative PIKE's letter as part of today's RECORD:

FEBRUARY 28, 1972.

EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The thing I loved most about your editorial on the subject of "Representative Hébert's Vendetta" was that it made me feel young, and at my age this is an increasingly rare delight. You feel that Congressman Hébert is being a cad and a bounder for discouraging the military from sending men to study at that handful of ivy-covered colleges which have kicked the military out of the colleges.

As a graduate of two of the universities included (inaccurately, by the way—one now has the Good Housekeeping seal of approval) in the prescribed list I remember all too well the thinking implicit, and even explicit, in your blast. It was exactly the way I thought when I graduated from college and law school.

Without the glories of an education at one of the 16 universities named I could not possibly have had the "best education available." By eliminating those 16 from the 2500 colleges and universities in America of course my choice would have been "severely limited" and of course I would have had "less than the best." Oh, the joyous youthful snobbery of it all!

Oh, but that was long ago and far away. Before I lost my first case to a lawyer with a "less than the best" education. Before I watched the happy possessors of "the best education available" sit on both sides of the table and approve the C5A contract which managed at the same time to rape the taxpayers and bankrupt the corporation.

For, oh so long, people who worship the natural and hereditary intellectual supremacy of the Ivy League have insisted that we should send all our majors and colonels to the Harvard Business School. We have done so for decades. The glorious result of this enlightened approach has been a new breed of elite officers, singing "Fair Harvard" and "Boola Boola", wearing their chickens on their shoulders and their degrees on their sleeves, while leading us into soaring cost overruns and sinking efficiency. But, by God, they can all play squash!

As long as the club insists on penetrating the fiction that "the military officers and the country as a whole" will suffer if our military leaders can't go to Harvard, doesn't a decent respect for the underprivileged 99 per cent of our people require that at least the editorial be written in good Ivy League Latin? Congressman Hébert would still get the message. Wrong college—right church!

Cordially,

OTIS G. PIKE,
Princeton '43, Columbia '48, Vinson Col-
lege '61.

THE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN VOTERS AND REPRESENTATIVES

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, in response to my most recent newsletter, I have received a reply from Mr. Charles A. Costello, Sr., one of my constituents. His letter comments on the value of communication between the voters and their representatives in Government. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask that Mr. Costello's letter be inserted below:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ARCHER: I appreciate very much the House of Representatives calendar which you recently sent to me. I also would like to take this opportunity to express my thoughts about your most recent capitol report newsletter sent to your constituents, which I received several weeks ago.

I have always attempted to maintain close correspondence with my Congressmen, and there are certain rewards from doing so. Unfortunately, this is not the case with most Americans—of course, it's kind of like the saying that what you put into something largely determines what you will get out of it.

While it is needless to say that we need more communication from the people to their representatives, we also need more of the type of communication from national legislators to the people such as that so superbly exemplified by your recent capitol report.

Quite naturally, proper attitudes of teamwork, proper senses of responsibility, and common motivational goals must be present at each end of communication in order to accomplish desirable, meaningful, and effective results. People must feel a sense of duty to the well-being of themselves and their fellow Americans and pride in achievement for liberty, freedom, and democracy. On the other hand, their representative must also feel the same motivations and have the same attitudes to properly function within the purpose for which their positions were established and currently exist. Like most anything else, the key to success lies within the efforts each group of communicators makes within these given attitudes and motivations.

Sure, every Congressman and Senator publicizes periodic reports for the folks back home. However, two things usually go wrong: the Congressman or Senator usually gathers together a batch of factual data from a given period, deleting personal communicative comment and avoiding real issues and their truths, all of this not necessarily due to their intent to do so.

Secondly, individual "folk back home" either doesn't care or feels he doesn't have the time to read "this stuff anyway" and communications never take place as the message usually finds its place at the bottom of the waste basket.

However, I know from personal experience that caring and taking an active role can pay off, as in the case where I have taken the time to read, absorb, and react to what you have taken the time to prepare and inform me of concerning your representation of me and many others. When all of the elements are present and working, our governmental process works beautifully—it just takes "two to tango," and the two ingredients must be a representative and a citizen, each with appropriate attitudes, purposes, and motivations.

As a citizen of Texas and our nation, I would like for the other hundreds of representatives and their millions of constituents to either be reassured or learn firsthand by

my experiences that our system can work and does work when properly approached and utilized.

I suppose my message basically comes down to what I said earlier about what is gotten out of something, because quite simply if we are to maintain those things which make America the greatest place to live, we can't simply sit back and feel secure—we have to work at it to keep it. And that's not just in government—we must all work at making a contribution to greatness in our everyday lives and realize that what we do every day does indeed have a bearing on what our country is and represents.

You may also wish to publish this letter in your next capitol report; it may help in stimulating more thoughtful communication from our district. Thank you once again for giving attention to my thoughts. Best wishes in your continuing efforts in representing the people of our district in our national government.

Warmest personal regards.

CHARLES A. COSTELLO, Sr.

STRATEGIC CONCEPTS AND SOVIET POLICY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the close relationship between strategic nuclear power and the domestic policy-making process in the Soviet Union is little discussed by Western analysts, as David Holloway points out in an article appearing in the November 1971, issue of *Survival* magazine.

In discussing the SALT talks, Mr. Holloway notes that:

To hope . . . for a dampening of the arms race on the basis of a common understanding of strategic concepts and theory seems unrealistic, in view of the complicated relationship that exists between concepts and policy. . . . For policy is the outcome, not of debates about concepts, but of immensely complex political and bureaucratic processes, of which those debates are only a part.

This relationship between concepts and policy is the subject of Mr. Holloway's article, which I recommend to my colleagues. The author is lecturer in politics at the University of Edinburgh. *Survival* is published by the widely respected International Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

The article follows:

STRATEGIC CONCEPTS AND SOVIET POLICY (By David Holloway)

It has been suggested by some commentators that one of the major benefits to be expected from the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) is the institutionalization of the strategic dialogue on a firmer footing than hitherto. While a comprehensive strategic arms treaty is generally regarded as the outcome most to be desired, considerable claims are often made for a firmly-grounded strategic dialogue. It is argued that the strategic dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union at SALT could lead eventually to a dampening of the strategic arms race through unilateral restraint flowing from increased understanding. Less conservative assumptions, it is argued, could be used in planning; the introduction of new weapons could be slowed down; and threats to the

other side's deterrent forces could be avoided in the procurement of new weapons.¹

Such a dialogue might be expected to include the exchange of information about strategic programmes, policies and perceptions. And there can be little doubt that, where this is coupled with the interpretation of specific programmes and their implications on strategic armaments. But it has also been suggested that the discussion of fundamental issues of strategy and arms control would contribute to a mutual understanding on the basis of which specific agreements could more easily be reached. Among the issues which might be discussed are the following: what are the purposes of strategic nuclear forces? What constitutes a 'sufficient' strategic posture? How stable is the present strategic balance? What are the principles and objectives of arms control? It is apparent that complete common understanding on these points is not a necessary condition for the achievement of a specific agreement on arms for which each side might have its own reasons. But it is widely assumed that common understanding would facilitate a specific agreement, and that it might have a beneficial effect beyond the letter of the agreement. This assumption appears to be made both for the case in which there is mutual understanding and agreement on these purposes and premises, and for the case in which there is both understanding and disagreement.

This line of argument raises a number of basic questions about the relationship between strategic concepts and the development of military power. For, in its simplest forms, it assumes that the development of strategic power is guided by strategic doctrine. This assumption is highly problematical and could not be made *tout court* on the analysis of Western defence policies. But it is often made in the analysis of Soviet policy, with a consequent failure to take into account the domestic policy-making process, the role of different institutions and the functions of different kinds of internal debate. All this greatly diminishes the value of such analysis. In this paper I shall look at Soviet military-strategic thinking in the light of the fundamental issues mentioned above. Besides looking at Soviet strategic concepts I shall consider briefly their role in Soviet policy-making, with particular reference to the Soviet decision to take part in SALT. The problem of defining the relationship between concepts and policy is of course an extremely difficult one, and I shall be able to do no more than touch on some of its aspects.

THE PURPOSES OF STRATEGIC FORCES

In the Soviet Union much of the argument about this extremely complex issue has centered on the specific proposition, associated with Clausewitz and endorsed by Lenin, that war is the continuation of politics (policy) by other, violent means. Soviet theory has adhered in general to this position. But in the nuclear age considerable difficulties arise in maintaining such a view: in what sense can missile-nuclear war be regarded as a continuation of politics? More generally, how can strategic nuclear capabilities be translated into political power and influence?

Under Khrushchev the general and mutually destructive nature of nuclear war was stressed; since Khrushchev's fall greater emphasis has been put on the capacity of the Soviet Union to survive and win such a war. The earlier view went hand in hand with a rejection of the idea that nuclear war could be regarded as a continuation of policy; the more recent emphasis has been accompanied by a reassertion of the validity of this conception in the nuclear age. The reaffirmation of this position does not prove, as some commentators have appeared to as-

Footnotes at end of article.

sume, that the Soviet Union has been aiming for some sort of first-strike capability. Soviet writers have been careful to distinguish two questions: that of the essence of war, and that of its expediency.

The new emphasis in Soviet military writing does not appear to signal a substantive change in policy. But it amounts, nonetheless, to more than mere casuistry, for it reflects several important features in Soviet military thinking. The first of these is the fear that undue and exclusive insistence on the destructive nature of nuclear war will lead to demoralization or complacency in the armed forces. It is one of the main purposes of the Soviet military press to help maintain the morale, fighting spirit and combat readiness of the Soviet armed forces, and any analysis of military writings must bear this in mind. The second feature is the emphasis of the war-waging, as well as the war-deterrence, elements in military strategy. This emphasis seems to arise out of a genuine conviction that nuclear war with the United States is a real possibility, and it is this possibility that forms the central focus of Soviet strategic thinking. The renewed stress on the Clausewitzian view of war can be seen as part of an attempt by Soviet military writers to discredit the assumptions which underlay Khrushchev's policy of minimum deterrence.

The emphasis on the possibility of nuclear war in Soviet strategic thinking has clear implications for Soviet understanding of the purposes of strategic nuclear forces. Their object is to deter war, and wage it if deterrence fails. Nuclear war would be a catastrophe for both sides, but damage could be limited, and to speak of victory is not necessarily meaningless. This emphasis affects also the relationship between offence and defence at the strategic level: an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system could, in principle, play an important role in limiting damage in a nuclear war. The focus on nuclear war affects also the roles and missions assigned to the different branches of the military establishment. More abstractly, it makes the point that deterrence is not viewed in the Soviet Union as an eternal principle of Soviet-American strategic relations. Mutual deterrence is not regarded as an exclusive mechanism for regulating the balance of strategic power, since deterrence is not viewed as the sole purpose of strategic capabilities; nor is mutual deterrence seen as a reliable device for preventing nuclear war—hence the need to prepare to wage such a war.

The political uses of strategic nuclear power are even more complicated than its military exploitation. Khrushchev espoused a highly personal style of managing military power in the pursuit of his political goals. He sought to exploit a nuclear posture which he defined, almost at will, as superiority or parity *vis-à-vis* the United States, without being prepared to pay for more than a minimum deterrent. His deterrent and counter-deterrent threats suffered a continuous decline in credibility. His successors have eschewed his vociferous manner, and have adopted a policy of greater restraint, though perhaps also of greater pertinacity, towards the United States. It has evidently been a prime concern of the new leadership to restore credibility to the political uses of their military power. This they have sought to do by building up their strategic capabilities and also by increasing the flexibility of their military power.

The feeling that numerical strategic inferiority was politically disadvantageous certainly seems to have been an important element in the Soviet decision to overcome that inferiority. Some observers have seen the attainment of strategic parity as a large contributory factor in the self-confidence which Soviet policy has displayed in the last two to three years. But the difficulty of isolating and evaluating this factor among others is ap-

parent from the use of such vague, though perhaps expressive, terms as 'superpoweritis', 'expansionist mood', and the assertion of 'seigniorial super-power rights' to characterize current Soviet policy. How long this mood will last, and how far it might be conducive to an adventurous, and potentially dangerous, policy is not clear.

THE DEFINITION OF SUFFICIENCY

There is in Soviet strategic theory no obvious criterion of nuclear sufficiency. There is a principle of military superiority which is extremely vague and impossible to quantify. It sometimes means little more than that standards of excellence should be pursued in all aspects of the military effort. Nevertheless it is no doubt extremely important inasmuch as it reflects a firm belief that the Soviet Union, as the leading socialist state, must have a superior military capability of some kind; and this superiority will tend to be expressed at the very least in terms of numbers. Whatever the motives behind the Soviet strategic build-up, and whatever the steps by which it was decided upon, the Soviet planners have been faced with the problem of how far to carry deployment. In spite of the almost ritualistic Soviet insistence on the need for superiority, the notion of sufficiency is not totally alien to Soviet thinking.

Khrushchev had declared Soviet defense to be 'wholly adequate' in 1960, but this assessment was based more on his faith in his own ability to exploit Soviet military power for political ends than on any military strategic criterion. Soviet strategic doctrine does not have a criterion of sufficiency such as is supplied by the notion of assured destruction. Indeed that notion is derived essentially from the concept of mutual deterrence, and the quantification of assured destruction may be seen as the deification of deterrence.

The Soviet build-up in strategic armaments has gone well beyond the point of attaining an assured destruction capability. The motives for the build-up are not wholly ascertainable, but it must presumably make sense in terms of the purposes of strategic nuclear forces—in a war-waging and damage-limitation context, and for the political gains to be extracted from it. Some commentators have suggested that, while inferiority was unsatisfactory, the achievement of parity has been accompanied by a realization of the diminishing political utility of vast strategic power. It has been argued also that Soviet planners are becoming increasingly aware that more armaments do not necessarily bring greater security. Soviet planners are faced, therefore, with the problem of deciding how much is enough.

THE STABILITY OF THE STRATEGIC BALANCE

Soviet military theorists do not deny that there may exist at a given time a situation in which either the Soviet Union or the United States could inflict enormous damage on the other in a retaliatory strike. But what they seek to do, with their distinction between the essence of war and its expediency, is to prevent any acceptance of mutual deterrence as a normal state of affairs.

In this they are doubtless helped by the connotations of the two Russian words for deterrence—*sderzhivaniye* (literally restraining or checking) and *ustrasheniye* (literally terrorization); the former is generally used to describe the effect of Soviet military power on the United States, and the latter is commonly used to describe what the United States tries to do to the Soviet Union. Thus, apart even from the possibility of destabilizing developments in weapons technology, there seems to be in Soviet thinking a consciousness of change and flux, and an unwillingness to accept mutual deterrence as in any way sacrosanct. This might be called a dialectical view of the strategic balance.

Allied to this issue is the Soviet concept

of the arms race. It is only in the last three to four years that the elements of action and reaction have gained any prominence in Soviet commentary on the arms race. Before that it was seen as something imposed on the Soviet Union by the aggressive United States. Recent Soviet analysis has pointed to the complexity of the policy-making process in the United States, though with due emphasis on the activities of the military-industrial complex. There seems to be a much greater awareness of the degree to which Soviet and American policies interact, and of the degree to which one side will attempt to offset increments in the other's military capabilities.

The attainment of parity seems to have contributed greatly to this awareness. To a government seeking to overcome a position of numerical strategic inferiority any mention by the other side of an action-reaction process will seem like a threat to maintain the existing strategic relationship. Once a situation has been reached in which both sides acknowledge parity, such a threat can more reasonably be made by both sides. In any event, the earlier Soviet insistence that ballistic missile defense (BMD) could not be considered destabilizing because it was purely defensive has now been replaced by an attitude which is more sensitive to its arms-race implications. But the problems of interpretation are exemplified here. We cannot tell whether such statements are purely declaratory or whether they represent a real change in Soviet attitude. The defensive nature of BMD was proclaimed when Soviet deployment was taking place; the destabilizing implications have been found since the U.S. decision to deploy the Safeguard system. But Soviet policy does seem to have become somewhat less introspective in the last three years. There has been an evident desire to understand American policy better. The very active Institute of U.S. Studies, which has been set up in the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, has a central role to play in the interpretation of U.S. policy.

THE PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES OF ARMS CONTROL

The Soviet Union remained for a long time suspicious of US arms-control proposals (e.g. the Johnson freeze) which might have served to legitimize American strategic superiority. By the summer of 1968 the Soviet leadership had decided to enter SALT at what *Pravda* described as "one of those rare moments in history . . . when both sides are ready to admit equality in the broadest sense and to view this as an initial position for reaching agreement concerning the freezing and the subsequent reduction of arms."²

They have insisted, as a basic principle, that no side should gain unilateral advantage from the talks.

The SALT talks seem to presuppose: recognition of the existence of strategic parity between the super-powers; acceptance of mutual deterrence as the basis for an agreement to limit arms; and an acknowledgment that if no limitation, tacit or explicit, is agreed upon, the arms race will enter another spiral because each side will seek to offset the other's potential and realized increases in strategic power. There is no criterion or guideline in Soviet strategic doctrine to suggest that agreement on the basis of these assumptions would be satisfactory. And it seems to have been precisely on this point that there has been controversy in the Soviet Union over the decision to take part in SALT. The decision seems to have been taken by the Soviet leadership on the basis of political calculation rather than military-strategic reasoning. As one Western commentator has put it:

"The question for the Soviet Union is not merely whether the present military balance

Footnotes at end of article.

is satisfactory, but whether it is more satisfactory than a situation resulting from a continuation of the arms race."³

And another:

"The Russians would like to possess a numerical superiority over the US at the highest level which would not spark off another major round of the strategic arms race. For, while nothing that the Soviet leaders have so far authorized in weapons policy has imposed an *intolerable* strain on the Soviet economy, another major round could; moreover, the Russians could not guarantee that such a round would not leave them relatively worse off than they are now."⁴

This is to pose the Soviet leadership a particularly fine problem of political judgment, especially when the policy-making machines on both sides appear to be so cumbersome, and the mechanism of the arms race so poorly understood. And it seems likely that there is in the Soviet Union disagreement about how far deployment can go without sparking off another round of the arms race. Part of this disagreement seems to focus on the interpretation of the arms race. For example, the American decision to go ahead with the deployment of multiple independently-targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs) raised doubts in some Soviet quarters about the genuineness of US adherence to a conception of stable mutual deterrence, and about the seriousness of its participation in SALT. The United States, it is maintained, will fabricate a Soviet 'threat' to enable it to pursue whatever policy it chooses, irrespective of the real nature of Soviet policy. Thus the interpretation of US policy becomes a delicate issue, and one of real importance, in Soviet politics.

It appears that the major aims of Soviet Strategic policy at SALT are: to stabilize the strategic relationship at parity; to prevent another spiral of the arms race, which would be extremely costly, and might diminish security rather than increase it; to establish more clearly its own strategic arms policy by probing US policy. Besides, participation in SALT is an outward and visible sign of super-power status. If this interpretation is correct, and the Soviet approach to SALT is serious, as it seems to be, then it appears that Soviet policy is based on the acceptance of assumptions and principles which run counter to dominant elements in Soviet military-strategic thinking.

CONCLUSIONS

I am aware that this argument has simplified enormously complex issues to the point of distortion. Soviet strategic thinking contains diverse elements: different institutional interests and different styles of argument are involved.

There is, for example, a disjunction between the emphasis on the need to prepare to wage war, to be found in military writings, and the stress to be found in Foreign Ministry statements on the political implications of strategic programmes. This difference in emphasis can be explained in part by saying that the military press serves to maintain the morale of the armed forces and to rationalize their combat training and political education. But this does not render the difference in emphasis irrelevant to our understanding of how Soviet policy is made. For if the morale and combat readiness of the armed forces have to be kept up by the propagation of a doctrine which is at odds with Soviet policy, the High Command and the Main Political Administration will press for at least some correspondence between Soviet policy and strategic doctrine, unless we assume the conscious dissemination among the armed forces of a doctrine which bears little relation to Soviet policy.

Another instance of diversity is to be found in Soviet strategic analysis. The military philosophers, who are based mainly on the Lenin Military Political Academy which is subordinate to the Main Political Administration, use in their arguments the potent

mixture of appeals to ideological orthodoxy and military conservatism. But newer kinds of analysis, based on economic modes of thinking and new forecasting techniques, are gaining ground in the military academies and the central administration.

These appear to be closely linked to the new emphasis on the elements of action and reaction in the arms race, and to the search for a definition of sufficiency. They flow from the attainment of parity—or rather, from the acceptance by the super-powers that parity does exist. For parity is an imprecise concept, whose precise definition in terms of armaments seems to matter less than the psychological effects of acknowledging its existence. The new modes of thinking are based on the belief that a plateau, or point of equilibrium, has been reached in the strategic balance. Hence the divergence between strategic policy and strategic concepts in the Soviet decision to take part in SALT may be no more than the symptom of a transitional period in Soviet strategic thinking.

If anything like a comprehensive agreement to limit strategic armaments were to emerge from SALT it would perhaps be accompanied by changes in strategic doctrine which rationalized the outcome and explained why it was satisfactory. But even if new methods of analysis, and new strategic concepts, were to gain greater influence in the Soviet Union, this would not necessarily destroy the 'Russian style' in policy, for the psychological basis of such concepts as deterrence and sufficiency would lead to their being made operational in a 'Russian way'.

The complexity of the relationship between concepts and policy makes it imperative to take account of institutional arrangements when analysing Soviet policy. By this I have in mind not so much the question of disagreements in the Politburo—the search for these is often a futile exercise—but rather the relationships between the various institutions involved in the making of strategic policy: the Ministry of Defence, the General Staff, the Main Political Administration, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Central Committee Departments, the Council of Ministers, the Military Academies, the Institute of US Studies and so on. For all the minute study of the Soviet press which has taken place, the institutional arrangements for the formation and executive of strategic policy have been largely neglected. Yet the internal debates in the Soviet Union can scarcely be properly understood without reference to the political and bureaucratic context within which they take place.

This discussion is relevant to our understanding of the strategic dialogue. Soviet participation in SALT seems to point to a less introspective approach to policy and to changes in strategic thinking. And for those who have seen Soviet strategic thinking as an obstacle to arms control, either because it lacked sophistication, or because it reflected aggressive designs, these changes will seem hopeful. But the process of change is complex, and present Soviet policy seems to be the result of a compromise reached in 1968 to adopt a businesslike approach at SALT, and at the same time to continue to deploy strategic armaments.

Indeed, both sides have been so intent on providing themselves with bargaining counters that SALT may have had the effect of speeding up the arms race rather than slowing it down. To hope, therefore, for a dampening of the arms race on the basis of a common understanding of strategic concepts and theory seems unrealistic, in view of the complicated relationship that exists between concepts and policy. I am not casting doubt on the value of the dialogue at SALT, which will be bound up in the discussion of strategic programmes. But the study of Soviet policy on the basis of open materials, if it is to contribute to our understanding of how Soviet policy is made and of how the arms

race works, must go beyond the analysis of concepts. For policy is the outcome, not of debates about concepts, but of immensely complex political and bureaucratic processes, of which those debates are only a part.

FOOTNOTES

¹ For an interesting discussion of SALT and the strategic dialogue, see Jerome H. Kahan, "Strategies for SALT" in *World Politics*, January 1971.

² *Pravda*, 7 July 1968. Quoted in R. Kolkowicz et al., *The Soviet Union and Arms Control: A Superpower Dilemma*, Johns Hopkins Press, 1970, p. 59.

³ M. Gallagher in R. Kolkowicz, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁴ M. Mackintosh, "Soviet Strategic Policy," in *The World Today*, July 1970, p. 273.

STAR EDITORIAL SAYS GOP-ITT MESS SHOULD BE CLEANED UP

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star in an editorial on yesterday emphasized the importance of clarifying the mystery surrounding a gift by the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. to the Republican National Convention.

The editorial emphasizes the importance of pursuing this matter "to the end, however bitter," to avoid shaking public faith in our system of government.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the editorial in the RECORD herewith:

THE ITT MESS

It is all too clear that the Senate Judiciary Committee must pursue the International Telephone and Telegraph \$400,000 mystery to the end, however bitter. More, much more, is at stake here than Richard G. Kleindienst's confirmation as attorney general.

For all we know, any connection between ITT's anti-trust settlement and the company's underwriting of Republican convention expenses may have had nothing to do with Kleindienst. As he and other administration spokesmen stoutly insist, there may have been no such connection.

But too many questions have been raised as to who did what, to and for whom, in this tangled affair. If they are left unanswered, public faith in our system of government will take a beating that the country cannot afford.

For these are not small questions. If in fact ITT's contribution was a payoff for Justice Department favors—if it was, indeed, a deal—then we confront a scandal of historic proportions that could involve highest administration officials.

There are indications that the G.O.P. now is preparing to renounce ITT's proffered largesse, and it would seem highly advisable for it to do just that. Such a move would involve no concession that this backing was tendered as a *quid pro quo* for settlement of the industrial conglomerate's merger problems. That agreement, between the Sheraton Corporation (an ITT subsidiary) and the City of San Diego (the Republican convention site) was a dubious proposition from the start.

Corporations, of course, are forbidden by law to contribute to political campaigns. It is doubtful that this prohibition covers gifts to a city for convention expenses. Yet the Republicans were critical when, in 1964, the

Democrats extracted \$15,000 a page from corporations for their convention program. Whether ITT's commitment is for \$400,000 or something less—the precise figure is part of the mystery—it is said to be by far the largest such donation in the history of convention financing. On the face of things, it is a bit much, even without the questions subsequently raised.

To forego ITT's generosity at this late date poses a tough problem for the Republicans. The citizens of San Diego seem strongly disinclined to grab for the check. But this mess has got to be cleaned up, one way or another. A good place to start is to say to ITT, however belatedly, what all concerned must fervently wish they had said in the first place: "Thanks, but no thanks."

ENVIRONMENTALISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious that concern for the environment can be carried to ridiculous extremes. In their zeal to return this land to its pristine state, the followers of the new religion of environmentalism seem to have forgotten that 208 million Americans must also live on this land. They must use resources for heat, housing, clothing, and food. If Americans are to have a standard of living above the starvation level, they must also use resources for energy.

I have noted, with some satisfaction, increasing differences of opinion between knowledgeable conservationists whose opinions have earned respect, and the new environmental zealots. The latter groups, composed of economically comfortable persons who profit from executive positions, article writing, and the lecture circuit, must receive continuous publicity or disappear. Unfortunately, these zealots have unquestioning followers who are eager to repeat their demands for instant solutions in complete disregard for the consequences in human suffering or economic damage.

An example of the selfish attitudes expressed by the environmental demagogues is this quotation of a leader in the field which was carried in the Fresno Bee on February 23, 1972.

We need to halt the growth of affluent, white, middle class America. The affluent, white American child uses 50 times the resources of a ghetto child.

If this is true, Mr. Speaker, what are its implications? I believe that the speaker's intention is clear. If he has his way, the ghetto child is to be denied the economic means to improve his standard of living. He means to call a moratorium on technical and economic progress, and thereby trap the poor in their existing situation.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are voices of reason and moderation. One of these is my friend, John F. Henning, executive secretary-treasurer, of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO. In a recent speech he most ably stressed the stake of labor and the unemployed in environmental issues. I will insert a report

of his speech, as carried in the California AFL-CIO News, into the RECORD at this point, and commend it to my colleagues as excellent reading:

[From the California AFL-CIO News, Feb. 25, 1972]

CALIFORNIA LABOR STRESSES STAKE OF JOBLESS IN ECOLOGIC ISSUES

Organized labor will not "remain silent in the face of assaults by environmentalists who would provoke more unemployment in a state already suffering from more than half a million jobless workers and in a nation where high unemployment has become part of economic planning by Washington."

So declared John F. Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, in an address in Los Angeles Wednesday in which he championed organized labor's position on environmental issues and challenged environmentalists "to make their proposals an integral part of economic and social advance."

The California AFL-CIO official stressed that organized labor does not intend to lend "the name and honor of labor to those who have through the years not only fought the working people but all environmental change."

Too often, Henning suggested, the conservationists' position "would mean additional limits on economic growth in a country already suffering from the restrictive monetary and fiscal policies which have added 2.5 million workers to the unemployment rolls since January of 1969."

In his address to a dinner meeting of the Los Angeles chapter of the Industrial Relations Research Association at the Wilshire Hyatt House in Los Angeles, Henning pointed out that:

Economic growth is imperative if we would have the more than two and a half million new jobs a year required to replace those removed by our average annual productivity increase of three percent. Economic growth is imperative if we would provide jobs for the approximate 1.5 million young workers who each year enter the labor force."

But, he charged, too many environmentalists "wish to throttle industrial expansion regardless of the distress thereby inflicted upon working people."

As an example, he cited the zoning debates that developed last year over San Francisco waterfront development which found "the wealthy and conservative voicing for the first time an interest in life along the Embarcadero."

"There is no record of these people over expressing resentment of the wretched housing that so long scarred the waterfront area; no record of resentment of the dangerous working conditions existing in the antiquated dock facilities; no record of resentment of the life seamen and longshoremen were once obliged to accept in this richest of nations...."

"The same environmentalists who will bleed over the sight of dead fish in oil polluted waters will never lift their voice in Sacramento or Washington in the name of jobless workers. These are the so-called moralists who like to lecture unions about narrow job interests. These are the so-called liberal intellectuals who take very good care of their own economic situation but who are outraged over protests by unemployed workers denied jobs by conservationists' schemes," he said.

Henning also cited the six-story height limitation placed on the ballot in San Francisco last fall and said that if it had been adopted there would have been no new high-rise offices or commercial construction.

"Such a limitation would not only have strangled San Francisco's commercial future but aborted thousands of jobs in the construction, service and maintenance fields," he said.

Another example of what he termed the "limited vision" of many environmentalists

is the demand for immediate prohibition of leaded gasoline.

"Abolition must ultimately come," he said, "but the immediate banning would prove a major economic blow to millions of workers. It would mean the choice of buying a new auto or converting a present car. The affluent would hardly notice."

But, he said, "the low-income family would be crippled by the choice."

"Is it, then, socially responsible merely to demand that only unleaded gasoline be sold as of this day? There must be a program of measured change; there must be a consideration of worker needs," he asserted.

Recalling that historically industrial decisions were made with little regard for social or environmental consequences, the State AFL-CIO official observed:

"The origins of our polluted nation rest in the still strong tradition of unregulated capitalism. Labor understands this and labor realizes that environmental reformers will be maligned and misrepresented by most of the U.S. business establishment."

"Labor also realizes that the environmental movement of the past decade was not only inevitable but essential if America would know something more than a civilization of waste, refuse and pollution," he said.

Henning emphasized, however, that there should be a natural alliance between labor and environmentalists and said that it's really ironic that labor finds itself "more and more in tragic combat with ecological reformers and their organizations."

But, he said, that conflict is not yet beyond control.

"It is the obligation of labor and environmentalists to search for areas of accord if they would both serve a common, liberal commitment," he said.

A number of such areas exist, Henning said, pointing to the Bay Area Rapid Transit System which has had the support of both environmentalists and labor since its inception. This project, he pointed out, will significantly reduce air and noise pollution and traffic congestion and improve the economic and physical environment of the area served.

At its peak, he noted, construction employment totaled 8,000 and an equal number of jobs were created in related industries. Thus BART met both environmental and economic needs.

Another area where conservationists and labor could find fairly easy accord, Henning said, is in the need to clean bays and rivers by installing new or revamped sewage disposal systems—programs that will create jobs and reduce pollution.

Henning emphasized that the AFL-CIO "remains willing to unite with socially responsible environmentalists."

He pointed out that last year the California AFL-CIO worked closely with the Sierra Club in Sacramento and Washington to maintain the 160-acre limitation of federal reclamation law and to seek to amend it to provide for federal purchase and resale or lease of excess lands to provide funds for recreational, conservation and educational development.

In conclusion, he reminded environmentalists "that the building of a decent society begins with the recognition of workers and their survival needs. Our dialogue should begin here," he said.

PAUL BABSON—A MAN WHO NEVER FAILED

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "A man who never failed."

These words epitomize Paul Babson and what he meant to his community of Wellesley, Mass., his State, and to the American financial world. He was many things to many persons—a sage and prophet as well as financial wizard to the business community; a generous and thoughtful philanthropist to the residents of New England; and a personable and delightful gentleman to his many friends and associates.

Paul Babson will be greatly missed in Massachusetts by all of us who loved and admired him and respected his wisdom. The many living monuments which stand to his memory will be all the more cherished as time touches them, and the lasting effect of his optimism will continue to inspire young lives to strive and to excel.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues a beautiful testament to the diversity of Paul Babson's achievements as summarized by the Wellesley Townsman on February 17, 1972.

PAUL BABSON DIES AT FLORIDA HOSPITAL IN HIS 77TH YEAR

Memorial services will be held Friday afternoon at 4 o'clock in the Church of the Covenant in Boston for Paul Talbot Babson, 77, prominent Boston businessman who lived on Kenilworth road for many years and was one of the community's most prominent citizens. Mr. Babson died Sunday in Memorial Hospital in Sarasota, Fla.

The man who would become known as one of New England's foremost philanthropists came to Wellesley as a young man and lived here during the many years in which he was among other important activities—a member of the Board of Directors of the Wellesley National Bank (now the South Shore National) from 1924 to 1966. He was its president from 1941 through 1947.

He would go on to become known as a man who never failed, and the story was told that when Standard and Poor's—the financial reporting firm—was in serious financial and management straits, he invested both cash and management shrewdness to save it and bring it roundly into the black.

Mr. Babson's philanthropies probably were not widely known. His most recent of interest to Wellesley involved new dormitory buildings at Babson College. His very substantial gift launched the project and it is now well on its way toward completion.

Babson was a director of McGraw-Hill, Inc., president and a director of the Gulf and Bay Corp. of Sarasota and a trustee of 330 Beacon St. Trust of Boston.

He was former chairman of the board of Standard & Poor's Corp. of New York and of the Boston-Worcester Corp. He also was an early associate of the late W. M. Kiplinger in the Kiplinger Washington News Letter.

A native of Seward, Neb. Babson was graduated from the University of Nebraska in 1917 with a degree in business administration. He served during World War I as a pilot in the Army Air Corps.

From 1924 to 1961 he was president and a director of United Business Services Co., a Boston-based investment adviser and publisher. He was author of a weekly column entitled "The Back Yard" which he wrote under the name of "Paul Talbot."

Babson was a trustee of Babson College, Springfield College and Newton Wellesley Hospital.

In a 60-year affiliation with the "Y" he was president and director of the Boston organization; a member of the National Council of YMCAs; a member and former vice-president of the National Board, and chairman of its International Committee of the United States and Canada during its worldwide "Buildings for Brotherhood" campaign.

For eight years, he served on the executive committee of the YMCA World Alliance, in Geneva and was awarded the YMCAs highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award.

In 1956, he was given the Washington Pilgrimage Citation as the nation's "Lay Churchman of the Year."

The University of Nebraska presented him with its Distinguished Service Award in 1941 and with an honorary doctor of laws in 1970. He also held honorary degrees from Boston University and Springfield College.

He was a member of the American Economics Society, the Boston Economics Club, Alpha Kappa Psi, the American Orchid Society, the Gulf and Bay Club, the Wellesley Club, the Wellesley County Club and the Algonquin Club.

He leaves his wife, Edith; a son, Donald P. of Wellesley Hills, and a brother, George L. of Syracuse, N.Y.

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

HON. K. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, a city in Utah's First Congressional District recently won a top national beautification award and in so doing set an example of what can be done to help improve the environment in which we live.

The community of Roy, Utah, was judged to have the most comprehensive community improvement program in the United States and received the National Clean-up Congress TRIGG Trophy for beautification excellence.

There were some 180 separate civic beautification projects involved in Roy's citywide improvement program and it was the total involvement of the community that not only won the national award, but also made Roy a much better community in which to live.

It is my pleasure today to pay tribute to the citizens of Roy, Utah, for their total involvement in community beautification. Such involvement is a result of not only cleaning up the physical facilities, but also involves the changing of attitudes. It is nice to know there are people such as those in Roy who have taken the initiative to improve their city and their lives.

I should also note that the city's youth were included in the project and often led the way with their enthusiasm. This will build a solid foundation for the years ahead and certainly makes for the "city with a future."

The Ogden Standard Examiner, one of northern Utah's major daily newspapers offered an editorial salute to Roy and I insert this in the RECORD for your consideration:

PRIDE, CHALLENGE IN ROY'S BEAUTY PRIZE

There was a justifiable sense of pride—and an underlying current of challenge—in the ceremonies Tuesday that recognized Roy as the nation's reigning beautification champion.

There's no question about Roy's right to display the three-foot-high gold-plated Trigg trophy, topped by a statue of Winged Victory, that symbolizes the community's triumph.

The story of how thousands of Roy citizens of all ages joined in the victorious campaign to make their city cleaner and more beautiful was told graphically in the big scrapbook that graced a table in the center of the Roy High Gymnasium.

Preparing that book meant a lot of work. But that preparation was only a fraction of the municipality's total effort that gave it first prize in the 1971 Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up competition.

No other Utah city has won the Trigg trophy before.

But what about 1972?

That's the challenge!

Jeff Lasater, 15-year-old, 6-foot-3, student body president at Sandridge Junior High, recognized this in the soul-searching remarks he made, rapidly because of his nervousness at facing the audience of "VIPs."

"We will have to work harder to keep our environment beautiful . . . as more people come to our earth," the handsome youth declared.

Councilman Joseph Dawson picked up the challenge, asserting that Roy's "total community involvement" to civic beautification "is built on a firm foundation."

Chairman George T. Frost of the Weber County Commission, expressing the entire county's pride in Roy's recognition, urged the championship city's neighbors to exhibit the same "sense of concern" and "strong motivation" for improvement.

Rep. K. Gunn McKay pointed out that "you can't be something you're not." Gov. Calvin L. Rampton said he hoped the achievements in Roy would serve as a model for the entire state, in keeping "with the great sense of pride in our homes and communities . . . that Utahns have shown for 125 years."

Roy Councilman Dennis Chugg, quarterback of the community's beautification team, acknowledged that winning of the 1971 national title had established standards that would take continued all-out effort to maintain. He said he believed the pace could be continued.

We think it can—if the spirit shown in the Roy High gymnasium this week is a true sample of the dedication to beautification throughout "The City With a Future."

The real key to meeting the challenge was illustrated, beautifully, in words and music by the Roy High concert band and chorale. They opened the meeting with "Your Land Is My Land" and closed it with "America the Beautiful."

That's what the beautification campaigns are really all about.

ENERGY SHORTAGES—1972

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, during the past 10 months that the House Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources has been investigating the energy supply/demand situation, we have been told repeatedly of impending shortages involving two basic energy sources—natural gas supplies and electric power generating plants.

Within the past few days, additional energy supply problems have been reported, together with projections of more shortages for the coming summer. The local natural gas utility, Washington Gas Light Co., has announced that, effective March 1, 1972, no new customers will be added to their system. This new policy

means that any building, old or new, residential or otherwise, cannot be connected to gas supply lines if a new line extension is required.

In western Pennsylvania, Columbia Gas has announced a similar ban on all new sales, including residential. This ban is also for an indefinite period. And, in Ohio, two Columbus-based gas companies have requested permission to impose a freeze on sales to new homeowners, a request presently being considered by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

In this instance, the president of the two companies said that it would be impossible to serve existing customers if new customers were contracted for. He also said that it will be mid-1973 at the soonest before the companies will be able to start supplying residential customers again. And, for nonresidential customers, it will be 1977 before all restrictions can be lifted.

One of the logical alternatives for natural gas is electricity. If the new homeowner or apartment construction firm can not get gas, then they can install electric heat, electric ranges, electric hot water heaters, and so forth. Or, can they?

On the same day that natural gas cutbacks were announced, the Federal Power Commission announced that summer electric power shortages are likely this year in Chicago and Miami. In both cities, the projected shortage is due in part to delays in starting up new power plants.

On a nationwide scale, the picture for electric power supply is summarized in a report by the National Electric Reliability Council of Princeton, N.J., published last month. In the interests of economy, I will not present the entire report, even though I recommend it for your review and consideration, but will present portions dealing with the reliability of our electric power supply.

The report is entitled, "Impact of a 12-Month Delay of New Nuclear and Fossil-Fired Steam Generating Units on the Adequacy of Electric Power Supply in the United States", and was prepared by the interregional review subcommittee of the technical advisory committee of NERC. The nine reliability regions comprising NERC are:

ECAR—East Central Area Reliability Coordination Agreement.

ERCOT—Electric Reliability Council of Texas.

MAAC—Mid-Atlantic Area Coordination Group.

MAIN—Mid-America Interpool Network.

MARCA—Mid-Continent Area Reliability Coordination Agreement.

NPCC—Northeast Power Coordinating Council.

SERC—Southeastern Electric Reliability Council.

SPP—Southwest Power Pool.

WSCC—Western Systems Coordinating Council.

As the report indicates:

Generation reserves are a vital and necessary component of generating capability to cover, most importantly, equipment failures, malfunctions, and essential maintenance. Reserves are not surplus capacity.

As the report also shows:

Any reduction in reserves from the required level is not a linear function when related to the reliability of power supply.

This nonlinear relationship between percent reserves and the ability to carry load can best be shown by an example from the report.

If reserves are cut in half—from 20% to 10%—the probability of insufficient capacity to carry the load increases sixty-fold. In other words, if a 20% reserve level results in only once in ten years when generating capability might be insufficient to carry the load, a reduction to a 10% reserve level will result in six occasions per year when load curtailment could be expected.

And, finally, the report deals with the question of interregional transfer of power into a shortage area, by showing that:

The widespread impact of delays in the in-service dates of new generation and the contiguity of the regions affected reduce to insignificance the ability of one region to assist another region. This eliminates interregional assistance as a remedy for coping with such delays. Here again, the problem is one of insufficient installed generation and not one to be met by transmission of power from other regions.

During the coming months, the task force will continue its study of the energy supply problem in the United States. The availability and costs of natural gas and electricity, together with oil and coal, are critical questions affecting all segments of our society.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present, as chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources, portions of the NERC report, presenting the relationship between new electric generating capacity and electric power reliability in the United States:

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL

FOREWORD

Recent US District Court decisions involving the issuance of a partial operating license for the Quad-Cities nuclear plant and the issuance of cooling water discharge permits by the Corps of Engineers raise the specter of serious delays in bringing into service new electric generating plants. These court decisions held that the regulations of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Corps of Engineers in implementing the National Environmental Policy Act are invalid and ordered that environmental impact statements must first be prepared by these agencies before granting the necessary power plant authorizations.

The National Electric Reliability Council (NERC) has directed the Interregional Review Subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to determine the impact of these court decisions on the adequacy of electric power supply on the basis that all nuclear and fossil-fired steam generating plants now under construction would be delayed by twelve months. This report evaluates the effect of such delays in each of the nine reliability regions comprising NERC.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report presents the results of an assessment of the impact on the adequacy of electric bulk power supply of potential delays of twelve months in the operation of all new nuclear and fossil-fired steam generating plants. The basis for this assumption is predicated on the possible effects of the two recent US District Court decisions referred to in the Foreword. The impact of such delays is analyzed for each of the nine regions

of the National Electric Reliability Council (NERC), encompassing the entire bulk power supply in the US and parts of Canada. The study is directed to an evaluation of the adequacy of region reserves for the peak-load periods of summer 1972, winter 1972-73, and summer 1973.

Based on a twelve-month delay in the operation of new nuclear and fossil-fired steam generating capacity an aggregate of 25,000 Mw, or one third of the scheduled generation reserves in NERC, would be unavailable during the summer 1972 peak-load period. In the winter 1972-73 peak-load period, 32,000 Mw or about 30% of the scheduled generation reserves would not be available. In the summer 1973 peak-load period, there would be a reduction in scheduled generation reserves of about 29,000 Mw, or 35% of these reserves. (See Tables 1, 2, and 3).

The impact of such delays would be considerably more severe in some regions than in others. In five of the nine regions—ECAR, ERCOT, MAIN, MARCA, and SERC—generation reserves would drop to 10% or less in the summer of 1972, reaching levels so low that periodic load curtailment would be expected. Reserves in the MAIN region would fall to less than 5%, and in SERC to 6.3%, values which are extremely low for any semblance of reliability.

Reserves during the winter 1972-73 peak-load period, while somewhat higher generally than during the previous summer, would still be critically low at 12% in the SERC region and 10.3% in the Rocky Mountain Power Pool area of the WSCC region. Furthermore, if essential maintenance requirements during the winter period are taken into account, the ECAR and MAIN regions, as well as the New York-New England subregion, would drop to marginal and submarginal reserve levels.

In the summer of 1973, five regions—ECAR, MAAC, MARCA, SERC and SPP—would fall again to 11% or less, with reserves in the MARCA region actually dropping to 4.6%. In addition, the MAIN region and the New York-New England subregion may well be critical in view of the fact that a substantial part of the generating capacity subject to a twelve-month delay would then be scheduled for service just prior to or during the summer of 1973. Should difficulties arise in start-up and this capacity become unavailable, reserves would drop in MAIN and New York-New England to 10.4 and 10.7%, respectively, a level which is critical.

On an overall NERC basis the aggregate delays in fossil-fired steam generating units during the period under consideration are in the order of twice the megawatt capacity of the nuclear units. This indicates the magnitude of escalation of the problem of inadequate power supply confronting the nation as compared with the already serious situation outlined in the NERC report of November 1971.¹ This latter report assessed the potential impact of nuclear plant delay as a consequence of the so-called "Calvert Cliffs" case.

As pointed out in the earlier report,² the impact of possible power plant delays as a result of recent court decisions, must be examined not merely in terms of such delays alone but also in the context of: (a) the industry's present reserve situation, which in some instances is already below desirable levels because of delays already experienced; (b) construction problems as a result of labor difficulties and delays in material and equipment deliveries; (c) less-than-acceptable performance of new generating units in their initial stage of operation; (d) increasing environmental restrictions in the

¹ Assessment of the Impact of Nuclear Delays on Adequacy of Electric Power Supply of the North American Bulk Power Systems.

² Ibid—Chapter I, pages 4-5.

operation of existing plants; and (e) fossil fuel shortages and a dislocation of supply.

Reference to Exhibits 3 and 5 herein shows the widespread impact of a twelve-month delay in completion of new generating capacity on the adequacy of power supply during the critical summer periods of 1972 and 1973. Past industry experience has repeatedly demonstrated the value of interconnected operation in allowing individual power system, to secure assistance for short-term emergencies from other power systems, areas, and regions. However, the dimensions of the problem confronted here are so vast

and widespread, both in terms of geographical impact and time duration, as to substantially eliminate interregional assistance as an ameliorating measure. Such delays would, during summer 1972, critically affect an area encompassing 40% of the US and 55% of the total electrical load of the nation. An additional 20% of the aggregate load would be exposed to below-normal reserves. During summer 1973, these values would increase to nearly 50% of the area of the US and encompass 80% of the total load. An additional 7% of the aggregate load would experience below-normal reserves.

Based on the above, the consequences of a twelve-month delay in the operation of all new nuclear and fossil-fired generating plants could only be considered disastrous in terms of adequacy of bulk power supply. In economic terms, the cost to the nation would be far-reaching.

This assessment has not considered the possible effects of the two court decisions on the operation of existing generating plants. Presumably, such plants could be subject to the same judicial action. If this were the case, the nation's electric power supply would be shut down.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF CAPABILITY (PEAKLOAD) RESERVE DUE TO POTENTIAL DELAYS OF 12 MONTHS IN THE OPERATION OF NEW NUCLEAR AND FOSSIL STEAM GENERATING UNITS
SUMMER 1972

	ECAR	ERCOT	MAAC	MAIN	MARCA	NPCC	SERC	SPP	WSCC	NERC
Net capability as scheduled ¹	58,761	25,716	34,860	34,567	14,764	54,028	73,543	33,723	74,879	404,841
Peakload.....	49,550	20,938	28,870	27,845	13,031	41,090	63,997	28,106	57,316	330,743
Reserves as scheduled:										
Megawatts.....	9,211	4,778	5,900	6,797	1,733	12,938	9,546	5,617	17,563	74,127
Percent.....	18.6	22.8	20.8	24.4	13.3	31.5	14.9	20.0	30.7	22.4
Delayed capacity: Megawatts.....	-4,215	-2,720	-1,555	-5,439	-719	-3,029	-5,543	-713	-848	-24,781
Reserves after delays:										
Megawatts.....	4,996	2,058	4,435	1,358	1,014	9,909	4,003	4,904	16,715	49,392
Percent.....	10.1	9.8	15.3	4.9	7.8	24.1	6.3	17.5	29.3	14.9

¹ Including net of purchases/sales, and without maintenance.

TABLE 2.—SUMMARY OF CAPABILITY (PEAKLOAD) RESERVE DUE TO POTENTIAL DELAYS OF 12 MONTHS IN THE OPERATION OF NEW NUCLEAR AND FOSSIL STEAM GENERATING UNITS
WINTER 1972-73

	ECAR	ERCOT	MAAC	MAIN	MARCA	NPCC	SERC	SPP	WSCC	NERC
Net capability as scheduled ¹	61,482	26,288	25,844	35,345	14,604	58,553	80,535	31,240	76,970	420,861
Net capability after maintenance.....	56,482	19,022	32,798	31,845	14,156	57,098	78,935	28,640	74,990	394,066
Peakload.....	48,692	13,545	24,933	23,902	11,959	44,815	65,252	19,210	61,131	313,439
Reserves after maintenance:										
Megawatts.....	7,790	5,477	7,865	8,018	2,297	12,283	13,683	9,430	13,859	80,702
Percent.....	16.0	40.5	31.5	33.5	19.4	27.4	21.0	49.2	22.7	25.8
Delayed capacity: megawatts.....	-4,865	-3,295	-1,555	-5,105	-729	-4,886	-8,032	-713	-2,283	-31,463
Reserves after delays:										
Megawatts.....	2,925	2,182	6,310	2,913	1,568	7,397	5,651	8,717	11,776	49,239
Percent.....	6.0	16.1	25.3	12.2	13.1	16.5	8.7	46.4	19.0	15.7

¹ Including net of purchasing/sales, and before maintenance.

² Reflects equipment unavailable as well as maintenance.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF CAPABILITY (PEAK LOAD) RESERVE DUE TO POTENTIAL DELAYS OF 12 MONTHS IN THE OPERATION OF NEW NUCLEAR AND FOSSIL STEAM GENERATING UNITS
SUMMER 1973

	ECAR	ERCOT	MAAC	MAIN	MARCA	NPCC	SERC	SPP	WSCC	NERC
Net capability as scheduled ¹	63,107	26,719	37,572	37,314	16,262	59,569	84,115	36,311	81,009	441,978
Peakload.....	54,161	23,011	31,470	30,114	14,269	43,970	70,994	30,772	61,065	359,826
Reserves as scheduled:										
Megawatts.....	8,946	3,708	6,120	7,275	1,993	15,599	13,121	5,539	19,944	82,227
Percent.....	16.5	16.1	19.4	24.2	14.0	35.4	18.5	18.0	32.8	22.8
Delayed capacity: Megawatts.....	-4,034	-575	-3,315	-2,209	-1,335	-3,920	-7,744	-2,144	-3,389	-28,665
Reserves after delays:										
Megawatts.....	4,912	3,133	2,787	5,066	658	11,679	5,377	3,395	16,555	53,562
Percent.....	9.1	13.6	8.9	16.8	4.6	26.6	7.6	11.0	27.2	14.9

¹ Including net of purchases/sales, and without maintenance.

PLANE TESTING TOTALLY INADEQUATE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office recently reported on testing programs conducted on components of our new jet aircraft.

That report reveals that much of our testing program today is outmoded and deceptive.

Some equipment for the planes is 500 percent less dependable than predicted by tests and required by minimal military standards. Presently each individual component is tested separately and once breakdown rates are equal to or greater

than required military standards the particular component is approved for installation on an aircraft. Once the sophisticated equipment is actually put together on a plane that flies, it breaks down much more often than expected.

Despite this obvious problem, the military continues to use the same old testing system that gives misleading and often meaningless results.

For example, tests of computers for the reconnaissance version of the F-4 phantom jet predicted a breakdown every 320 hours. That was above the required military standards. But once the plane was put in actual operation the system broke down on the average every 40 hours. This computer is eight times more likely to malfunction than predicted by original tests and required by minimal military standards.

The result of this inadequate and often

deceptive testing program is a lot of broken down equipment that takes a great deal of time and money to repair.

Testing should be completed on prototype aircrafts rather than on individual components. The only way to test an aircraft is to build a complete prototype and find out if it works or not.

Instead, today, the military's piecemeal testing program produce useless and even deceptive testing results. The General Accounting Office's report which is a letter to Secretary Laird, follows:

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1972.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The General Accounting Office (GAO) has looked at the procedure used by the Air Force to achieve reliability in aviation equipment. Aware that a low level of reliability was being experienced on some equipment, GAO wanted to know why.

We examined the performance records of selected subsystems and compared these with

reliability test requirements incorporated in the procurement contracts. Our work was performed at the Ogden, Oklahoma City, Warner Robins, and San Antonio Air Materiel Areas; the Air Force Logistics Command; and the Air Force Systems Command.

The Air Force buys and accepts subsystems from contractors on the basis of reliability demonstrated in tests. There is little, or no, direct correlation, however, between the reliability achieved in tests and that experienced during actual operations. When installed in aircraft, these subsystems are usually much less reliable.

The quality of maintenance performed in the field, the type of missions the equipment is used on, the skill with which it is used and how the equipment interfaces with other subsystems all affect its reliability. For these reasons, it is understandable that reliability in actual use will be somewhat less than in test conditions. However, because such extensive differences are being experienced by the Air Force, we believe there are weaknesses in the testing methods or criteria being used.

TEST RESULTS COMPARED WITH OPERATIONAL EXPERIENCE

One measure of reliability of equipment is the length of time that it will perform satisfactorily without failing. This interval of time is called "mean time between failures" (MTBF). The Air Force and the Naval Air Systems Command contracts specify a minimum acceptable interval that must be achieved in reliability testing.

Comparisons were made of actual operating performances of subsystems with the minimums used in the testing programs, and wide differences were noted. The bomb navigation system of the A-7D attack aircraft illustrates this.

The bomb navigation system integrates various avionic subsystems which provide (1) navigation to the target, (2) a computerized run on the target, (3) weapon release, and (4) return navigation from the target. The failure of any one of the major subsystems detrimentally affects the accuracy of the system. The following table shows the minimum acceptable reliability, which was met during test, and the actual mean time between failures experienced. Additional comparisons for F-4 aircraft systems are shown in an attachment.

MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES

[In hours]

Major subsystems of the bomb navigation system	Minimum acceptable demonstrated by test	Experienced during actual operations
Forward looking radar ¹	125	20
Weapon delivery computer.....	650	95
Air data computer.....	500	175
Doppler radar.....	250	48
Head up display.....	350	88
Inertial measurement.....	325	77

¹ At the time of our review the forward looking radar had not passed the minimum acceptable reliability qualification test

NEED FOR BETTER TESTING

Reliability is a system performance characteristic which must be considered when the effectiveness of a weapon system is being determined. The characteristic, therefore, is as important in designing new weapon systems as other performance parameters such as range, speed, or payload weight. The decisionmaker must decide whether more time and money should be spent for additional research, or to accept equipment with the possibility of incurring additional costs for subsequent modifications and logistic support. However, the reliability information available—on which decisions are based—does not permit realistic prediction of reliability. We believe that better testing will provide a more realistic prediction of reliability.

A Military Standard (781B) has been issued to facilitate the development of factors for realistic correlation of test and operational levels of reliability. According to an Air Force Systems Command official, there is no correlation between test and operational MTBF's primarily because tests do not simulate environmental conditions and do not assure that the components are compatible with other equipment. Also, important test requirements are sometimes waived. It is the opinion of Air Force Logistics Command personnel that tests, if properly planned and administered, will show a correlation between test and operational levels of reliability. Operational levels of reliability averaged over a large number of units could be within 20 to 30 percent of the reliability specified in tests. To support their opinion, they referred to a study by Air Research, Incorporated, on the Navy's P-3C aircraft program, which showed that in the majority of cases the minimum acceptable level of reliability was achieved in operations when good test plans were implemented and enforced.

Conclusions and recommendations

Acceptance of subsystems after they have demonstrated reliability not only in laboratory tests but also in actual use would be the preferred method of acquiring subsystems. Until that type of procurement becomes a reality it appears that better testing will limit the deviations between test results and actual use. We believe that better testing will provide subsystems which will perform closer to acceptable limits.

We recommend that the Air Force adopt procedures to (1) assure a correlation of test and operations MTBF's and (2) assure that the predictions of operational reliabilities are within known confidence limits.

The above recommendations are subject to the provisions of Section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. We will appreciate receiving copies of the statements you furnish the specified committees in accordance with these provisions.

If you desire, we will be glad to discuss these matters in greater detail with you or with your staff.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. TUTTMANN,
Acting Director.

MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES

[In hours]

Major subsystems of the F-4 aircraft	Minimum acceptable required by test	Experienced during actual operations
Radio navigation system:		
Navigation computer set (RF-4C).....	320	40
Navigation computer set (F-4E).....	320	87
Inertial navigation system (RF-4C).....	175	38
Inertial navigation system (F-4E).....	180	62
Loran (RF-4C).....	50	25
Integrated electronic central (F-4C).....	50	17
Integrated electronic central (F-4E).....	50	32
Radar navigation system:		
Radar altimeter (RF-4C).....	400	26
Radar mapping system:		
Forward looking radar (RF-4C).....	90	15
Side looking radar (RF-4C).....	56	12
Bombing navigation system:		
Attitude reference bomb computer set (F-4D).....	173	93
Computer system (F-4D).....	250	246
Fire control system:		
Radar set (F-4E).....	9	12
Tuning drive (F-4E).....	1 600	632
Lead computing sight (F-4E).....	300	430

¹ Specifications were not available, therefore, Air Force officials estimated the minimum acceptable figure.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rising production costs faced by milk producers, I have been urging Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz to increase the support level for manufacturing milk.

Last year it was set at \$4.93 per hundredweight, or 85 percent of parity.

Because of rising costs the parity figure changes during the year. A \$4.93 price today equals something less than 80 percent of parity. This is an average price based on a national average milk fat test of 3.67 percent.

Knowing dairy farmers so well, it was with real regret that I learned of Secretary Butz' decision to maintain the support price at its present level for the marketing year starting April 1. I include at the close of my remarks an Agriculture Department news release announcing that action.

The National Milk Producers Federation, one of the major associations representing dairy producers, had shown restraint, I felt, in asking that the support price be increased to reflect 85 percent of parity at today's figure. This would have been an increase of about 35 cents per hundredweight, to \$5.28.

Rather than improving the income position of dairy farmers, this modest increase would have placed them back where they were a year ago. Instead, they are being asked to absorb that added cost.

In order that my colleagues may gain further understanding of the producer's side of this question, I include a news release issued today by the National Milk Producers Federation, followed by a letter written to USDA by NMPF Secretary Patrick B. Healy.

In order that they might know in a little more detail some reasons for the USDA's decision, I include a report to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—ASCS—from a study by USDA's Economic Research Service on "Impacts of Alternative Dairy Price Support Levels."

This will give each Member a chance to look at the economic arguments.

The material follows:

[U.S. Department of Agriculture news release]

USDA ANNOUNCES DAIRY SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR 1972-73

WASHINGTON, March 9.—Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz today announced that the support level for manufacturing milk will be continued at \$4.93 per hundredweight for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1972. The support rate for manufacturing milk is for milk of national average milk fat test of 3.67 percent. This is equivalent to \$4.79 per hundredweight for milk of 3.5 percent test.

The law requires that milk be supported at such level between 75 and 90 percent of parity as the Secretary determines necessary to assure an adequate supply. The Secretary has determined that the support rate of \$4.93 will assure an adequate supply. This level of support should provide assurance against the resumption of a downward trend in milk pro-

duction and provide a supply of milk adequate for our commercial needs and an increase in the quantity of dairy products, over the approximately 7 billion pounds of milk equivalent acquired by CCC this year, which will be available for domestic food assistance and other programs.

The announced prices to be paid for butter, nonfat dry milk and cheese to carry out the support level will remain unchanged for the 1972-73 marketing year. These prices follow:

[Cents per pound]

Butter, U.S. grade A or higher: ¹	
New York, N.Y., and Jersey City, Newark and Secaucus, N.J.	68.75
Seattle, Wash., Washington, San Francisco, Calif., California, Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina	67.75
U.S. grade B: 2 cents per pound less than for U.S. grade A.	
Cheddar cheese, U.S. grade A or higher, standard moisture basis	54.75
Nonfat dry milk (spray) U.S. extra grade (but not more than 3.5 percent moisture): 50-pound bags, with sealed closures	31.7

¹ The price of butter located at any other point will be the price at a designated market, either New York, Seattle, or San Francisco, less 80 percent of the lowest published domestic railroad freight rate per pound gross weight for a 60,000 pound carlot, in effect at the beginning of this marketing year, from such other point to the designated market names by the seller.

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION
NEWS RELEASE

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 9.—Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz today announced that dairy price support levels would be continued unchanged during the 1972-73 marketing year.

Secretary Butz took this action in spite of recommendations of the National Milk Producers Federation and its member dairy cooperatives which presented a sound economic case for an adjustment in the price support level to 85 percent of parity.

"Announcement by the Department of Agriculture that prices paid dairy farmers for milk after April 1 would be supported at last year's level is severe and unwarranted," commented Patrick B. Healy, Secretary, National Milk Producers Federation. "It is astounding that the Administration, in reaching such decision, completely overlooked the economic necessity of adjusting prices paid dairy farmers, so that they could keep pace with increased production costs," he continued.

The present price support level of \$4.93 per hundredweight was 85 percent of parity

when made effective a year ago. Increases in production costs were such that it would be necessary to increase the price to \$5.28 to maintain the 85 percent of parity position. Even this would mark no improvement in the income position of farmers.

Farmers support efforts to bring inflation under control but cannot absorb increases in costs unless they are compensated with higher prices. Adjustments in prices to dairy farmers are as essential to the economy as adjustments in wage rates which have been built into the wage and price control program.

Dairy farmers cannot be expected to carry the whole burden for holding the line on prices paid by consumers for food.

"We are now looking to the Congress to rectify this injustice to dairymen," stated Healy. "We are asking the Congress to establish a support price paid farmers for milk at 85 percent of parity for the marketing year ending March 31, 1973. To that end, we are calling on all members of the Senate and House of Representatives to enact the necessary legislation without delay."

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS

FEDERATION,

Washington, D.C., February 15, 1972.

Re Notice in Federal Register (Vol. 37, No. 1) January 4, 1972, Requesting Data, Views, and Recommendations Relative to Terms and Conditions of Price Support Program for Milk for Marketing Year Beginning, April 1, 1972.

MR. REUBEN R. JONES,
Director, Livestock and Dairy Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: This is in response to the notice in the Federal Register, January 4, 1972, requesting data, views, and recommendations relative to terms and conditions of price support for milk for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1972.

The views of the National Milk Producers Federation are the nationwide expression of dairy farmers and of their cooperative marketing associations. The Federation membership consists of cooperative associations doing business throughout the 50 states of the Union, and represents the great majority of all milk produced and marketed in the United States.

The Federation membership, at its 55th Annual Convention held November 29-December 1, 1971, carefully considered the need for adjusting price support levels, and purchase prices of commodities, for the 1972-73 marketing year. Since that time, the Federation membership has given the matter further consideration in light of the latest data. The views expressed herein are those of the Federation's Executive Committee at its meeting on February 15, 1972.

The Executive Committee consists of 21

cooperative leaders throughout the United States. Its actions are reflective of the member cooperative associations and their dairy farmer members.

The National Milk Producers Federation staunchly supports the Price Support Program, as authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949, as a major bulwark of legislation enacted to stabilize the dairy industry, improve incomes to dairy farmers throughout the nation, and to assure adequate supplies of milk and its products for consumers.

The Congress, in enacting agricultural legislation consistently has declared parity prices to farmers as its goal. In efforts to adjust farm prices toward this goal as rapidly as possible, it has enacted specific legislation pertaining to the dairy industry. Among those are the Agricultural Act of 1949, authority for the Price Support Program; the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, authority for the milk marketing order program; and other enactments which amend and supplement these two major laws.

The National Milk Producers Federation and its member cooperative associations of dairy farmers believe that attainment of parity prices to farmers is essential, if they are to participate in the economy on a basis that is equitable with other segments of the population.

The cooperative associations of dairy farmers are making every effort to achieve parity prices, and realize the necessity of Government assistance such as the Price Support Program.

It will be necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1972, a level of price support to dairy farmers for milk, and prices at which the Commodity Credit Corporation will purchase dairy products to achieve the announced price support level.

On March 25, 1971, the Secretary of Agriculture announced a price level of \$4.93 per hundredweight for milk of average butterfat content for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1971, and ending March 31, 1972. On March 26, 1971, he announced prices at which the Commodity Credit Corporation would purchase: butter, nonfat dry milk, and cheese as a means of assuring dairy farmers the support level of \$4.93 per hundredweight for their milk during the year.

With respect to such announcements:

1. The \$4.93 per hundredweight represented a price at 85 percent of parity based on the latest parity data available at the time of such announcement. It is estimated that 85 percent of parity in March 1972 will be \$5.25 or higher. Thus 85 percent of parity will be at least 33 cents per hundredweight above the 1971-72 price support level.

2. Dairy farmers received less than the announced level of \$4.93 per hundredweight in 8 of the first 10 months of the current marketing year, by amounts ranging from 4 to 13 cents per hundredweight. See Table 1.

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF MONTHLY DATA, SHOWING PARITY EQUIVALENT PRICES FOR MANUFACTURING MILK, THE ANNOUNCED SUPPORT PRICE, PERCENT THE ANNOUNCED SUPPORT PRICE WAS OF THE PARITY EQUIVALENT PRICE, PRICES RECEIVED BY FARMERS FOR MANUFACTURING MILK, PERCENT THAT SUCH PRICES WERE OF THE PARITY EQUIVALENT PRICE AND THE AMOUNT BY WHICH THE PRICE RECEIVED BY FARMERS VARIED FROM THE ANNOUNCED SUPPORT PRICE, APRIL 1971-JANUARY 1972

[All prices for milk of average annual butterfat content—3.67 percent]

Month	Announced support level			Received by farmers			Month	Announced support level			Received by farmers		
	Parity equivalent prices	Price	Percent of parity equivalent price	Price	Percent of parity equivalent price	Variation from support price		Parity equivalent prices	Price	Percent of parity equivalent price	Price	Percent of parity equivalent price	Variation from support price
April 1971	\$5.85	\$4.93	85.0	\$4.84	82.7	—\$0.09	September 1971	\$5.97	\$4.93	82.6	\$4.82	80.7	—\$0.11
May 1971	5.89	4.93	83.7	4.82	81.8	—11	October 1971	5.98	4.93	82.4	4.85	81.1	—13
June 1971	5.92	4.93	83.3	4.81	81.2	—12	November 1971	6.00	4.93	82.2	4.89	81.5	—15
July 1971	5.89	4.93	83.7	4.81	81.7	—12	December 1971	6.01	4.93	82.0	4.97	82.7	+6
August 1971	5.96	4.93	82.7	4.80	80.5	—13	January 1972	6.16	4.93	80.0	4.97	80.7	+7

¹ As per announcement, during the course of the 1971-72 marketing year, the dairy farmers' production and living costs increased substantially. This is demonstrated by the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities and services, interest, taxes and wage rates. See table 2.

TABLE 2.—Index of prices, paid by farmers for commodities and services, interest, taxes, and wage rates, April 1971-January 1972

[Index—1910-14=100]

April 1971	407
May 1971	410
June 1971	412
July 1971	410
August 1971	412
September 1971	413
October 1971	414
November 1971	415
December 1971	416
January 1972	420

TABLE 4.—PURCHASES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS BY THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, 1970-71 AND 1971-72

	1970-71	1971-72
Butter (pounds).....	305,000,000	285,000,000
Cheese (pounds).....	57,000,000	95,000,000
Nonfat dry milk (pounds).....	452,000,000	425,000,000
Evaporated milk (pounds).....	79,000,000	80,000,000
Government cost of price support program.....	\$410,000,000	\$350,000,000

¹ Partially estimated.

Milk production increased during the 1971-72 marketing year by only about one percent over the previous year. Furthermore, on a per capita basis, production held at or was very close to the 1970-71 level.

Marketings by farmers showed a moderate increase in 1971-72, but commercial market sales also increased. These increases are partially explained by the additional day due to leap year.

During the 1971-72 marketing year, CCC purchases of butter and nonfat dry milk will be lower than for the previous marketing year.

Cheese purchases thus far have been higher. Most cheese purchases, however, were made on a bid basis for the School Lunch Program.

The closing Government inventories will be low March 31, 1972. On January 31, 1972, USDA had stocks of only 37 million pounds of butter, 2 million pounds of cheese and a million pounds of nonfat dry milk. These included supplies being packaged for specific program uses.

The purchases by CCC during the 1971-72 marketing year represented a needed source of dairy products for Government programs, a great quantity of which would have been needed even without the Price Support Program, such as cheese for the School Lunch Program.

The number of children in schools and the number of persons participating in Government programs will be substantially higher in the next marketing year, thus indicating need for more dairy products, particularly cheese and nonfat dry milk.

It should be noted that the net Government cost of the Price Support Program for 1971-72 will be substantially less than for the 1970-71 marketing year. This is reflective of the reduction in purchases of butter and nonfat dry milk, but is in large measure due to export sales of butter which amounted to about 140 million pounds. The opportunity for selling butter overseas resulted from a change in milk supplies relative to requirements in Western Europe and England, accompanied by drought conditions in New Zealand and Australia. Also, tighter supply situation is in evidence in Canada.

Although conditions which prevailed outside the United States may not be the same during the 1972-73 marketing year, it reasonably can be estimated that some 100 million pounds of butter will be needed for the export market. Such exports will relieve the United States of excess butterfat, which nec-

essarily will be produced if the domestic market is to have a sufficient supply of milk solids-not-fat for all uses. Furthermore, such sales will favorably affect the U.S. balance of payments.

A review of CCC purchases over the past several marketing years demonstrates that Government purchases of milk solids-not-fat reached their peak of 13.3 percent of total marketings in 1961-62. Since that time, they have receded gradually, and will approximate only 4.5 percent in 1971-72.

In view of the needs for dairy products containing milk solids-not-fat for Government programs, the present purchase levels are approaching, if not already past, a practical minimum. Milk and dairy products, both commercially and through Government programs, are essential to the nutritional well-being of the U.S. population. Furthermore, their use has been of great value in up-grading diets in under-developed areas.

The need for milk and dairy products in the diet has been repeatedly recognized by the Congress in enacting legislation and in providing funds for the National School Lunch Program, the Special Milk Program for Children, supplemental feeding programs for the armed forces, Veterans' Administration hospitals and for other feeding programs, domestic and foreign.

It is essential that milk production be encouraged to meet the requirements of the U.S. population, which is increasing at a rate of some 2.5 million persons per year.

Prices paid dairy farmers, like other prices, have been increasing in recent years, but such increases have been insufficient to stem the downward trend in milk production. During the period 1960-71, prices paid dairy farmers for milk increased nearly 40 percent, but all prices were increasing at the same time. When increases in prices paid farmers for milk are deflated to represent its purchasing power in terms of goods and services, the price paid dairy farmers in 1971 was only 2 percent above 1960.

During this same span of years, per capita disposable income for wage earners rose over 85 percent, and when deflated on the same basis, still amounted to more than 35 percent. Thus, off-farm employment opportunities have drawn great numbers out of dairy farming.

U.S. milk production reached its peak of 127 billion pounds in 1964. Since that time, it has declined. In 1971 total milk production was about 118.6 billion pounds, only slightly above 1970, and represented no increase when expressed on a per capita basis.

The number of farms maintaining dairy herds has been diminishing for 25 years. In 1945, milk or cream was being marketed from about 2.3 million farms. At present, the number is something less than 400,000 farms. Likewise, the number of milk cows has declined, being 12.3 billion head as of January 1, 1972, the lowest number on record.

These trends are reflective of the low returns from dairy farming relative to costs of production and to other opportunities available to farm operators.

In striving to maintain or improve net incomes, dairy farmers have made significant increases in productivity. This is expressed in larger herd sizes, increased milk production per cow, and increased milk production per unit of labor. These gains have required greatly increased investments by dairy farmers, and greater cash outlays.

Dairy farmers have been exerting tremendous efforts to improve their own income, relative to their costs. These include herd improvement through artificial insemination, selective breeding, record keeping, improved feeding practices, in mechanization to reduce labor and other costs per unit; and by strengthening their cooperative marketing associations.

Increases in productivity, particularly milk production per cow, cannot be sustained

at rates which have prevailed in recent years. It will be necessary to arrest the decline in cow numbers, if there is to be an adequate supply of milk.

Gains which farmers have made by increasing productivity have been more than offset by the continuing rise in production and living costs, which are beyond their control.

While prices received by dairy farmers for milk increased 2.6 percent from 1970 to 1971, prices, wages, taxes, and interest rates paid by farmers for production and living expenses rose approximately 5.1 percent. Thus dairy farmers lost ground in 1971. These trends indicating higher costs are continuing. This is shown by the parity index of prices, taxes, interest and wages paid by farmers, which rose from 400 in January 1971 to 420 in January 1972, or 5 percent.

Dairy farmers commend the efforts of the Government to bring the inflationary spiral to a halt. It is obvious, however, that despite Herculean efforts, costs to dairy farmers will continue upward during the 1972-73 marketing year.

The inflation control program contemplates a general increase in the U.S. price level of some 3 percent during the year and likely it will be more. It contemplates wage rate increases of 5 percent which also must be considered as the minimum.

The Federal budget indicates substantially higher governmental expenditures which will exert upward pressures on costs to dairy farmers.

If the 1972-73 price support level for manufacturing milk were established at 85 percent of the parity equivalent price at the beginning of the marketing year—which is the minimum we believe should be considered by the Secretary—it would only reflect cost increases to dairy farmers which have occurred during the past marketing year. It would, in no way, compensate them for prospective cost increases which will occur during the 1972-73 marketing year. Thus, if incomes to dairy farmers are to be maintained, it will be necessary in establishing the price support level for the 1972-73 marketing year to consider prospective cost increases during the year.

In viewing the cost of the Price Support Program, consideration should be given to the fact that most, if not all, of the dairy product purchases have served Government nutrition needs and that the cost of maintaining the price support to dairy farmers has consistently been low relative to the contribution of the dairy industry, to total agricultural income, and low relative to the total Government cost for supporting agriculture.

Furthermore, Government costs for maintaining prices paid farmers for milk have been relatively stable during a period within which the total expenditures by Government for all services has more than doubled.

The prices at which CCC will purchase dairy products during the 1972-73 marketing year should be set at levels which will assure that the intended support to farmers for milk will be fully accomplished.

If the support level to farmers were established at 85 percent of parity, we would recommend no change in the purchase price of butter, but that the upward adjustment be made in the price of nonfat dry milk and cheese. If, however, the price support level is established higher than 85 percent of parity, then we would recommend some upward adjustment in the price of butter as well as the other two products.

In establishing the level of price support to farmers, it should be kept in mind that the goal of agricultural legislation, including the price support authority, is achievement of parity prices to farmers.

In the attainment of this goal, we urge the Department of Agriculture to utilize all

of its available authority, including the Price Support Program, the marketing order program, the full use of section 32 funds, the supplementing of price support purchases by use of Section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, the curtailment of imports under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the maximum use of milk and dairy products through the Special Milk Program for Children, the School Lunch Program and other feeding programs, both domestic and foreign.

If these authorities are utilized to their full potential, farmers can eventually obtain parity prices in the marketplace. As an important step toward this goal, the level of price support for the 1972-73 marketing year should be established at not less than 85 percent of parity.

Sincerely,

PATRICK B. HEALY,
Secretary.

IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS

(A report to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service by the Economic Research Service U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 1972)

INTRODUCTION

The decision on the price support level for milk in the 1972-73 marketing year will have impacts on production, sales, Government costs, dairy farm income, and consumer costs for dairy products. These effects will extend over a number of years. In order to provide estimates of the probable effects of various support levels, ASCS entered into an agreement with ERS on October 18, 1971,

to conduct an economic analysis of the production and consumption of milk and dairy products under various assumptions as to support levels in the marketing year 1972-73.

This analysis is designed to show the differential effects of five alternative support programs for 1972-73. In comparing the effects of these different programs, all other economic variables have been held at the same level for each alternative in any given year. In order to isolate the effects of the 1972-73 price support level, it is assumed that there will be no increases in support prices in subsequent years. Thus, this analysis is not a prediction of the course of events in the dairy industry in the next 5 years. It is a projection of the effects of alternative price support levels, if those price levels are maintained through 1976-77. It is the comparison of the long-term effects of these alternative price support programs which is unique. The results of this analysis may not afford meaningful comparisons with the results of other analyses made under different assumptions.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IN THE SIXTIES

Milk prices were fairly steady through the first half of the sixties, while production rose to a peak in 1964 and then began a fairly rapid decline. Support prices were raised from 75 to 89.5 percent of parity in 1966. A rise in market prices had preceded the increase in the support level. Since then, prices have generally risen. Production reached a low point in 1969 and increased slightly in 1970 and again in 1971.

The consumption of milk and dairy products combined has declined both in total and per capita since 1960. Significant in-

creases have occurred for lowfat fluid milk products, hard cheese and cottage cheese. The most significant declines in consumption have been in fluid whole milk, fluid cream, butter, evaporated milk and condensed milk. Per capita sales of nonfat dry milk declined moderately between 1960 and 1971, although year-to-year changes were erratic.

Commodity Credit Corporation net removals of butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk under price support programs declined from a 1961-62 peak to a low point in 1966-67. Removals moved upward the following year and then downward through the 1969-70 marketing year. In 1969-70, for the first time since 1953-54, CCC purchases of fat solids as a percent of total fat solids marketed were greater than the percent removals of solids-not-fat.

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS ANALYZED

The effects of three different dairy support programs were analyzed:

The 1971-72 support level of \$4.93 per hundredweight.

Support level at \$5.20—85 percent of estimated parity as of April 1, 1972.

Support level at \$5.50—90 percent of estimated parity as of April 1, 1972.

The analyses of the programs at \$5.20 and \$5.50 (85 and 90 percent of parity) were conducted under two sets of alternatives as to purchase prices for butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk. For the first set, butter prices were held at 1971-72 levels and cheese and nonfat dry milk were raised to yield the specified support price levels. For the second set, the prices of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk were maintained in the same relationship as in 1971-72. The purchase prices used are shown in table 1.

TABLE 1.—SUPPORT PURCHASE PRICES UNDER ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

Alternative and description	Support level of manufacturing milk Dol./cwt.	Support purchase prices			Purchase price evaporated milk Ct./lb.
		Butter Ct./lb.	Cheese Ct./lb.	Nonfat dry milk Ct./lb.	
I. Current level.....	4.93	67.8	54.75	31.7	16.13
II. 85 percent of parity ¹	5.20				
(a) Butter price constant.....		67.8	58.50	36.3	17.23
(b) Current ratio.....		72.1	58.50	33.9	17.23
III. 90 percent of parity ¹	5.50				
(a) Butter price constant.....		67.8	61.50	39.9	18.12
(b) Current ratio.....		75.8	61.50	35.5	18.12

¹ Estimated parity as of Apr. 1, 1972.

For this analysis, most variables not crucial to the analysis were assumed unchanged at their levels in recent years. These include the relationship of average prices for all milk to support price levels, imports, exports, farm-retail price spreads, military consumption, and Government purchases of evaporated milk and dry whole milk. The assumptions as to general economic conditions were that per capita income will increase at 4 percent per year in current dollar, population will increase in line with Census projections, and that the unemployment rate will decline to 4 percent by 1976-77.

EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS, 1972-73 TO 1976-77

Effects on milk production

The current income position of commercial dairy farmers is good and they are increasing production at a moderate rate in response to earlier price increases. Without further price increases, milk production can be expected to increase by about 1 billion pounds next year, nearly level off in 1973-74, and then decline at a rate of about 1 billion pounds per year for the next 3 years (table 2). Most of the adjustment to the higher prices and improved income position will be completed during 1972-73, with some slight carryover

to 1973-74. During 1973-74, milk production will begin to decline as moderately increasing prices in the rest of the economy will cause the costs of milk production to rise and increase returns in alternative farm enterprises. Also, increased availability of non-farm jobs will pull more farm operators and farm labor away from dairying. In areas where dairying competes with other livestock enterprises, favorable prices for hogs and beef will exert a pull toward those enterprises. The decline in production in the last 3 years (1974-75 to 1976-77) is due to a combination of these factors.

TABLE 2.—MILK PRODUCTION, SALES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS, AND USDA ACQUISITION COSTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS BOUGHT UNDER THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM, ALTERNATIVE PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77

Item and alternative	Support price	Purchase prices raised ¹	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Milk production (billion pounds milk equivalent):								
I.....	\$4.93		118.9	119.9	120.0	119.0	118.0	117.0
II.....	5.20		118.9	120.3	120.7	121.0	120.3	119.4
III.....	5.50		118.9	120.7	121.2	121.6	121.8	121.0
Sales: ²								
I(a).....	4.93		109.5	108.9	108.6	108.5	108.2	108.1
II(a).....	5.20	NFDM, cheese all.....	109.5	108.1	107.8	107.6	107.4	107.2
III(a).....	5.20	do.....	100.5	107.3	107.1	106.9	106.7	106.5
I(b).....	5.50	do.....	109.5	107.2	106.9	106.8	106.5	106.3
II(b).....	5.50	do.....	109.5	106.0	105.7	105.6	105.4	105.2

Footnotes at end of table.

3 31472-002-117420

Item and alternative	Support price	Purchase prices raised ¹	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
USDA acquisition costs ² (million):								
I.....	4.93	-----	\$400	\$465	\$480	\$429	\$379	\$321
II(a).....	5.20	NFDM, cheese all.....	400	584	606	619	579	523
II(b).....	5.20	do.....	400	606	630	645	605	550
III(a).....	5.50	do.....	400	704	737	754	758	706
III(b).....	5.50	do.....	400	739	774	795	800	750

¹ Products purchased under the price support program for which purchase prices were raised over 1971-72 levels.

² Domestic commercial sales plus exports and shipments from commercial stocks (1,000,000,000 pounds per year).

³ Quantities of dairy products purchased valued at support purchase prices.

Note: See tables 8-16 for more detail.

With the support price at \$5.20—85 percent of parity as of April 1, 1972—production can be expected to rise somewhat more sharply in 1972-73 and continue to increase through 1974-75. In that year, production will peak at 121 billion pounds, declining thereafter at a somewhat slower rate than is projected for current price levels, since the pinch of rising costs will be felt less at higher price levels.

With the support level at \$5.50—90 percent of parity as of April 1, 1972—production will increase even more rapidly and peak in 1975-76 at about 121.8 billion pounds. A decline in production would appear in 1976-77.

Impacts on demand

If prices are not increased, per capita consumption of most dairy products will decline moderately in the next 5 years. Even with population increases, total commercial disappearance of butter, fluid milk and cream, and evaporated milk will decline (Appendix tables 13 and 14). Total commercial disappearance of cheese, ice cream, and nonfat dry milk will increase. However, total dairy product sales (in terms of milk equivalent—fat solids basis) will decline at an average rate of about 0.2 billion pounds per year (table 2).

With support levels at 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) and butter prices constant, sales of butter are not affected, but sales of most other products will decline somewhat more in 1972-73 because of the effects of higher prices. Total sales of dairy products (milk equivalent) will be approximately 0.8 billion pounds lower than they would be if prices were not raised (Alternative II(a)). In later years, sales of all products will de-

cline at the same rates as under Alternative I.

Raising the support level to 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) will decrease total dairy product sales by an additional 0.9 billion pounds per year (Alternative III(a)).

If support purchase prices for all products are raised to achieve 85 percent of parity (Alternative II(b)), dairy product sales (milk equivalent) will decline about 0.7 billion pounds per year from the level reached when butter prices are held constant. The drop would be 1.3 billion pounds per year at 90 percent of parity (Alternative III(b)). Sales of nonfat dry milk (which are not reflected in the milk equivalent figures) will not decline as much as under Alternatives II(a) and III(a).

Effects on Government purchases

If support prices are not raised, Government purchases of dairy products will rise for 2 years, peaking at 9.5 billion pounds milk equivalent in 1973-74, and then decline to 7.6 billion pounds in 1976-77 (table 2). Most of the increase will be in butter purchases, since purchases of nonfat dry milk will trend downward throughout the period with a fairly rapid decline in the last 3 years. USDA's cost of acquiring these purchases will rise from an estimated \$400 million in 1971-72 to \$465 million in 1972-73 and \$480 million in 1973-74, and then decline to \$321 million in 1976-77.

If support prices are raised to 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) and butter purchase prices held constant, Government purchases will climb to 10.1 billion pounds milk equivalent in 1972-73 and continue rising for 2 more years as production declined. With this program, USDA acquisition costs will peak at

\$619 million in 1974-75, dropping to \$523 million in 1976-77.

With the support level at 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) and butter prices held constant, Government purchases will rise sharply from the estimated 7.1 billion pounds milk equivalent in 1971-72 to 11.4 billion in 1972-73. They will peak at 13.8 billion pounds in 1975-76 and decline slightly to 13.4 billion pounds in 1976-77. USDA acquisition costs will jump to \$704 million in 1972-73 and \$758 million in 1975-76, then drop back to \$706 million in 1976-77.

If the prices of butter, nonfat dry milk and cheese are all increased, rather than putting all of the increase on cheese and nonfat dry milk, Government purchases and costs under the higher support levels will rise even more. With a support level of 85 percent of parity (\$5.20), Government purchases will peak at 12.5 billion pounds milk equivalent in 1974-75 with acquisition costs of \$645 million. The support level of 90 percent of parity (\$5.50), will boost Government purchases to a high of 14.9 billion pounds in 1975-76 and acquisition costs to \$800 million in that year.

Impacts on dairy farmers

Number and size of dairy farms

Major changes in the number and size distribution of farms with cows will occur under all three price support levels. By 1974, the number of dairy herds in this country will decline from 649,000 in 1969 to 396,000, if the support level remains unchanged (table 3). Declines will be less under the higher support levels. Under the \$5.20 support level, U.S. dairy herds will number 403,000 in 1974 and with the \$5.50 level they will total 405,000.

TABLE 3.—NUMBER AND SIZE OF FARMS WITH MILK COWS, BY REGION, 1969 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1974 UNDER ALTERNATIVE PRICE-SUPPORT LEVELS

Region	Farms with dairy cows									
	1 to 19 cows		20 to 49 cows		50 to 99 cows		100-plus cows		Total farms	
	1969 actual	1974 estimate	1969 actual	1974 estimate	1969 actual	1974 estimate	1969 actual	1974 estimate	1969 actual	1974 estimate
\$4.93 price-support alternative:										
Northeast.....	67,830	33,864	46,442	34,348	15,138	15,583	2,485	3,204	131,895	86,999
Corn Belt.....	101,877	48,370	37,365	28,039	7,029	7,867	813	1,178	147,084	85,454
Lake States.....	42,365	25,217	62,374	50,619	7,370	8,848	462	690	112,571	85,374
Southeast.....	28,213	9,802	2,196	1,559	1,861	1,717	1,223	1,441	33,493	14,519
South-central.....	93,355	37,631	9,179	6,504	6,341	5,623	2,362	2,677	111,237	52,435
Plains.....	44,365	23,027	11,339	10,298	1,926	2,297	282	447	58,512	36,609
Mountain.....	19,882	12,246	1,971	1,444	1,201	1,157	470	596	23,324	15,443
Southwest.....	4,351	2,884	860	534	905	578	2,665	2,391	8,781	5,987
Northwest.....	15,507	7,766	4,399	3,202	2,028	2,075	646	846	22,580	13,889
United States.....	418,145	200,407	176,125	136,547	43,799	45,745	11,408	13,470	649,477	396,169
\$5.20 price-support alternative:										
Northeast.....	34,467	-----	34,960	-----	15,860	-----	3,261	-----	88,548	-----
Corn Belt.....	49,232	-----	28,538	-----	8,007	-----	1,199	-----	86,976	-----
Lake States.....	25,666	-----	51,520	-----	9,006	-----	702	-----	86,894	-----
Southeast.....	9,977	-----	1,587	-----	1,746	-----	467	-----	14,777	-----
South-central.....	38,301	-----	6,621	-----	5,722	-----	725	-----	53,369	-----
Plains.....	23,438	-----	10,481	-----	2,337	-----	455	-----	36,711	-----
Mountain.....	12,464	-----	1,471	-----	1,176	-----	607	-----	15,718	-----
Southwest.....	2,529	-----	544	-----	587	-----	2,434	-----	6,094	-----
Northwest.....	7,904	-----	3,259	-----	2,112	-----	861	-----	14,136	-----
United States.....	203,978	-----	138,981	-----	46,553	-----	13,711	-----	403,223	-----
\$5.50 price-support alternative:										
Northeast.....	34,638	-----	35,133	-----	15,939	-----	3,277	-----	88,987	-----
Corn Belt.....	49,475	-----	28,680	-----	8,047	-----	1,205	-----	87,407	-----
Lake States.....	25,793	-----	51,777	-----	9,049	-----	706	-----	87,325	-----
Southeast.....	10,026	-----	1,595	-----	1,756	-----	474	-----	14,851	-----
South-central.....	38,491	-----	6,653	-----	5,751	-----	738	-----	53,633	-----
Plains.....	23,553	-----	10,533	-----	2,350	-----	457	-----	36,893	-----
Mountain.....	12,526	-----	1,478	-----	1,182	-----	610	-----	15,796	-----
Southwest.....	2,541	-----	547	-----	590	-----	2,446	-----	6,124	-----
Northwest.....	7,943	-----	3,275	-----	2,123	-----	865	-----	14,206	-----
United States.....	204,986	-----	139,671	-----	46,787	-----	13,778	-----	405,222	-----

Note: Appendix figure 1 for States in each region.

Changes in herd numbers vary significantly among size groups. The number of herds with 1-19 cows and 20-49 cows declines substantially at all support levels. The larger herds (50-99 cows and 100+ cows) increase in numbers under all levels. Approximately half the producers with 1-19 cows will either quit dairy farming or expand into a larger herd-size category by 1974. About three-fourths of the 20-49 cow herds will remain in 1974; the others will expand, contract, or leave dairy farming. The number of produc-

ers with 50 or more cows will increase by 7 percent with no increase in the support level and by 9-10 percent at the higher support levels. Changes in the numbers of herds follow roughly the same pattern in all regions.

EFFECTS ON GROSS INCOME BY REGION AND HERD SIZE

Nearly all of the increase in gross income to dairy farmers at higher price support levels is due to the increase in price. Only 1-2 percent of the higher gross income is

caused by the increase in production. In such a situation, the distribution of the increases in gross income brought about by higher price support levels is almost identical with the distribution of production among regions and herd-size groups. The distribution for 1974, approximately midway through the 5-year period, gives a good representation of the way benefits to farmers in terms of increases in gross income—and, to a considerable extent, in net income—would be distributed (table 4).

TABLE 4.—DISTRIBUTION OF FARMS AND MILK PRODUCTION, AND OF INCREASED CASH RECEIPTS FROM SALE OF MILK BROUGHT ABOUT BY HIGHER PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS, BY HERD SIZE AND REGION, 1974

Herd size	Northeast	Corn Belt	Lake States	Southeast	South Central	Plains	Mountain	Southwest	Northwest	United States
Production from farms with (percent of U.S. production):										
1 to 19 cows.....	1.5	2.0	2.1	0.1	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.3	7.8
20 to 49 cows.....	10.6	7.6	14.5	.4	1.8	2.5	.5	.1	1.0	39.0
50 to 99 cows.....	9.5	4.7	5.2	1.1	3.3	1.4	.7	.4	1.4	27.7
100 plus cows.....	4.3	1.5	.9	3.4	3.9	.6	1.2	8.1	1.5	25.5
All sizes.....	25.9	15.8	22.7	5.0	9.8	5.3	2.6	8.7	4.2	100.0
Farms with dairy herds (percent of U.S. dairy herds):										
1 to 19.....	8.6	12.2	6.4	2.5	9.5	5.8	3.1	.6	2.0	50.6
20 to 49.....	8.7	7.1	12.8	.4	1.6	2.6	.4	.1	.8	34.5
50 to 99.....	3.9	2.0	2.2	.4	1.4	.6	.3	.2	.5	11.6
100 plus.....	.8	.3	.2	.4	.7	.1	.2	.6	.2	3.4
All herds.....	22.0	21.6	21.6	3.7	13.2	9.1	3.9	1.5	3.0	100.0

Since the benefits are generally distributed in relation to production, larger farmers would receive most of the benefits. The half of the farmers with fewer than 20 cows would receive about 8 percent of the benefits. Most of these farms are in the Northeast, Corn Belt, and Lake States. The largest single share of the benefits would go to farmers with 20-49 cows in the Lake States—14.5 percent. Farmers with 100 cows or more—concentrated in the Southwest, South Central, Southeast and Northeast—while only 3 percent of all farmers, would receive 25 percent of the increase in gross income.

NET INCOME POSITION OF DAIRY FARMERS

Published reports of farm business management projects were used to develop the relationships between production and in-

come. Farms included in these records were generally above average. However, they supply the only data available which provide an adequate basis for analysis. Business analysis records for all regions of the United States are not available. Examples from four regions were obtained. These regions accounted for 70 percent of the dairy cows in the United States in 1970. Net cash incomes on comparable-sized farms did not differ a great deal between these regions.

Based on 1970 business summaries for dairy farms in these four regions, three types of income analyses were calculated. Net cash income was the basic income indicator. Type A results estimate net cash income with price/cost rates of the 1965-70 period. Type B calculations estimate the required blend price to maintain 1970 purchasing power,

assuming that all price changes, except those for milk, follow those of the 1965-70 period. Type C calculations estimate net cash income at the three alternative support prices of \$4.93, \$5.20 and \$5.50 per hundredweight, assuming all prices but milk change at the 1965-70 rates. Income variation within groups of sample farms was considerable and the analysis has all the limitations associated with using averages.

The records for 1970 show that increased returns are consistently associated with farm size. For farms of comparable size, returns to operator labor and management and family labor were similar among States and fell within the range of nonfarm hourly wage rates. Smaller farms have low returns compared to larger farms and industry (table 5).

TABLE 5.—FARM INCOME, 1970 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1974, AND BLEND PRICE ESTIMATES, 1970 AND ESTIMATED 1971, 1974, AND 1976, UNDER ALTERNATIVE PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS

Region and State	Herd size group	Average number of cows per herd	Net cash farm income in 1974 (1970 dollars) ¹								Blend price ² (per hundredweight)				Annual average change
			At \$4.93		At \$5.20		At \$5.50		Estimated to maintain net cash income at 1970 purchasing power						
			Actual for 1970	Income	Percent of 1970	Income	Percent of 1970	Income	Percent of 1970	Actual for 1970	1971	1974	1976		
HERDS WITH LESS THAN 50 COWS															
Northeast:															
Pennsylvania.....	20-29	26	\$7,980	\$7,310	92	\$8,020	100	\$8,830	110	\$6.17	\$6.30	\$6.69	\$6.96	\$0.13	
Do.....	30-39	35	10,940	9,880	90	10,890	100	12,060	110	6.16	6.30	6.71	6.99	.14	
New York.....	40-54	46	15,700	13,950	89	15,220	97	16,780	107	6.02	6.17	6.62	6.92	.15	
Corn Belt: Michigan.....	1-29	26	12,280	10,947	89	11,800	96	12,720	104	5.95	6.14	6.71	7.10	.18	
Lake States:															
Southern Minnesota.....	1-24	20	5,980	5,780	97	6,220	104	6,700	112	4.52	4.61	4.87	5.05	.09	
Do.....	25-34	30	12,960	12,420	96	13,220	102	14,080	109	4.86	4.96	5.29	5.51	.11	
South Atlantic: North Carolina.....	1-49	40	14,720	12,900	88	14,060	96	15,310	104	7.21	7.38	7.89	8.24	.19	
HERDS WITH 50-99 COWS															
Northeast:															
Pennsylvania.....	50-59	54	15,470	14,050	91	15,620	101	17,440	113	6.24	6.37	6.75	7.01	.13	
Do.....	70-89	78	22,860	20,180	88	22,450	98	25,080	110	6.22	6.37	6.81	7.11	.15	
New York.....	85-99	92	29,990	25,860	86	28,580	95	31,900	106	6.05	6.21	6.69	7.01	.16	
Corn Belt: Michigan.....	50-74	61	20,440	17,360	85	19,400	95	21,590	106	5.94	6.12	6.67	7.05	.18	
Lake States:															
Southern Minnesota.....	45-54	50	22,510	21,380	95	22,800	101	24,350	108	5.07	5.20	5.56	5.81	.12	
Do.....	55+	76	31,950	29,890	94	32,129	100	34,570	108	5.13	5.26	5.66	5.93	.13	
South Atlantic: North Carolina.....	50-80	60	22,040	19,400	88	21,140	96	23,020	104	7.12	7.29	7.78	8.29	.19	
HERDS WITH 100 COWS OR MORE															
Northeast:															
Pennsylvania.....	110+	147	33,050	29,310	89	33,630	102	38,620	117	6.33	6.46	6.84	7.10	.13	
New York.....	100+	129	37,250	31,400	84	35,120	94	39,640	106	6.23	6.40	6.90	7.24	.16	
Corn Belt: Michigan.....	100+	141	34,320	26,780	78	31,310	91	36,200	105	5.94	6.13	6.72	7.13	.19	
South Atlantic: North Carolina.....	81+	119	33,920	27,370	81	30,970	91	34,860	103	7.16	7.35	7.91	8.29	.19	

¹ Type C analysis.
² Type B analysis.

Note: See appendix tables 19 to 52 for more detail on each group.

Type A Results.—Based on 1965-70 price trends, dairymen as represented by the sample farms show a 5-6 percent annual average increase in net cash income. Adjusted to 1970 purchasing power by the consumer price index, the annual increase would be about 2-3 percent.

Type B Results.—This procedure estimates the blend price required to maintain a net cash income with the purchasing power of that received in 1970. Annual milk price increases required to maintain the 1970 net cash income ranged from 9 to 19 cents per hundredweight (table 5).

Type C Results.—This series estimates the effects of the alternative levels of support prices upon farm receipts and farm expenditures (table 5). Analysis of net cash income in 1970 dollars shows the \$4.93 price will maintain the 1970 level of income only through 1971 for most of the sample farms (table 6). The \$5.20 price will support incomes at the 1970 level through 1973 for more than half the farms. For some of the larger farms, the \$5.50 support price will not be adequate to maintain the 1970 level of income in 1974. In general, however, the \$5.50 support price will maintain income at the level of 1970 purchasing power through the year 1975 for about one-half of the farm.

TABLE 6.—PERCENT OF DAIRY FARMS WITH REAL INCOMES EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN 1970 UNDER ALTERNATIVE PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS.¹

Year	Support price		
	\$4.93	\$5.20	\$5.50
Percent of farms:			
1971.....	90	100	100
1972.....	10	100	100
1973.....	0	57	100
1974.....	0	20	90
1975.....	0	7	57
1976.....	0	0	40
1977.....	0	0	7

¹ Real income in 1970 dollars.

SUMMARY

At current price levels, the net incomes of commercial dairy farmers are good and farmers are increasing milk production. With no further increases in prices, they will increase production for the next two years. Commercial sales of dairy products are declining both per capita and in total and will continue to decrease. With increasing production and declining sales, surpluses will increase and USDA acquisition costs for price support purchases will rise from \$400 million in the current marketing year to \$480 million in 1973-74. Production, sales, and Government purchases will decline in the following years with USDA acquisition costs reaching \$321 million in 1976-77.

Increases in the support price, following those of recent years, will further encourage milk production and discourage commercial sales. Peak production and surpluses with a \$5.20 support price will occur in 1974-75 and with a \$5.50 support price in 1975-76. USDA acquisition costs will reach an estimated level of \$619 million at the \$5.20 support level if butter prices are not raised and all of the price increase is put on nonfat dry milk and cheese. At the \$5.50 support level, they would reach a level of \$758 million.

If the prices of butter, nonfat dry milk, and cheese are all raised to achieve the desired support level, Government costs will be higher than they would be under programs where butter prices are not raised. USDA acquisition costs would reach peaks of \$645 million at the \$5.20 support level and \$800 million at the \$5.50 support level.

Whatever the support level, the shift toward fewer and larger dairy farms will continue. Small herds will disappear at a rapid rate at any of these price levels. Higher support levels have very little impact on the disappearance of smaller dairy herds (fewer than 50 cows). The number of larger dairy herds will rise in any case, but the rate will

increase slightly at higher prices. These adjustments occur in all regions.

Whether or not support prices are increased, the share of milk production and gross farm income held by the Corn Belt, Lake States, South Central, and Plains regions will decline slightly.

If support prices are not raised and other prices continue to increase, producers with fewer than 50 cows will have net incomes in 1974 (in 1970 dollars) at about 90 percent of the 1970 level. Producers with 50-99 cows would generally have incomes of about 85-90 percent of the 1970 level. Producers with more than 100 cows would have net incomes of 80-85 percent of the 1970 level. While these income levels are lower than those currently existing, they are still very good by comparison with any other period. Net incomes on 50-99 cow farms would range from \$14,000 to \$30,000 per year, while those on farms with 100 plus cows would range from \$26,000 to \$31,000.

If support prices were raised to \$5.20, net incomes on dairy farms with fewer than 100 cows would be at least 95 percent of the 1970 level and for larger herds at least 91 percent of the 1970 level in 1974.

With support prices of \$5.50, 1974 net incomes would be higher than the 1970 level for all sizes of dairy farms in the areas studied.

Five-year-total effects

One useful way of summarizing the analysis of the long-run effects of alternative price support programs is in terms of 5-year totals. Between 1972-73 and 1976-77, production will total 7.8 billion pounds more with the price support level at \$5.20 than at \$4.93 and 12.4 billion pounds more at \$5.50 (table 7). Considering for the moment only those alternatives which would not raise butter prices (Alternatives II(a) and II(b)), sales for consumption would be 4.2 billion pounds milk equivalent less with the support level of \$5.20 and 8.6 billion pounds less at \$5.50.

TABLE 7.—5-YEAR-TOTAL EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS, 1972-73 TO 1976-77

(Dollar amounts in millions)

Alternative	Support price	Purchase prices raised ¹	Production (billion pounds)	Sales ² (billion pounds)	USDA acquisition costs ³	Consumer expenditures for major dairy products ⁴		Gross farm income from milk ⁵	Added income less costs ⁷
						Amount	Percent of disposable income		
I.....	\$4.93		593.9	542.3	\$2,074	\$55,108	1.22	\$34,391	
II(a).....	5.20	NFDM, cheese, all.....	601.7	538.1	2,911	55,913	1.24	36,613	
II(b).....	5.20	do.....	601.7	534.5	3,036	55,966	1.24	36,613	
III(a).....	5.50	do.....	606.3	533.7	3,659	56,668	1.25	38,671	
III(b).....	5.50	do.....	606.3	527.9	3,858	56,716	1.26	38,671	
Change from \$4.93 support level									
II(a).....	5.20	do.....	+7.8	-4.2	+837	+805	+0.02	+1,643	+2,222
II(b).....	5.20	do.....	+7.8	-7.8	+962	+858	+0.02	+1,812	+2,222
III(a).....	5.50	do.....	+12.4	-8.6	+1,585	+1,560	+0.03	+3,145	+4,280
III(b).....	5.50	do.....	+12.4	-14.4	+1,784	+1,608	+0.04	+3,392	+4,280

¹ Products purchased under the price support program for which prices were raised over 1971-72 levels.

² Domestic commercial sales plus exports and shipments from commercial stocks in milk equivalent (fat solids basis).

³ Quantities of dairy products purchased valued at support purchase prices.

⁴ Cash receipts from sale of milk and cream by farmers.

⁵ Consumer expenditures for fluid milk and cream, butter, American cheese, canned milk, ice cream, and nonfat milk valued at retail prices.

⁶ Added costs over the current support level represented by USDA acquisition costs plus consumer expenditures for dairy products.

⁷ Added gross farm income from milk less added costs to the public.

Gross farm income (cash receipts) from the sale of milk by farmers will be \$2.2 billion higher with price supports at \$5.20 than at \$4.93 and \$4.3 billion higher with price supports at \$5.50. Nearly all of the increase in gross farm income would be reflected in net income, since 98-99 percent of the increase in gross farm income is due to the change in price and only 1-2 percent due to an increase in the quantity produced.

The added cost to the public of higher price support levels can be considered to be USDA acquisition costs plus the increase in consumer expenditures for milk and dairy prod-

ucts which is attributable to the price increase. With this assumption, the added costs to the public (with butter prices constant) would be \$1.6 billion with the price support level at \$5.20 and \$3.1 billion at \$5.50. These costs do not include any allowance for the value to consumers of the dairy products which they would have consumed had the prices not been raised. Also, Government costs do not include transportation, storage and other costs nor the proceeds from any sales out of CCC stocks.

The increase in gross farm income from the

sale of milk is \$580 million larger than the additional public costs of increasing the price support level to \$5.20 over the next 5 years. Gross income to farmers from the sale of milk exceeds the added cost to the public by \$1,135 billion with price supports at \$5.50.

The alternatives which raised the price of butter as well as the prices of nonfat dry milk and cheese in order to achieve the higher support levels (Alternatives II(b) and III(b)) yield the same increases in gross farm income at a higher cost to the public.

Tables 8 through 17 follow:

TABLE 8.—MILK: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES, ALTERNATIVE I, MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77
ALTERNATIVE I: CURRENT SUPPORT PURCHASE PRICES

Item and unit	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76,	1976-77
Production (billions of pounds)	118.9	119.9	120.0	119.0	118.0	117.0
Supply ¹ (billions of pounds)	116.6	117.8	118.1	117.4	116.5	115.7
Sales ² (billions of pounds)	109.5	108.9	108.6	108.5	108.2	108.1
Government purchases:						
Milk equivalent (billions of pounds)	7.1	8.9	9.5	8.9	8.3	7.6
Butterfat (millions of pounds)	269	335	357	333	310	283
Percent of marketings	6.4	7.9	8.4	7.9	7.4	6.8
Nonfat solids (millions of pounds)	480	481	472	375	286	181
Percent of marketings	4.9	4.8	4.7	3.8	2.9	1.9
Butter (millions of pounds)	285	357	375	346	322	294
Cheese (millions of pounds)	90	120	140	140	130	120
Nonfat dry milk (millions of pounds)	450	450	425	325	235	130
Evaporated milk (millions of pounds)	90	90	90	90	90	90
Farm price of milk:						
Manufacturing grade (dollars per hundredweight)	4.87	4.87	4.87	4.87	4.87	4.87
All milk (dollars per hundredweight)	5.90	5.90	5.90	5.90	5.90	5.90
Farm cash receipts (millions of dollars)	6,848	6,920	6,938	6,896	6,842	6,795
USDA acquisition costs (millions of dollars)	400	465	480	429	379	321

¹ Includes production less farm use, plus/minus milk equivalent (fat solids basis) of commercial stock changes, plus imports.² Includes exports and shipments from commercial stocks, estimated at 1,000,000,000 pounds milk equivalent (fat solids basis) annually.TABLE 9.—MILK: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES, ALTERNATIVE II(A), MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77
ALTERNATIVE II(A): 85 PERCENT OF PARITY (\$5.20) SUPPORT LEVEL; BUTTER PRICE HELD CONSTANT

Item and unit	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Production (billions of pounds)	118.9	120.3	120.7	121.0	120.3	119.4
Supply ¹ (billions of pounds)	116.6	118.2	118.8	119.4	118.8	118.1
Sales ² (billions of pounds)	109.5	108.1	107.8	107.6	107.4	107.2
Government purchases:						
Milk equivalent (billions of pounds)	7.1	10.1	11.0	11.8	11.4	10.9
Butterfat (millions of pounds)	269	384	417	445	432	409
Percent of marketings	6.4	9.0	9.7	10.3	10.1	9.6
Nonfat solids (millions of pounds)	480	620	603	573	493	395
Percent of marketings	4.9	6.2	6.0	5.7	4.9	4.0
Butter (millions of pounds)	285	407	444	479	464	436
Cheese (millions of pounds)	90	140	150	150	150	150
Nonfat dry milk (millions of pounds)	450	579	557	526	443	341
Evaporated milk (millions of pounds)	90	90	90	90	90	90
Farm price of milk:						
Manufacturing grade (dollar per hundredweight)	4.87	5.20	5.20	5.20	5.20	5.20
All milk (dollars per hundredweight)	5.90	6.20	6.20	6.20	6.20	6.20
Farm cash receipts (millions of dollars)	6,848	7,294	7,331	7,369	7,331	7,288
USDA acquisition costs (millions of dollars)	400	584	606	619	579	523

¹ Includes production less farm use, plus/minus the milk equivalent (fat solids basis) of commercial stock changes, plus imports.² Includes exports and shipments from commercial stocks, estimated at 1,000,000,000 pounds milk equivalent (fat solids basis) annually.TABLE 10.—MILK: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES, ALTERNATIVE II(b), MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77
ALTERNATIVE II(b): 85 PERCENT OF PARITY (\$5.20) SUPPORT LEVEL; BUTTER, AMERICAN CHEESE, AND NONFAT DRY MILK PRICES INCREASED

Item and Unit	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Production (billions of pounds)	118.9	120.3	120.7	121.0	120.3	119.4
Supply ¹ (billions of pounds)	116.1	118.2	118.8	119.4	118.8	118.1
Sales ² (billions of pounds)	109.5	107.3	107.1	106.9	106.7	106.5
Government purchases:						
Milk equivalent (billions of pounds)	7.1	10.9	11.7	12.5	12.1	11.6
Butterfat (millions of pounds)	269	413	444	473	458	435
Percent of marketings (percent)	6.4	9.7	10.3	11.0	10.7	10.2
Nonfat solids (millions of pounds)	480	600	583	552	473	374
Percent of marketings (percent)	4.9	6.0	5.8	5.5	4.7	3.8
Butter (millions of pounds)	285	443	478	514	497	469
Cheese (millions of pounds)	90	140	150	150	150	150
Nonfat dry milk (millions of pounds)	450	558	536	504	422	319
Evaporated milk (millions of pounds)	90	90	90	90	90	90
Farm price of milk:						
Manufacturing grade (dollars per hundredweight)	4.87	5.20	5.20	5.20	5.20	5.20
All milk (dollars per hundredweight)	5.90	6.20	6.20	6.20	6.20	6.20
Farm cash receipts (millions of dollars)	6,848	7,294	7,331	7,369	7,331	7,288
USDA acquisition costs (millions of dollars)	400	606	630	645	605	550

¹ Includes production less farm use, plus/minus the milk equivalent (fat solids basis) of commercial stock changes, plus imports.² Includes exports and shipments from commercial stocks, estimated at 1,000,000,000 pounds milk equivalent (fat solids basis) annually.TABLE 11.—MILK: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES, ALTERNATIVE III(a), MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77
ALTERNATIVE III(a): 90 PERCENT OF PARITY (\$5.50) SUPPORT LEVEL; BUTTER PRICE HELD CONSTANT

Item and unit	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Production (billions of pounds)	118.9	120.7	121.2	121.6	121.8	121.0
Supply ¹ (billions of pounds)	116.6	118.6	119.3	120.0	120.3	119.7
Sales ² (billions of pounds)	109.5	107.2	106.9	106.8	106.5	106.3
Government purchases:						
Milk equivalent (billions of pounds)	7.1	11.4	12.4	13.2	13.8	13.4
Butterfat (millions of pounds)	269	432	470	501	524	507
Percent of marketings	6.4	10.1	10.9	11.6	12.1	11.7
Nonfat solids (millions of pounds)	479	750	750	729	690	600
Percent of marketings	4.9	7.5	7.4	7.2	6.8	5.9
Butter (millions of pounds)	285	461	509	548	577	556
Cheese (millions of pounds)	90	150	150	150	150	150
Nonfat dry milk (millions of pounds)	450	710	709	687	646	553
Evaporated milk (millions of pounds)	90	90	90	90	90	90
Farm price of milk:						
Manufacturing grade (dollars per hundredweight)	4.87	55.0	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50
All milk (dollars per hundredweight)	5.90	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
Farm cash receipts (millions of dollars)	6,848	7,670	7,716	7,762	7,781	7,742
USDA acquisition costs (millions of dollars)	400	704	737	754	758	706

¹ Includes production less farm use, plus/minus the milk equivalent (fat solids basis) of commercial stock changes, plus imports.² Includes exports and shipments from commercial stocks, estimated at 1,000,000,000 pounds milk equivalent (fat solids basis) annually.

TABLE 12.—MILK: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES, ALTERNATIVE III(b), MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77
ALTERNATIVE III(b): 90 PERCENT OF PARITY (\$5.50) SUPPORT LEVEL; BUTTER, AMERICAN CHEESE, AND NONFAT DRY MILK PRICES INCREASED

Item and unit	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Production (billions of pounds)	118.9	120.7	121.2	121.6	121.8	121.0
Supply ¹ (billions of pounds)	116.6	118.6	119.3	120.0	120.3	119.7
Sales ² (billions of pounds)	109.5	106.0	105.7	105.6	105.4	105.2
Government purchases:						
Milk equivalent (billions of pounds)	7.1	12.6	13.6	14.4	14.9	14.5
Butterfat (millions of pounds)	269	477	515	545	566	548
Percent of marketings	6.4	11.1	11.9	12.6	13.0	12.7
Nonfat solids (millions of pounds)	480	713	712	691	651	561
Percent of marketings	4.9	7.1	7.1	6.8	6.4	5.6
Butter (millions of pounds)	285	518	565	603	529	607
Cheese (millions of pounds)	90	150	150	150	150	150
Nonfat dry milk (millions of pounds)	450	671	669	647	605	512
Evaporated milk (millions of pounds)	90	90	90	90	90	90
Farm price of milk:						
Manufacturing grade (dollars/per hundredweight)	4.87	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50
All milk (dollars/per hundredweight)	5.90	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
Farm cash receipts (millions of dollars)	6,848	7,670	7,716	7,762	7,781	7,742
USDA acquisition costs (millions of dollars)	400	739	774	795	800	750

¹ Includes production less farm use, plus/minus the milk equivalent (fat solids basis) of commercial stock changes, plus imports.

² Includes exports and shipments from commercial stocks, estimated at 1,000,000,000 pounds milk equivalent (fat solids basis) annually.

TABLE 13.—BUTTER: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES UNDER SELECTED PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES, MARKETING YEARS, 1971 TO 1976-77

Alternatives ¹	Support purchase price (cents per pound)	Production					
		1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Million pounds							
I	67.8	1,142	1,177	1,163	1,101	1,043	980
II(a)	67.8	1,227	1,232	1,234	1,185	1,122	1,122
II(b)	72.1	1,228	1,233	1,235	1,186	1,123	1,123
III(a)	67.8	1,281	1,297	1,303	1,298	1,242	1,242
III(b)	75.8	1,283	1,299	1,305	1,299	1,243	1,243
Sales ²							
I		859	822	790	757	723	688
II(a)			822	790	757	723	688

Alternatives ¹	Support purchase price (cents per pound)	Production					
		1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Government purchases ³							
I		285	357	375	346	322	294
II(a)		407	444	479	464	436	436
II(b)		443	478	514	497	469	469
III(a)		461	509	548	577	556	556
III(b)		518	565	603	629	607	607

¹ Alternative I: Current support purchase prices. Alternative II(a): 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative II(b): 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased. Alternative III(a): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative III(b): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased.

² Including domestic civilian commercial disappearance, military purchases, and exports and shipments from commercial stocks.

³ Assumes imports and those exports from commercial stocks to be constant.

TABLE 14.—AMERICAN CHEESE: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES UNDER SELECTED PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES, MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77

Alternatives ¹	Support purchase price (cents per pound)	Production					
		1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Million pounds							
I	54.75	1,535	1,615	1,695	1,755	1,810	1,865
II(a)	58.50		1,620	1,689	1,747	1,810	1,874
II(b)	58.50		1,620	1,689	1,747	1,810	1,874
III(a)	61.50		1,611	1,668	1,728	1,788	1,850
III(b)	61.50		1,611	1,668	1,728	1,788	1,850
Sales ²							
I		1,453	1,510	1,571	1,631	1,696	1,761
II(a)			1,495	1,555	1,613	1,676	1,740
II(b)			1,495	1,555	1,613	1,676	1,740
III(a)			1,476	1,534	1,594	1,654	1,716
III(b)			1,476	1,534	1,594	1,654	1,716
Government purchases ³							
I		90	120	140	140	130	120
II(a)			140	150	150	150	150
II(b)			140	150	150	150	150
III(a)			150	150	150	150	150
III(b)			150	150	150	150	150

¹ Alternative I: Current support purchase prices. Alternative II(a): 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative II(b): 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased. Alternative III(a): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative III(b): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased.

² Includes domestic civilian commercial disappearance, military purchases, and exports and shipments from commercial stocks.

³ Assumes imports and those exports from commercial stocks to be constant.

TABLE 15.—NONFAT DRY MILK: PRODUCTION, SALES, AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASES UNDER SELECTED PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES, MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77

Alternatives ¹	Support purchase price (cents per pound)	Production					
		1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Million pounds							
I	31.7	1,490	1,525	1,510	1,420	1,340	1,250
II(a)	36.3		1,610	1,600	1,580	1,510	1,420
II(b)	33.9		1,610	1,600	1,580	1,510	1,420
III(a)	39.9		1,710	1,720	1,710	1,680	1,600
III(b)	35.5		1,710	1,720	1,710	1,680	1,600
Sales ²							
I		1,062	1,077	1,087	1,097	1,107	1,117
II(a)			1,033	1,045	1,056	1,069	1,081
II(b)			1,054	1,066	1,078	1,090	1,103
III(a)			1,002	1,013	1,025	1,036	1,049
III(b)			1,041	1,053	1,065	1,077	1,090
Government purchases ³							
I		450	450	425	325	235	130
II(a)			579	557	526	443	341
II(b)			558	536	504	422	319
III(a)			710	709	687	646	553
III(b)			671	669	647	605	512

¹ Alternative I: Current support purchase prices. Alternative II(a): 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative II(b): 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased. Alternative III(a): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative III(b): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased.

² Includes domestic civilian commercial disappearance, military purchases, and exports and shipments from commercial stocks.

³ Assumes imports and those exports from commercial stocks to be constant.

TABLE 16.—UTILIZATION OF MILK MARKETINGS UNDER SELECTED PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES, MARKETING YEARS, 1971-72 TO 1976-77

Alternatives ¹	Milk production					
	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
	Million pounds					
I.....	118,900	119,900	120,000	119,000	118,000	117,000
II (a and b).....	120,300	120,700	120,700	121,000	120,300	119,400
III (a and b).....	120,700	121,200	121,200	121,600	121,800	121,000
	Farm use					
I ²	3,800	3,600	3,350	3,100	2,950	2,800
	Farm marketings					
I.....	115,100	116,300	116,650	115,900	115,050	114,200
II (a and b).....	116,700	117,350	117,900	117,900	117,350	116,600
III (a and b).....	117,700	117,850	118,500	118,500	118,850	118,200
	Use of marketings—Fluid products (milk equivalent) ³					
I.....	51,375	50,875	50,395	49,875	49,375	48,875
II (a and b).....	50,446	49,932	49,455	48,954	48,471	47,971
III (a and b).....	50,031	49,512	49,031	48,546	48,061	47,581
	Manufactured products (milk equivalent) ⁴					
I.....	63,725	65,425	66,275	66,025	65,675	65,325
II (a and b).....	66,254	67,418	68,445	68,396	68,129	67,862
III (a and b).....	67,069	68,338	69,469	70,304	70,143	69,982

¹ Alternative I: Current support purchase prices. Alternative II: 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level. Alternative III: 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level.

² Same under all alternatives.

³ Includes fluid products processed for civilian and military use.

⁴ Manufactured for use in all outlets.

TABLE 17—ESTIMATED SUPPORT PURCHASE PRICES UNDER ALTERNATIVE SUPPORT LEVELS

Alternative and support purchase price levels ¹	Support level of manufacturing milk (per hundredweight)	Cents per pound			
		Support purchase prices			Purchase price evaporated milk
		Butter	Cheese	Nonfat dry milk	
I. Current level.....	\$4.85	67.8	54.75	31.7	16.13
II. 85 percent of parity ²	5.20				
a. Change only snf.....		67.8	58.50	36.3	17.23
b. Current ratio.....		72.1	58.50	33.9	17.23
III. 90 percent of parity ²	5.50				
a. Change only snf.....		67.8	61.50	39.9	18.12
b. Current ratio.....		75.8	61.50	35.5	18.12

¹ Alternative I: Current support purchase prices. Alternative II(a): 85 percent of parity (\$5.20) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative II(b): 85 percent of parity (5.20) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased. Alternative III(a): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter price held constant. Alternative III(b): 90 percent of parity (\$5.50) support level; butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk prices increased.

² October estimates of parity for Apr. 1, 1972.

U.S. LEGAL OBLIGATIONS TO DISALLOW TAX CREDITS RESPECTING NAMIBIA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today, 21 Congressmen and five Senators joined me in expressing our deep concern to the Secretary of the Treasury "about the failure of the Department to implement the U.S. position on the illegality of the South African administration of Namibia by disallowing tax credits for moneys paid to the illegal South African Administering Authority as taxes on income earned in the international territory of Namibia."

The Congressmen and Senators who joined me in expressing our deep concern were:

The Honorable BELLA S. ABZUG.
The Honorable HERMAN BADILLO.
The Honorable JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.
The Honorable SHIRLEY CHISHOLM.
The Honorable WILLIAM CLAY.
The Honorable GEORGE W. COLLINS.
The Honorable JOHN CONYERS, JR.
The Honorable RONALD V. DELLUMS.
The Honorable ROBERT F. DRINAN.
The Honorable DON EDWARDS.
The Honorable WALTER E. FAUNTROY.
The Honorable DONALD M. FRASER.
The Honorable AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.
The Honorable RALPH H. METCALFE.
The Honorable ROBERT N. C. NIX.
The Honorable CHARLES B. RANGEL.
The Honorable OGDEN R. REID.
The Honorable BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. RYAN.
The Honorable JAMES H. SCHEUER.

The Honorable LOUIS STOKES.
The Honorable EDWARD W. BROOKE.
The Honorable FRED R. HARRIS.
The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS.
The Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN.
The Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

On February 22, I reiterated to the Department of the Treasury the importance of furnishing to the Subcommittee on Africa "information on the dollar costs to the United States, that is, revenue loss from 1966 to the present, because of the allowance of tax credits against U.S. income tax for payments to the South African Government for income earned in Namibia . . . as expeditiously as possible."

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the texts of both of these communications. The material follows:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
February 22, 1972.

Mr. JOHN M. HENNESSY,
Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. HENNESSY: I am aware that the Department is preparing the responses to the inquiries made by the Subcommittee during the Department's appearance before the Subcommittee on December 7. It is of special importance, however, that the information on the dollar costs to the United States, that is, revenue loss from 1966 to the present, because of the allowance of tax credits against U.S. income tax for payments to the South African Government for income earned in Namibia be furnished as expeditiously as possible.

I am therefore writing to request that the Department submit this information now without waiting for the final preparation of answers to the other questions raised during the hearing.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1972.

HON. JOHN B. CONNALLY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SECRETARY: We are writing to express our deep concern about the failure of the Department to implement the United States position on the illegality of the South African administration of Namibia by disallowing tax credits for moneys paid to the illegal South African Administering Authority as taxes on income earned in the international territory of Namibia.

We wish to emphasize the facts of this situation:

The illegality of the South African Administering Authority was determined in a resolution by the United Nations General Assembly, GA Res. 2145, supported by the United States and affirmed by the Security Council, terminating South Africa's mandate over the international territory;

The validity of these United Nations resolutions was reaffirmed in the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice on "The Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia, notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276," and (1) that the South African Government is illegally occupying Namibia, and (2) that states have a duty to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts in behalf of and concerning Namibia;

The acceptance by the United States Government of the conclusions of the International Court of Justice;

U.S. international legal obligations "to refrain from any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of, the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration."

In sum, what is involved here is the allowance of credits against U.S. income tax obligations for monies paid to an administering authority formally adjudicated to be illegal by the highest international tribunal and

accepted as such by the United States Government.

Clearly, the issues raised by this matter are *sui generis* and Internal Revenue Service policy in cases relating to credits for monies paid as income taxes to unrecognized authorities is not relevant. Nor would precedents involving taxes paid to de facto authorities or to enemy governments be pertinent since tax credits for payments to South Africa for income earned in Namibia involve payments to an authority formally adjudged to be illegal. Nor is the IRS practice of having tax matters independent of political or foreign policy considerations relevant; for in this case the legal—as distinguished from a foreign policy position regarding a non-recognized regime or a government with which we do not have diplomatic relations—is the crux of the matter.

Inasmuch as international law is the law of the land, credits against U.S. income taxes for monies paid to South Africa on income earned in Namibia should be disallowed.

We note that in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Africa on December 7, The Honorable John R. Petty, the former Assistant Secretary for International Affairs for the Department of the Treasury, said:

In view of the illegality of South African control of this territory under the 1966 Resolution of the United Nations, we believe there is a question as to whether taxes imposed and collected by the South African Government on income earned in South West Africa can properly be considered taxes under U.S. legislation for purposes of granting a foreign tax credit.

We call your attention to the "Message from the President of the United States transmitting His Third Annual Report on the State of United States Foreign Policy" of February 9, 1972, wherein President Nixon stated, *inter alia*:

In Namibia, South Africa continues to resist the efforts of the United Nations on behalf of self-determination. It rejects the 1971 holding of the International Court of Justice that South Africa is obliged to quit Namibia. We accept that holding and continue to discourage U.S. investment in Namibia. We seek to encourage peaceful ways of realizing and protecting the rights of the people of Namibia.

We further draw your attention to Security Council Resolution 283, which was supported by the United States, and which reads in pertinent part:

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

4. *Calls upon* all States to ensure that companies and other commercial and industrial enterprises owned by, or under direct control of the State, cease all dealings with respect to commercial or industrial enterprises or concessions in Namibia;

5. *Calls upon* all States to withhold from their nationals or companies of their nationality not under direct government control, government loans, credit guarantees and other forms of financial support that would be used to facilitate trade or commerce with Namibia;

6. *Calls upon* all States to ensure that companies and other commercial enterprises owned by the State or under direct control of the State cease all further investment activities including concessions in Namibia;

7. *Calls upon* all States to discourage their nationals or companies of their nationality not under direct governmental control from investing or obtaining concessions in Namibia, and to this end withhold protection of such investment against claims of a future lawful government of Namibia. . . .

We further note the statement of the United States Representative to the Security Council during the consideration of Security Council Resolution No. 301 of October 20, 1971:

The resolution takes note of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, particularly its conclusions. For our part the United States accepts these conclusions which declare in paragraph 133 that South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the territory and which further declare that member states are "under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia, and to refrain from any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration." In his speech 2 weeks ago in the General Assembly, Secretary of State William P. Rogers stated our acceptance of these conclusions and observed this was consistent with our support of practical and peaceful means to achieve self-determination and end racial discrimination.

Our acceptance also reflects the importance which my government attaches to the Court. We consider that this advisory opinion adds a significant and authoritative legal element to the effort of the international community to make possible for the people of the territory to enjoy their right to self-determination. Our acceptance, of course, does not necessarily imply approval of all the Court's reasoning. We note in this connection concerns about charter interpretation which had been mentioned by several Council members.

The resolution reaffirms Resolution 283, which urges member states to take a member of actions vis-a-vis Namibia. . . .

In closing, we wish to reiterate our deep concern that the Department is not disallowing income tax credits for monies paid to the illegal South African Administering Authority as taxes on income earned in the international territory of Namibia.

Sincerely,
CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT INTRODUCED

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be joined by my colleagues Congressman QUIE, Congressman STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Congressman HANSEN of Idaho in introducing the Child Development Act on March 8.

My colleagues and I have been longtime supporters of comprehensive early childhood education and child development legislation.

On February 9, 1970, along with members of the Republican Task Force on Education and Training which I chaired, I introduced the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970, H.R. 15776. Congressmen QUIE, STEIGER, and HANSEN were all members of the task force, each of them helped to develop H.R. 15776, and each joined in introducing it.

Shortly thereafter, in April of 1970, our task force issued a report analyzing the need for early childhood services in the United States which was entitled, "Re-

port on Programs for Early Childhood." In both the 91st and 92d Congress, we all worked to try to come up with a sound child development bill which would satisfy all interested parties.

I remain convinced, as I was when I introduced H.R. 15776 over 2 years ago, that there is a real need to provide increased Federal support for early child development programs. The question my colleagues and I are concerned with is, how do we provide these funds within a workable administrative system. The reason I voted against the conference report on S. 2007 in December was that the child development provisions tacked on to that bill did not provide for such a system. I believe the bill we have introduced does provide the means for establishing a consolidated, coordinated approach that can be effectively and efficiently administered. Moreover, the bill could be implemented now.

CONSOLIDATION

In our 1970 "Report on Programs for Early Childhood," the task force found:

There are more than 60 Federal programs which relate to early childhood either directly or indirectly. This diffusion of programs has resulted in confusion, lack of coordination, and ineffectiveness at Federal, State, and local levels.

We went on to recommend:

A consolidation of those programs which provide directly for the operation of early childhood programs should be enacted at once.

Title I of the bill my colleagues and I have introduced provides for consolidation of child care and child development programs under a single Federal agency to be designated by the President.

It is our hope that as coordination efforts get underway, recipients of Federal moneys will not have to write individual applications going to five, 10 or even 15 individual agencies to receive funds. Instead there should be a simplified mechanism for apply for money as well as dispensing money.

PLANNING

As a result of the lack of coordination among Federal child care programs, our task force found in 1970 a "crazy quilt pattern" of overlapping and duplication that actually put some programs in the same areas funded under separate Federal authorities in competition for the same children. At the same time, other areas desperately in need of child care programs could not qualify for one or another of the specific Federal programs.

This situation has not been alleviated in the last 2 years. On January 26, 1972, a copy of a study made by the General Accounting Office to evaluate child-care activities in the District of Columbia was sent to every congressional office. This report shows clearly the overlapping and duplication of services that resulted from legitimate application of the laws passed by Congress. Although the study evaluated child-care activities in the District of Columbia, GAO indicated that the same charts could probably be drawn for every major city in the country. In an effort to comply with laws, Federal

departments and agencies as well as local governments have established bureaucracies which have resulted in a bewildering duplication of agencies, efforts, and at best uneven services to children. Clearly what is needed in addition to consolidation and coordination as provided in title I of our bill is a mechanism for better planning to insure that some areas are not totally neglected while others end up with competing Federal programs.

The bill my colleagues and I have introduced gives an overall planning role to the States, and specifically directs States to develop comprehensive programs which assure that needs in all areas—urban and rural—are met.

Planning is essential to determine what services are needed for which children as well. There is no evidence right now to indicate that every single child in America needs exactly the kinds of services provided under Headstart or any other federally-funded program. We doubt that any one set formula will answer the needs of parents and children throughout the country. As States look at and evaluate their own needs, their findings will no doubt help give Congress sound information to help determine the direction of future child development legislation.

RESEARCH

In 1970 our task force found that, while the Federal Government had invested in research in the early child development field, much more research was needed. In addition, the research that had been done in the field was hampered by the same lack of coordination that characterized all Federal involvement in the child development field. Our task force recommended expanding Federal research efforts and providing better coordination of these efforts.

Two years after our task force's study, much of the Government's research efforts are still being conducted without a master plan. Although there has been some coordination achieved, it is our hope that the new agency designated in title III will be the focal point for coordinating all research activities and initiate new research whenever and wherever necessary to fill in any gaps which might exist. We hope that the research authorized under title III will help us gain more basic knowledge about the needs of individual children and how this knowledge can be translated into actual programs.

TRAINING

Another finding of our task force 2 years ago was, "One of the major obstacles blocking the rapid expansion of early childhood services is the lack of qualified, trained personnel." In our report we specifically endorsed steps to encourage more young people to undertake careers in early childhood development, and also advocated greater expenditures for training programs for both professional and paraprofessional personnel in the early childhood field.

We remain convinced 2 years later that a fundamental ingredient for success in any program for children is the personnel who are employed in it. Whether they are professionals with extensive college training or nonprofessionals who

bring a basic life experience to the program, some additional concentrated focus must be provided so that they can better understand how and why children learn. The training of both professional and nonprofessional personnel in the area of child development to meet the needs of today's programs. Beyond this, we are aware that even if vast amounts of new Federal dollars were available to establish new child development programs, there simply are not enough trained professionals and nonprofessionals to do the job. Finally, if we are to expand the Federal role in this field, we must have trained individuals who are prepared to step in and implement new programs.

Title IV of the bill my colleagues and I have introduced authorizes Federal assistance for programs and projects to train both professional and nonprofessional personnel to enter the child development field, and also authorizes a program of inservice training for both professionals and nonprofessionals already in the field.

Once again I want to emphasize that my colleagues and I feel that much of the future quality of our Nation depends on how we enrich the lives of our children. Our bill is an attempt to answer many of the problems that arose during consideration of the child development provisions in S. 2007. I doubt that anyone needs to be reminded of the objections that were raised across the country to the Federal Government going into the business of raising children. Personally I do not believe these fears were based on a clear understanding of what those child development provisions sought to do. But the point is that, whether these fears were justified or not, they were indeed genuine and we should not ignore them.

For this reason, our bill under title II attempts to reassure those who had such fears by directing the States to provide structures which will bring about the maximum involvement of parents.

All in all, I believe the bill which Congressmen QUIE, STEIGER, and HANSEN have introduced with me provides a mechanism which can be realistically implemented within the near—not distant—future. It is sad to me that so many of the findings of our task force over 2 years ago still apply today. Obviously we need to learn our lessons from the past legislative history on child development and move ahead.

I insert the provisions of the Child Development Act, H.R. 13649, at this point:

H.R. 13649

(A bill to provide for the consolidation and coordination of all Federal child care and child development programs and to insure that they will be effective to attain their intended objectives)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Child Development Act".

TITLE I—CONSOLIDATION AND COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. The President shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that within one year after the date of enactment of this Act all child care or child develop-

ment programs carried on or assisted by the United States are, to the maximum extent feasible, administered by a single Federal agency which he shall designate. The head of the designated child development agency shall carry out his functions directly under the supervision of the President or of the Secretary of the executive department in which such agency is situated and shall not be responsible to any other officer of the United States. Any provision of law assigning functions related to child care or child development programs to Federal officers or agencies, other than to the designated child development agency and its head, are hereby made inapplicable to the extent necessary to permit the President to take the action required by the first sentence of this section.

SEC. 102. The designated child development agency shall be the principal agency of the Federal government for coordination of programs or activities related to child care and child development. Each Federal officer and agency which is carrying on a program which affects or is affected by child care and child development programs, but is not administered by the designated child development agency, shall consult with such agency with respect to such programs, shall coordinate such programs or activities with those carried on by such agency, and shall take such action (mutually agreed upon by the two agencies) as will assure that such programs are conducted in a manner consistent with the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 103. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE II—PLANNING

SEC. 201. A State, through its Governor, may make application to the child development agency for assistance in developing plans for carrying out and coordinating child care programs within that State. The plans developed should be carried out on a State-wide basis and assure that all programs in both urban and rural areas of that State will be so coordinated as to insure that all needs within the State are met. Such plans will—

(1) provide for the identification of child care and child development needs,

(2) provide a comprehensive program for meeting such needs in a manner which recognizes priorities of need according to established criteria, and

(3) provide a structure which brings about the maximum involvement of parents in the development of their children.

SEC. 202. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE III—RESEARCH

SEC. 301. Programs of the Federal government for research in the field of child care and child development shall be considered child care and child development programs to which section 101 applies, so that the designated child development agency shall be the principal agency of the Federal government for coordinating research in the field of child care and child development.

SEC. 302. In addition to research carried out under authority of other laws the designated child development agency shall, to the extent such research is not being conducted by other agencies, either directly or by grant or contract, conduct research in the field of child care and child development. Such research shall give special emphasis to—

(1) determining the method of carrying out programs which will yield the greatest benefits,

(2) determining the content of programs which will be most beneficial in meeting the needs of children,

(3) devising means of evaluating programs which will permit determinations of the type referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) on a basis which will permit the objective validation, and

(4) developing means to determine the needs of individual children in particular areas such as education, socialization, nutrition, and medical services, so as to permit modeling programs to fit the needs of particular children.

SEC. 303. In addition to its other research activities, the designated child development agency shall name a special study to establish national objectives in the field of child care and child development which are achievable through the application of existing knowledge in the field and in light of the number of trained and experienced personnel who are or will be available to participate in child care and child development programs. A report containing the results of such special study shall be submitted to the President and to the Congress on or before July 1, 1974.

SEC. 304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—TRAINING OF CHILD CARE AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT PERSONNEL

SEC. 401. Section 532 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "There is additionally authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for programs and projects under this part to train or retrain professional personnel for child care and child development programs, and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for programs and projects under this part to train or retrain nonprofessional personnel for child care and child development programs."

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized to award grants to individuals employed in child care and child development programs for the purposes of meeting the costs of inservice training for professional and nonprofessional personnel to be conducted by an agency carrying on a child care or child development program, by a community or higher education institution, or by a combination thereof.

SEC. 403. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of section 402 such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each succeeding fiscal year.

STATUS REPORT ON NASA INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN SPACE COMMUNICATIONS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 and 1970, the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the House Foreign Affairs Committee held extensive hearings into the subject of space communications and their international implications.

As a result of those hearings and a subsequent study mission to Latin America by subcommittee members, a provision was added to the Foreign Assistance Act calling on the United States to provide assistance internationally for "programs of peaceful communications."

Since that time the subcommittee has continued to monitor U.S. activities in this field by requesting periodic status reports from the U.S. executive agencies involved. Recently I received the 1972

status report in this area from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The report describes ongoing programs in space communications now being conducted with India, Brazil and Canada.

In the belief that these projects will be of general interests in my colleagues in the House, I am including at this point in the RECORD the text of the report and the covering letter from NASA.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., February 24, 1972.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,

Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: In response to your recent request, I am pleased to send you the attached Status Report on NASA International Programs in Space Communications for the information of the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD W. FRUTKIN,
Assistant Administrator for International Affairs.

STATUS REPORT ON NASA INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN SPACE COMMUNICATIONS

There are at present two major NASA international cooperative experiments in space communications—one with India for a one-year Satellite Instructional Television Experiment (SITE) and the other with the Canadian Department of Communications (DOC) for the development, fabrication and launching of a Communications Technology Satellite (CTS). NASA is also cooperating with Brazil in a voice and data link experiment using the ATS-III satellite and is considering with Brazil a basis for experimental use the ATS-F spacecraft. In addition to these cooperative projects, NASA will launch two Canadian domestic operational communications satellites (ANIK) on a cost-reimbursable basis. Each of these efforts has been described to the Subcommittee in previous years' hearings; the following summarizes the current status of each project.

INDIA-UNITED STATES SATELLITE INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION EXPERIMENT (SITE)

The SITE experiment is made possible by the development of the ATS-F and G satellites, which will have considerably more power than earlier communications satellites. Terms of the cooperative project, which involves no export of US funds, are set forth in a September 1969 Memorandum of Understanding between NASA and the Indian Department of Atomic Energy. The experiment will commence approximately one year after the ATS-F satellite is launched and will last for one year. TV signals will be transmitted from an Indian ground station at Ahmedabad via the spacecraft directly to some 2,000 village receivers, each augmented by a small 7-10 foot ground antenna, a pre-amplifier and a frequency converter. An additional 3,000 villages will have conventional TV sets to receive the program via ground relay stations located at Delhi, Srinagar, Bombay and Madras.

India is responsible for the ground segment including the transmitting stations, the TV receivers, antennas, pre-amplifiers and frequency converters, and the TV program material. The Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) is designing, developing, procuring and installing the hardware elements for the ground segment. All India

Radio (AIR) of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting is preparing the TV program material with the advice and assistance of the Ministries of Agriculture, Education, Health and Family Planning.

Approximately one year after launching, NASA will move the satellite from its initial position in synchronous orbit at 94°W to 35°E where it will be in view of India. It will then be available to India for the SITE experiment from 4-6 hours a day. Other NASA communications, navigation, meteorological and scientific experiments will be conducted at other times.

During 1971, construction of the thermal-structural model of the spacecraft was completed by Fairchild Industries and vacuum testing of this unit was successfully completed. Structural tests will be run the first quarter of 1972. The engineering model for the SITE transponder (860MHz) was fabricated and is under test. The NASA tracking and data acquisition facility near Madrid was tentatively selected as the location for ground facilities to control the ATS-F spacecraft during the SITE experiment.

Indian engineers continued on-the-job training and project assignments at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. Specifications for the ground receivers and re-diffusion terminals have been determined by ISRO. Selection has been made for the production of the solid state TV receivers using one of several competing indigenous Indian designs. Two low-cost community antennas built by India will be shipped to the U.S. during 1972 for testing and evaluation at the Goddard Space Flight Center. Design work continues on the front-end converters, and a batch production facility is planned for these converters at Ahmedabad. Expansion and upgrading of the ESCES up-link terminal at Ahmedabad began in August 1971. A back-up to this station, India is planning to construct an 85-foot-aperture terminal near New Delhi to be completed in 1974.

TV program production will be done primarily at the existing VHF TV station in Delhi and secondarily at stations planned for Srinagar, Bombay, Madras, Calcutta and Lucknow (to be commissioned 1972-74). In addition, special field production centers will be established in each village cluster for local programming.

From the Indian point of view, the SITE experiment will serve as a valuable precursor to their planned operational satellite telecommunications system, designated INSAT. Plans for this system were included in the Indian 10-year space plan approved by the Government of India during 1971. INSAT project planning has begun at ISRO's Space Science and Technology Center in Trivandrum. Three satellites are currently planned. Procurement of the first two operational satellites would be from contractors outside India, probably in the United States, with the third spacecraft to be built in India.

BRAZILIAN EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION PROPOSAL

Brazil's Project SACI (Advanced Satellite for Interdisciplinary Communications) contemplates three phases: Phase 1—a voice and data link experiment, already approved, which utilizes the ATS-III satellite for communications between the Brazilian Instituto de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE—formerly CNAE) and Stanford University; Phase 2—a proposed demonstration broadcast experiment via ground communication links and the ATS-F satellite to 500 elementary schools in the state of Rio Grande de Norte; Phase 3—a nationwide educational TV broadcast system via a Brazilian-owned and operated (educational and telecommunications) satellite.

For Phase 1, NASA is providing access to the ATS-III satellite VHF transponder for a cooperative experiment involving two-way voice and data transmissions between Stan-

ford University and INPE for up to six hours a week for 3-6 months. The preliminary experiment checkout and preparation has been conducted and the planned program transmission is expected to begin with the Stanford spring semester.

With respect to Phase 2, NASA in 1970 determined that an INPE proposal to use the 860 MHz ATS-F transponder was technically viable and desirable as a possible cooperative project subject to the schedule requirements and priorities of other experiments planned while the satellite is in the Western Hemisphere.

As a result of the August 1971 World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications (WARC-ST) frequency allocation decisions and the addition of an S-Band transponder to the ATS-F spacecraft, INPE has recently submitted a revised SACI proposal to use the S-Band for the experiment. This is currently under review.

As part of the pre-Phase 2 operations, INPE will begin in March an experimental transmission—via terrestrial means—of educational radio and TV programs into many of the Rio Grande de Norte schools which would participate in the proposed ATS-F experiment. Programs will be broadcast via a TV station recently installed at Natal and three radio stations (in Natal, Mossow, and Caico).

CANADA-UNITED STATES COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SATELLITE (CTS) PROJECT

In this cooperative project with the Canadian Department of Communications (DOC), NASA will launch a Communications Technology Satellite (CTS) into a geostationary orbit in 1975 for experimentation directly with earth stations in Canada and the United States.

The overall objective of the CTS project is to advance the state of the art in spacecraft and related ground-based technologies relevant to communications and other satellite application systems. The satellite will permit broadcast and distribution experimentation at a frequency band between 11.7 to 12.2 GHz on the satellite-to-earth link in both the US and Canada. This band was allocated for the Broadcasting Satellite Service at the World Administrative Radio Conference in 1971. Under study for CTS experimentation is a broad spectrum of experiments to develop and test techniques for services to small villages, including community TV and audio broadcast, two-way voice communications, and data linking and distribution including facsimile, which will have potential future applications for the US in Alaska and for Canada in its outlying northern areas.

In addition to these communications experiments, the CTS spacecraft will include these technology experiments:

- (1) a 200-watt superefficiency 12 GHz transmitter,
- (2) unfurlable solar arrays with initial power capability larger than one kilowatt,
- (3) liquid metal slip rings for power transfer across rotary joints,
- (4) an electric propulsion system for spacecraft keeping; and
- (5) an accurate stabilization system for a spacecraft with flexible extended solar arrays.

NASA responsibilities include provision of a Thor-Delta class launching, development and test of the superefficiency power tube and testing of the completed spacecraft. Canada will fund, develop, and construct all other experiments. Canada will also be responsible for the spacecraft design, fabrication, integration, and systems testing, as well as for tracking, data acquisition and command and control of the spacecraft after it achieves geostationary orbit.

US and Canadian experiments will be conducted on a 50/50 time-shared basis. All scientific and technical results will be shared and made generally available through publication in established channels. As in the case

of other NASA cooperative projects, there will be no exchange of funds between the DOC and NASA. Since the conclusion of the agreement in April, 1971, the Steering Committee has appointed a Joint Weight Review and Control Board, which has established the baseline weight for the spacecraft within the capabilities of the launch vehicle. The Canadians have sent out Requests for Proposals (RFP's) for the subsystems under their responsibility and will begin letting contracts soon. NASA has issued RFP's on the traveling wave tube (TWT) and the associated power supply. Contractor selection is expected shortly.

CANADA UNITED STATES REIMBURSABLE LAUNCHING AGREEMENT

In May 1971, NASA concluded an agreement with TELESAT Canada (Canadian Corporation for Telecommunications by Satellite), a quasi-governmental corporation, for the launching of two Canadian domestic communications satellites on a reimbursable basis. NASA will provide the Thor-Delta class launch vehicles, related launch services, and some tracking and computer support. The two satellites will be launched from the Eastern Test Range in the 1972-3 time period. The first satellite, ANIK-A, is scheduled for launch in October 1972.

THE RED CHINESE DOPE PUSHERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, somewhat hidden by the administration's courtship of Communist China is the fact that the Red Chinese have become one of the major suppliers of dangerous drugs in the international drug market. There is evidence to indicate that "worldwide distribution of drugs has now far exceeded exportation of the quotations of Mao Tse-tung."

I insert an article by Ch'in Yung-fa, specialist in Chinese Communist Military Affairs, entitled "The Economic and Political Significance of Chinese Communist Production and Exportation of Dangerous Drugs," which appeared in the March 1972 issue of *Issues and Studies*, in the RECORD at this point.

THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CHINESE COMMUNIST PRODUCTION AND EXPORTATION OF DANGEROUS DRUGS

(By Ch'in Yung-fa)

I. FOREWORD

The Chinese Communists' policy on the production of dangerous drugs was laid down in 1928 by Mao Tse-tung. Forced cultivation of poppy plants, which were processed into opium, morphine and heroin, was coordinated with Mao's strategy for Communist seizure of power by armed force. Production of these drugs was an important economic resource for the Chinese Communists in securing materials they needed during their initial rebellion against the National Government, and for their eventual seizure of power in mainland China. Since the establishment of the Peiping regime, exportation of dangerous drugs on a global scale has become one of the most important national policies of the Chinese Communists.

Today, mainland China has become one of the major suppliers of dangerous drugs in the international drug market. Drugs and the "Mao Quotations" have served as the major Maoist instruments in corrupting both the

health and minds of innocent people in many parts of the world. Moreover, worldwide distribution of drugs has now far exceeded exportation of the Quotations of Mao Tse-tung. The drugs are readily available on the international drug market, including those of the United States and the Soviet Union.

II. THE CHINESE COMMUNIST DRUG POLICY

1. Kiangsi (Chingkangshan) Period: 1828-1934.

In March 1928 when Mao Tse-tung and his Communist followers took refuge in Kiangsi and there established the so-called "soviet government," Communist cadres were ordered to cultivate opium in large quantities in an effort to secure needed materials, demoralize the "white area," save the crumbling "Red Army," and restore Communist armed force in order to continue their struggle. However, their effort was greatly hampered by the Government's five "encirclement and extermination" campaigns. Drug traffic was also curtailed because of blocking by the government troops. As a result, no significant exportation of drugs was achieved during this initial period.

2. Yenan Period: 1935-1949

In 1935 when the Communist troops occupied northern Shansi, Mao Tse-tung, in his effort to expand Communist armed rebellion, handed down an overall plan for producing and selling opium. At the beginning of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937, drugs were obtained from the Japanese-controlled areas such as Shansi and Suiyuan Provinces and resold on a retail basis. Later, orders were given to Wang Cheng, commander of the 359th brigade of the 120th Division under Ho Lung, (Wang was "Minister of Land Reclamation" before the Cultural Revolution) to intensify cultivation of opium in Nanniwan in the eastern and southern part of Yenan. To promote opium production, farmers in the Yenan area were told that poppy plants could be refined into oil, tobacco, and kitchen wood. They were thus persuaded that as long as they refrained from smoking opium, cultivation of poppy plants could be useful rather than harmful to them. Furthermore, specific areas were demarcated for cultivation of poppy plants and farmers were forced to deliver certain amounts of their products at specified dates. Around 1941 when the Communists occupied the border region of Shansi, Kansu, and Ninghsia, poppy plants were cultivated in many parts of these provinces except along the highway areas where they might be discovered. Major opium production regions include: in northern Shensi: Lu County, Tingpien, Chingpien, Yenchuan, and along the Yenchang area; in northern Shansi: Hsin County, Kolan, Paote, Hochu, and Pienkuan area; in eastern Kansu: Hosui, Ch'ingyang areas, Tiensui and Huan County, Yenchih and other places along the border region in Shensi and Ninghsia. In 1942, according to preliminary estimates, more than 13,200 *mou* of land was used to cultivate poppy plants in the following counties in northern Shensi: Shunhua, Chuyi, Yichui, Lu County, Kanchuan, Yenchang, Yenchuan, Anting Suite, Michih, Hsia County, Hengshan, and Chingpien; 7,000 *mou* in Chengning and Chingyang in eastern Kansu; more than 4000 *mou* in Hochu in western Shansi; and about 47,000 *mou* in Ling County, Hsin County, and Paote County in western Shansi. In 1946, 40 per cent of the arable land in Chingchien, Suite, Michih and Hsia County in northern Shensi was used for planting poppies. During the same period, cultivation of tobacco seeds in Kanchuan and Anting in northern Shensi had exceeded 39 *tan*.

In 1936 in northern Shensi, the Communists promulgated a regulation on the collection and distribution of opium between the farmers and the Communist authorities. The regulation stipulated among other things that two-thirds of the product would go to

the Communist authorities and the other one-third to the farmers. The portion allotted to the farmers, however, had to be sold to Communist authorities and free selling of opium by the farmers was strictly prohibited. In 1942, new regulations on collection and distribution of poppy plants were announced in an effort to encourage intensive cultivation on the part of the farmers. The regulation included, among other things, the following items:

(1) Two-thirds of the poppy products would go to the Communist authorities and one-third to the individual landlords when production exceeded 60 *liang*. Total allocation to the individual landlords, however, must not exceed 1,000 *liang*. Sale of this portion in the Communist-controlled border area was strictly prohibited.

(2) Seventy *liang* would go to the individual landlords when production exceeded 700 *liang*; two-thirds of the remainder would go to the Communist authorities and one-third to the farmers. 80 *liang* would go to the individual landlords when production exceeded 800 *liang*; two-thirds of the remainder would go to the Communist authorities and one-third to the farmers.

(3) Fifteen out of each 100 *liang* would go to the individual landlords when production reached 1,000 to 5,000 *liang*; two-thirds of the remainder would go to the Communist authorities and one-third to the farmers.

Furthermore, in order to improve planting technique, experienced farmers were recruited in Hsia County and Wupao and sent to other regions as supervisors. Each of these specialized farmers received the handsome sum of 2,700 silver dollars monthly.

Opium collected by the Communist border authorities was delivered to "Yenan Local Products Company" where armed escorts were provided and the product was sold to merchants in the government-controlled areas. These opium traders were also instructed to buy materials out of the transactions they made and re-exchange these materials with opium upon their return to the Communist-controlled border areas. Around 1942, opium markets were set up in every opium-producing county. Six or ten opium markets were established in each county depending on the amount of arable land for cultivation. Each market had a special "guest-house" to be used as a bartering place (opium bartered for materials) by opium-traders from the government-controlled areas. Special benefits were offered to those opium traders who managed to barter more goods. During this period, armed escorts for opium traders were provided by way of the following three major regions:

(1) Opium traders reached Communist-controlled northeastern China from Communist-controlled border regions by way of the Yellow River all the way eastward through Shansi, Hopei and Honan.

(2) Opium traders reached Suiyuan and Ninghsia Provinces from Communist-controlled border regions; they also reached the Government rear areas from Chengyuan, Kansu, by way of Pingchuan to Changwu, Hsingcheng to Pingliang, and from Taiping to Chingchuan and Lingtai. Each year during the barter season on May 5 to May 10, the opium traders also took the opportunity to dump large quantities of opium in many market places in many counties.

(3) Retail sales of opium were also made in Shensi and Kansu Province from the Communist-controlled regions.

During the Sino-Japanese war, the Communists took advantage of the situation in the Japanese-controlled rear area by establishing "local government" and cultivating opium in large quantities. For example, intensive cultivation of opium was made in such Communist-controlled areas as Wei-yang, Talkang and Hsihwa. In Chingho Cheng, the "Hual-Tai-Hsi County" was established which was directly under the juris-

diction of the Hopei-Shantung-Honan Communist "border government." Intensive production of opium was also carried on in these regions. On July 9, 1945, the "Provisional Rules for Opium Taxation and Control in Hual-Tai-Hsi County" was promulgated (See Appendix 1). This regulation provides general information on Communist policy on production of opium in the so-called "liberated area."

In 1945 when the Communists began to expand their nation-wide armed rebellion, opium was used as reserved capital by banks for issuing paper money in the "liberated area." Farmers were also given the green light to cultivate poppy plants without much interference. Furthermore, in 1947 each militia was ordered to cultivate one *mou* of poppies in fertile and safe regions. In many areas, chemical factories were built for manufacturing morphine and heroin. Communist agents, disguising themselves as businessmen, bartered these products for munitions and materials in the government-controlled areas. Such practices greatly aided Communist military operations against the Government forces.

3. The Period Since the Establishment of the Communist Regime: 1950—to the present

(1) Organs in Charge of the Production and Sale of Dangerous Drugs

Around 1949, each local and regional military commander was held responsible for the production of opium. Profits from the sale of opium were to be used for paying and feeding soldiers. Later, however, production and management were brought under the control of the "Ministry of Finance" because of widespread corruption. As cultivation, production and transportation of drugs speedily increased, drug administration policy was assigned and coordinated among the following eleven departments:

A. "Ministry for Land Reclamation": Responsible for cultivation of drugs through immigration and reclamation in border region.

B. "Ministry of Agriculture": Responsible for cultivation of drugs and improvement of laboratory research in state operated farms.

C. "Ministry of Education": Responsible for improving production and laboratory research.

D. "Committee for Prevention of Waste": Responsible for supervision and increment of drug production.

E. "Ministry of Commerce": Responsible for collection and sale of drugs by each "Special Local Product Company."

F. "Bureau for Preservation of National Resources": Responsible for protection of drugs.

G. "Central Production Management Committee": Responsible for drug manufacture.

H. "Ministry of Public Security": Responsible for supervising and protecting drug production.

I. "Ministry of Finance": Responsible for supervising drug taxation.

J. "Ministry of Foreign Trade": Responsible for supervising all affiliated "Foreign Trade Companies" and for exporting drugs.

K. "Ministry of Foreign Affairs": Responsible for promoting drug exportations.

(2) Production and Sale of Drugs in Yunnan Province.

On February 1950 when the Communist troops led by Ch'en Keng and Sung Jen-ch'ung entered Yunnan Province, they brought large quantities of drugs to Kunming for sale. Since very little profit was gained, opium was transported by men and animals to Burma. From there it was transported to Rangoon via Mandalay and then to northern Thailand for sale. This marked the beginning of Communist dumping of drugs in Southeast Asia by way of Yunnan Province.

During their early occupation of Yunnan Province, the Communists, stressing the unique topology there, prohibited opium

smoking but allowed opium cultivation. Beginning in 1951, Loping, Kwangnan, Funing, Yensan Chiupai and Luhsi in northern Yunnan were designated as a "special zone" for opium cultivation. Products were procured at official prices by the "Special Products Management Committee" of the "people's government" in each county. These products were then exported by the "Yunnan Provincial Trading Company." In 1952, official prices for opium produced in Yunnan, Kweichow and Kwangsi were set as follows: Yunnan products—60,000 old JMP (10,000 old JMP equals one new JMP) for each *liang*.

Kweichow products—65,000 old JMP for each *liang*.

Kwangsi products—58,000 old JMP for each *liang*.

Beginning in 1953, all opium producing lands in Yunnan Province were "nationalized" and experienced farmers were hired to supervise production work. Ninety nine per cent of the product went to the Communist authorities and only one per cent was allotted to the farmers. Since 1953, more than 250,000 *liang* of opium have been exported each month by the "Yunnan Provincial Trading Company."

At the present time, the following counties have been designated by the Chinese Communists as major opium producing areas:

In eastern Yunnan: Loping, Kwangnan, Funing, Makuan, Wensan, Yensan, Chiupai and Luhsi.

In southern Yunnan: Ningerl, Shihfang, Chengyue, Lanchang, Changyuan, and Shuangchiang.

In western Yunnan: Kungsan, Lichiang, Huoching, Tali, Chingtung, Kenma, Chengkang, Lungling, Ruyli, and Lungchuan.

The total area of land used for cultivation of opium in these places was above one million *mou*. In September 1970, the Mengpang Village Revolutionary Committee in Mengla County organized a 500-man production team to cultivate poppy plants in the vicinity of Sula Village under the supervision of a company of Red soldiers. Most of the "state-operated farms" in Yunnan Province also engaged in opium cultivation. Morphine and heroin processing factories, including ten big pharmaceutical factories have been built in Yunnan Province. They include the "Special Materials Processing Factory of China Chemical Company" in Kunming, and the "Yunnan Chemical Factory" of the "China Pharmaceutical Company" in Tali. Opium imported from the Burmese border region was processed and re-exported.

III. CURRENT PRODUCTION WORK

1. Cultivation area

(1) Ordinary cultivation area—This includes an area of 5,830,000 *mou* in the mountain regions in 22 provinces. Cultivation is directed and supervised by the "people's government." Cultivators may apply, on a credit basis, for poppy seeds, fertilizers, and farming tools at the local "people's bank." Products, however, are to be procured by the Communist authorities at official rates or no the basis of advanced agreement. Unauthorized sales are strictly prohibited. In the region where the area of cultivation exceeds 500 *mou*, one or two agricultural department representatives are sent to supervise production and determine personnel records. Punishments are inflicted on those who fail to reach their production goal, while those who surpass their production goals are hailed as "production heroes" and "model workers" and given extra benefits.

(2) Special cultivation area—The special cultivation area or the so-called "state-operated" area, totals about four million *mou* (See Appendix III). Various agencies such as public clinics, the agricultural department, the border garrison and scientific research agencies were jointly involved in mapping

planting policy. For example, the "Chinese Academy of Sciences," Agricultural Science Institute, Anhwei School of Agriculture, Kweichow School of Agriculture, Hsipei School of Agriculture, Yunnan University, Szechwan University and the Yunnan Advanced School of Agriculture were assigned to do research to improve poppy seeds. "Model farmers" were sent to various provinces to "exchange experience" with others, and propaganda teams were dispatched on a nation-wide campaign to explain various cultivation methods.

2. Annual Production

(1) It is estimated that the Chinese Communists process about 10,000 tons of narcotics a year. From 1952 to 1957 the annual production and sale totaled about 2,000 tons, but it increased to 8,000 tons a year between 1958 and 1964. From 1965 to the present the annual export has been 10,000 tons, earning a net profit of over US\$800 million per year.

(2) In 1950 experts on narcotic production, including those from the Soviet Union, were assigned to about 30 "processing factories for special products" in Peiping, Tientsin, Dalian, Mukden, Chingchow, Kuopelkuo, Yenchi, Shanghai, Hangchow, Hankuo, Chingking, Tihua, Lahasa, Kangting, Kunming and Canton. (See Appendices IV and V for the names of the factories and their products.)

IV. CURRENT EXPORT SITUATION

1. Exportation Methods

Peiping-produced narcotics are usually smuggled to various places by such organizations as "export companies for native products" in mainland China and "native products companies" overseas.

(1) Agencies in Hongkong and Macao—In 1951 a "station for exporting narcotics" was set up in Wanchi Village, Chungshan County, Kwangtung, bordering Macao. It instructed "native products companies" in Hongkong and Macao to sign contracts with local smugglers, who would then secretly enter the "safe area" to handle the "goods." "Yu Lien Company" in Macao operated by Li Shen-chih was the foreign headquarters for selling Peiping narcotics, with branches in Hanoi and Bangkok. Later the company was enlarged into the "Macao Yu Lien Company, Limited" financed by Ho Hsien-che, board chairman of the "Macao Chinese Chamber of Commerce" and a "Special reception Committee" member the "Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference." The person actually in charge was Tsui Te-ch'i, board vice chairman of the "Macao Chinese Chamber of Commerce" and member of the Kwangtung Provincial Committee of the "Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference," he was assisted by Huang Shen and Chen Man. After the United Nations warned against the Communist attempt to narcotize the world in 1952, the Maoists abolished the "station for exporting narcotics" in Chungshan County, Kwangtung and decided to label narcotics "special products." A trade company for "native special products" was established in Peiping under the joint supervision of the CCP Central Committee, the "Foreign Ministry" and the "Ministry of Foreign Trade." The commercial attaches of Peiping's foreign diplomatic missions were responsible for selling narcotics and for improving the smuggling method.

(2) Smuggling Activities in Hongkong—On October 15, 1970, the chief of the narcotic investigation division of the Hongkong Police revealed that large quantities of narcotics were seized in 1969 by the Hongkong police, including 10,500 lbs. of opium, 310 lbs. of heroin and 250 lbs. of morphine. All persons involved were punished according to regulations. However, the police official said that to avoid political issues, all Chinese Communists arrested had been released. Because of the increasing vigilance of the Hongkong police, drugs smuggled into the British colony

from other places had recently decreased and Hongkong dealers had to turn to Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand for their narcotic supply. In the first half of 1969 opium was sold at 90 Hongkong dollars per ounce; in the latter half, the price fell to HK\$60. Heroin was sold at HK\$190 per ounce and morphine at HK\$350. The "Hua Jen Company" in Hongkong, similar to the "Yu Lien Company" in Macao, is led by high-ranking members of the "Hongkong Chinese Chamber of Commerce" and members of the "Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference." It has branches in Bangkok "where the '999,' 'Camel' and '555' brands of heroin have been produced.

(3) Collaboration with the Burmese Communists—The Chinese Communists have long been using minority nationalities in the border area called "the zone outside of every jurisdiction" of Yunnan, Burma and Thailand to engaged in the smuggling of "special goods." The profits have been used to finance the rebellious activities of Kachins, Karens and Shans against the Burmese government on the one hand and to support the Burmese Communists on the other. Wang Ch'eng, trade representative of the PLA units in Yunnan, met P'eng Chia-sheng, leader of the Burmese Communists in April 1970, to discuss plans for setting up a processing factory near Kangnan. It was also agreed that Wang would send morphine processed in Kunming to P'eng, who then shipped opium produced in Burma to Kunming for processing. According to travelers who returned to Hongkong from Kunming in September 1970, the free market for narcotics in Kunming had gone underground and had attracted many dealers from Shanghai, Nanking and Chungking.

2. Smuggling routes

At present the exported narcotics are from mainland China through four main routes:

(1) East China route—Shanghai is the main center, Amoy the second export port, and Hongkong the transferring post. From Hongkong, the narcotics are delivered to the Middle East, Australia, Europe, America, Southeast Asia, and sometimes Taiwan.

(2) South China route—Canton is the main center, and Shenchuan, Shihchi, Humen, Nanton, Chungshan, Shekou, Lachiwei, and Hainan are the export stations. Hongkong and Macao are the main destinations. Motor boats are used as the main transportation from Humen and Nantou to Hongkong and Macao. The narcotics are first delivered to Inner Lingting Island, and then to Macao or Tayushan, an off shore island of Hongkong. From Tayushan they are delivered to Kowloon or Hongkong by small speed boats. In Macao, Nankuang Hong (company) is the headquarters of narcotics transaction and the minimum quantity of purchase is 10,000 ounces. The delivery of goods is usually made on the high seas near Tankanshan, which is very close to Macao. In Hongkong, narcotics dealers are mostly influential and well-financed corporations.

Another export station was set up on Lachiwei Island (near Hongkong and Macao) in November 1969 with docks and warehouses, which were completed in April 1970. Narcotics are transported from Canton by gunboats, packed in wooden cases with seals of "Ministry of Defense." Deliveries are made four to six times monthly. The docks are marked as forbidden areas until the narcotics are taken away by foreign ships through previous arrangements.

(3) West China route (also called the Southeast Asian route)—Chehli, Lungchuan, Tengchung, and Wanting are the main centers. Goods are transported via the border areas of Vietnam, Laos, and Burma to Burma, Cambodia, Laos, South Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore. They may also be transferred to Indonesia, Hongkong, Macao and other places. Some may be transported via North Vietnam to Cuba, Albania,

and some of the African countries. According to the Hsingchou Daily and the Nanyang Daily, narcotics dealers consider the route from Yunnan via Thailand to Singapore and Malaysia as most profitable and call it the "golden throat." This route has therefore become the main line of the Chinese Communists' narcotics distribution to the free world.

(4) North China route—Tientsin is the center; Tsingtao, Weihaiwei, and Dairen are the export ports; and Japan and Korea are the main destinations. Transferring stations have been set up in Kyushu, Hokkaido, Kobe and Osaka, where the Japanese Communists are rather active. The goods may also be transported via North Korea to East Germany and then to European countries, or via North Korea to Cuba, Albania and certain African countries and then to other countries.

3. Smuggling methods

Various methods are used for smuggling: (1) Seamen and pilots are used as carriers; secret places on board ship are designed to hide the goods.

(2) Small fishing boats are used for transportation at night; the goods are unloaded at quiet coastal spots, or left in water with floats waiting to be picked up by divers.

(3) Goods are parachuted from small airplanes at designated spots at night.

(4) Submarines are sometimes used to deliver the goods to their destination.

(5) Narcotics may be mixed with flour, spice, sugar or soap. After delivery, technicians dissolve the mixture and extract the drug.

(6) Cotton cloth is soaked in liquid morphine and then dried. The morphine can be extracted after delivery.

(7) Narcotics may be packed with other goods in tins, toothpaste tubes, plaster figures, or other commodities.

(8) Coffins, dead bodies and even open wounds are sometimes used as hiding places.

(9) The carrier may hide narcotics in his anus, in female private organs, or in a special layer fixed in suitcases.

(10) The opportunity of official visits made by diplomats, trade missions, goodwill delegations, cultural exchange groups, or tourists may be used.

(11) Bribery may be used, or sometimes tourists are made to carry narcotics without their knowledge.

(12) After delivery, the goods are stored in many different places. Direct contact between the responsible Communist cadres and the agents, between the agents and the distributors, and between distributors and retailers is always avoided. It is, therefore, difficult for the police to track down the whole network.

V. ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE

1. To earn foreign exchange

(1) In 1952 officials of the Chinese Communist "State Planning Commission," "Finance Ministry" and "Ministry of Foreign Trade" held a secret meeting in Peiping, attended by local cadres primarily from Southwest and South China; the purpose was to discuss how to use earnings from exporting narcotics to increase state revenues. After the meeting measures were taken to insure that narcotics would become one of the three major financial resources for the Communist regime, namely, "white goods" referring to rice, wheat and cotton, "yellow goods" referring to gold, silver, U.S. dollars and bonds, and "black goods" referring to opium. According to an article entitled "The Inside Story of the Chinese Communists' Sale of Narcotics" written by a former high-ranking CCP cadre and published in the *Hongkong Times* on December 12, 1950, the "white goods" were used to pay the salaries of military personnel, government employees and teachers, the "yellow goods" to finance construction and military projects and the "black goods" to pay for part of military

expenditures and secret service costs and to eliminate the deficit.

(2) Tsusai Sugawara, Chairman of Japan's National Commission for Control of Narcotics, has disclosed that the Chinese Communists make a profit of 60 billion yen (approximately US\$ 170 million) from the sale of narcotics to Japan each year; however, the amount is less than one third of the total export.

(3) The director of the U.S. Federal Narcotics Investigation Bureau has pointed out that the Chinese Communists have been engaging in extensive opium planting as a means to earn large amounts of foreign exchange.

(4) In an article entitled "How the Maoists Smuggle Opium" published in No. 30 issue of the semi-monthly, *Intelligentsia*, B. Bulatov, a correspondent for the Soviet *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, estimated that the annual production of opium on the Chinese mainland is about 8,000 tons, an amount which could be converted into 500 tons of heroin. Calculated on the basis of US\$20,000 per pound, the selling price in Japan, the United States and Western Europe, the 500 tons of heroin would earn Peiping over US\$10 billion in foreign exchange. However, it is impossible for the Communists to refine all opium into heroin. Taking this fact into consideration and excluding the cost for transportation and bribing officials of various countries, experts estimated the annual gain of the Chinese Communists at US\$800 million.

2. Exchange for strategic materials

(1) Narcotics are sold to Southeast Asian areas in return for rubber and petroleum.

(2) Narcotics are sold to Japan and Hongkong in return for steel, vehicles and industrial materials.

VI. POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE

1. To demoralize the free people of the free world

In producing and selling narcotics to non-Communist countries, the Chinese Communists follow Lenin's advice that when normal weapons are not enough to deal with the enemy, dirty weapons may be used.

(1) The secretary-general of the Narcotics Control Committee of Thailand said in June 1966 that the Chinese Communists had attempted to weaken the anti-Communist force with drugs. He revealed at the same time that in 1965 the Thai authorities captured seven tons of opium and morphine smuggled into Thailand by the Chinese Communists.

(2) According to a dispatch filed by the Agency France Press from Budapest on March 29, 1969, the Chinese Communists earned US\$800 million annually from exporting narcotics including heroin and opium; of that amount, US\$170 million was sold to Japan. The Chinese Communist decision to poison mankind was made in 1952 and the smuggling route passed through Southwest China, Burma, Laos and Thailand with Hongkong as the center.

(3) Dr. Donald Loubie, professor of the Medical College at Cornell University and director of the Narcotics Prohibition Department in New York, estimated that of the 12,049 male prisoners in Hongkong, 10,487 were drug addicts.

(4) A study group set up by the Standing Committee of the Hongkong Narcotics Prohibition Committee made a survey in December 1969 which showed that 30,000 to 65,000 men in Hongkong were drug addicts; female addicts comprised about 3 per cent of the total female population in Hongkong.

(5) Statistics show the following breakdown of the annual Chinese Communist export of narcotics: 1,000 tons (about 1 billion doses) for Singapore and Malaysia, 3,000 tons for Japan, and 800 to 1,000 tons for Hongkong.

2. To demoralize American troops abroad

(1) An AP dispatch filed from London on October 24, 1971, (*China Post*, Taipei October 25, 1971) reported a conversation between Egypt's late President Nasser and Chou En-lai which took place in June 1965. In the conversation, reported in a political biography of Nasser by one of his closest advisers, Mohammed Helkal, Chou was quoted as claiming:

a. He wanted the United States to send more and more of its young men to Vietnam as "an insurance policy" against a nuclear attack on mainland China by the "American militarists."

b. Some American troops in Vietnam were trying opium and the Communists were helping them. "We are planting the best kinds of opium especially for the American soldiers in Vietnam."

c. Recalling that the West had sold opium to China, he said that the Chinese Communists intended to wage an opium war with the West so as to "treat a person in the same manner as it treated others."

(2) According to the English-language daily *Vanguard* published in Argentina, October 31, 1970, an investigation group made a report to the U.S. Senate on the use of narcotics by American troops in Vietnam to this effect:

a. The Chinese Communists were exporting large quantities of the cheapest but highest quality heroin to Vietnam in a plot to paralyze the American troops. The local price was only US\$20 per ounce compared with US\$4,000 per ounce in the United States while the quality of the heroin was 99 to 100 per cent refined.

b. In 1969 American deaths in Vietnam resulting from drug addiction averaged two persons a month; however, the figure rose to two per day from January to October 1970.

c. In the last six months the percentage of drug addicts among American troops in Vietnam had risen from 30 to 50 per cent. In some military units 70 to 80 per cent were reported. On October 31 a group of GIs was even trying morphine publicly before personnel of the CBS Television Network.

(3) According to a UPI dispatch reported by the Central News Agency (CNA) on December 3, 1970, all kinds of narcotics could be obtained at a low price in Thailand. Bangkok had become a major market in the Far East and American GIs were the main customers.

(4) It is reported that Leftist owners of restaurants and shops in Thailand have been selling specially made cigarettes with morphine to American military personnel.

3. To finance leftist organizations abroad

(1) After the Korean War, the Maoists established a "department for overseas work" under the Political Bureau of the CCP Central Committee. The department is engaged, among other things, in confiscating American banknotes and selling "special native products." In his book, *Supply of Narcotics and Spying Work*, published in 1955, Li Tung, former CCP cadre with the Department for Overseas Work, stated the following conclusions:

a. All experienced spies must be good at smuggling drugs, and all able drug smugglers ought to shoulder important responsibilities in intelligence work.

b. It would be easy and safe to turn smuggling organizations into front organs for the intelligence network.

c. It is necessary to strengthen the political knowledge of drug smugglers so that they can advance from the stage of "working for money" to that of "struggling for the revolutionary cause."

d. With the flow of narcotics into a place, many underground organizations are bound to spring up, and they are the best components of the intelligence network.

e. Bribed officials in various countries should be encouraged to encourage their friends to receive bribes.

(2) The chairman of the Labor and Immigration Committee of the Philippine Senate said on April 30, 1966, that the value of narcotics smuggled into his country from the Chinese mainland via Singapore and Hongkong had reached 7,200,000 pesos. He also pointed out that the Hongkong-based Communist drug traffic intended to narcotize both the bodies and minds of the Philippines and to damage the economic construction in the Philippines in order to create dissatisfaction and incite rebellion among the Filipinos.

(3) Soviet *Pravda* disclosed in September 1964 that some US\$500 million, derived annually by Chinese Communist leaders from smuggling narcotics, had been used to support subversive activities around the world.

(4) The director of the Narcotics Investigation Section of the Hongkong Police revealed in August 1970 that the Maoists earned about 1.5 million Hongkong dollars each month from selling narcotics and deposited all the money in the "Bank of China" in the British colony to pay for machinery imported from Europe and for secret service activities in the Far East.

(5) It is said that the Maoists are selling opium to chieftains in Laos, Burma and Thailand at half price as a means of winning local support. According to a Reuter dispatch from Bangkok on November 30, 1970 Communist guerrillas in northern Thailand have been using morphine-containing medicine to treat various diseases among the villagers.

(6) Various reports indicate that the border areas in Yunnan (China), Burma, Thailand and Laos have become the most important place for growing narcotics by the Chinese Communists. There are more than ten companies in Southeast Asian countries engaged in selling opium. The *Saturday Evening Post* attributed the continued existence of these companies to the fact that the authorities concerned in these countries "have been ordered not to intervene" because of the efforts made by Peiping's "Ministry of Foreign Trade." Such is the seriousness of the threat of the Maoist world-wide campaign to sell narcotics. While there are two aspects of this drive—economic and political, the latter is even more significant than the former.

APPENDIX I

PROVISIONAL RULES FOR OPIUM TAXATION AND CONTROL In Hwai-Tai-Hsi County Promulgated on July 9, 1945

1. In order to strengthen economic struggle against the enemy and lessen the financial burden of the people, it is necessary to control the export of opium in exchange for daily necessities. These rules are formulated in accordance with the taxation principles of the Hwai-Shantung-Honan Border Region Government and in conformity with the practical needs of this county.

2. A general opium store shall be set up in the central market of this county to administer the opium stores and collect the opium tax.

a. Any firms engaging in the opium business shall register with the general opium store in order to pay the business tax, obtain the business license and operate under its supervision and control.

b. The general opium store may have branches or representatives in other towns or markets as needed for opium taxation and control.

c. The general opium store may set the number of such firms as needed in the opium sales. In the case of additional firms, they should apply to the County Government for

approval, and the unapproved shall be listed as reserve firms.

d. The licensed opium stores of firms may collect—

(1) a 30 per cent commission from both the buyer and seller for each transaction they make;

(2) a 10 per cent commission on the tax payments they help collect.

e. The general opium store may check into the operations and performance of the firms for the purpose of reward and punishment. In case of a serious offense, it may withdraw the license from the offender and award it to a reserve firm.

3. Buyers and sellers shall see to it that the outstanding taxes are paid to the general opium store of the licensed firms before a purchase is allowed to be taken out.

a. A prospective buyer shall first apply to the general opium store or its branches and representatives for a permit when making a purchase.

b. Once the purchase is made, the handling firm shall collect the tax payment before delivery.

c. A direct opium export shall be allowed only when payment of the outstanding tax is made to an authorized tax-collecting agency.

4. Tax rates:

a. The opium tax shall now be 15 per cent of the selling price.

b. It shall be 5 per cent of the selling price if the deal is settled with silver dollars or gold surrendered to the general store or its assigned agencies.

5. Penalties for offenses:

a. In case of tax evasion by underdeclaring the value of a sale, the handling firm shall pay the unpaid tax plus a fine twice the amount of the tax payment.

b. In case a purchaser is caught smuggling his purchase, he shall pay the outstanding taxes plus a fine twice the amount of the tax payment. This provision shall apply to all cases of opium smuggling.

c. In case of an illegal deal made through the unlicensed firm, the seller shall pay a fine equal to 10 per cent of the selling price, and the buyer shall pay the outstanding tax plus a fine equal to 40 per cent of the selling price. The firm involved shall pay a fine of 5,000 to 20,000 dollars as the case may warrant.

d. In case of a private deal without going through the firms, the seller shall pay a fine equal to 10 per cent of the selling price, and the buyer shall pay the outstanding tax plus a fine equal to 50 per cent of the selling price.

6. Rewards:

a. Anti-smuggling agents and the unemployed shall be given a reward equal to 10 per cent of the fine for discovering tax evasion, illegal deals or other irregularities leading to payment in fines. But in each case, the reward shall not exceed 1,000 dollars for each person.

b. Employees of commercial firms shall have the right to report tax evasion, illegal deals or other irregularities known to them to the general opium store. There shall be a reward equal to 20 per cent of the fine for any report leading to a payment in fines.

c. The county government and/or the general opium store shall constitute the sole authority in exercising the right of punishment and reward. No other organizations or individuals shall have such a right.

7. These rules shall become effective after promulgation with approval by the Office of the Shui-Tung District.

APPENDIX II

LOCATIONS AND AREAS OF ORDINARY OPIUM PLANTATIONS

Location, Districts of Plantation, and Total Area (mu)

Northeast China: Counties on Sino-Korean border such as Yenchí, Hunch'un, Holung,

Changpei, Fusung, Linkiang, Yian, Kuantien and Chingyu, 400,000.

Northwest China: Shensi—Luehyang, Changwu; Kansu—Liangtang, Chingchuan, Hoshui, Chingning, Chingyuan; Wuwei, Changyeh; Ninghsia—Chungwei; Sinkiang—Yiwu, Nanhu, Sullai, Chinghua, Changchi; Tsinghai—Tungjen, Yushu; and Shensi-Kansu border districts, 250,000.

Inner Mongolia: Jehol—Chaoyang, Chengteh, Chihfeng, 100,000.

East China: Kiangsu—Tunghai, Kuanyun, Lienshui, Liuho; Chekiang—Yuhang, Wukang, Anchi, 700,000.

Central China: Honan—Nanyang, Neihsiang, Chech'uan, Fangcheng; Hupeh—Anshih, Laifeng, Hofeng, Tungshan, Huangpeh; Kiangsi—Juichin, Huich'ang, Yuntu, Hsin-feng; Anhwei—Hsuancheng, Taiping, Hsiuning, Nanning; Hunan—Paoching, Sangchih, Yungshun, Chinyang, Huit'ung, Wukang, Hs'inning, Ch'angteh, 1,700,000.

Szechwan Basin: Szechwan—T'ungkiang, Nankiang, Pachung, Chiangching, Welyuan, 30,000.

Southwest: Kwangsi—Silung, Silin, Paise, Chenpien, Huichi; Yunnan—Loping, Kwangnan, Funing, Makuan, Wenshan, Yenshan, Chiupel, Lusi, Ningerh, Szemao, Chenyueh, Mengla, Lantsang, Tsangyuan, Shuangchiang, Kungshan, Lichiang, Hoch'ing, Tali, Chingtung, Kengma, Chenkang, Lungling, Juili, Lungch'uan; Kweichow—Pichieh, Chinglung, Lungyi.

Sikang and Tibet: Sikang—Ya'an, Sich'ang, Huli; Tibet—Langma, Teh'ing.

Kwantung Mountain Area: Kwangtung—Ch'ingyuan, Tungwan, Yingteh, Juyuan, Yangshan, Lienhsien, Kwangning, Szechui, Yunfu, Yangkiang, Wuhua, Hsingning, Tzechin, Loch'ang, Yangchun, Fengch'uan, Kao-yao, Loting, Lufeng, Huahsien; and Hainan Island, 330,000.

Remarks: The Chinese Communists bought marijuana seeds from India and Brazil in 1968, and planted them in Hainan Island; however, the production is unknown.

APPENDIX III

LOCATIONS AND AREAS OF SPECIAL OPIUM FARMS

Organizations in Charge, Name of Farm, and Area (mu)

Water and Soil Conservancy Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture: Third Experimental Farm, Fifth Experimental Farm, 20,000; and 16,000.

Central Bureau of State Farms, Ministry of Agriculture: Model Farm directly under central authority, 12,000; Chinchow Farm, Liaoning, Frog Pool Farm, Liaoning, and Hsungyu Farm, Liaoning, 7,000; Princess Ridge Farm, Kirin, Chiuchan Farm, Kirin, Lingwu Farm, Ninghsia, Tarim Farm, Sinkiang, Kupeikou Farm, Hopei, Chihung Farm, Hopei, Huanghua Farm, Hopei, Yungnien Farm, Hopei, Kaoi Farm, Hopei, Paoting Farm, Hopei, Yellow River Valley Farm, Honan, Hulan Farm, Chekiang, and Nanhsung Farm, Kwangtung, 3,000.

Agricultural Products Bureau Ministry of Agriculture: Special Farm directly under central authority, and Chaoyang Farm directly under central authority, unknown.

Northwest Agricultural and Forest Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture: Second Farm, 2,000.

Chinese Academy of Sciences: Special Products Farm, Institute of Sciences, Experimental Farm for Narcotic Plant Seeds, Botany Institute, 800.

Sinkiang Military Region: August First Farm, 1,000.

Tibet Military Region: Chiangtze Farm, 700.

Inner Mongolia Military Region: Koerhsin Farm, and Taolin Farm, 1,500.

Ninghsia Hui Autonomous District: Yin-chuan Farm, 500.

Heilungkiang People's Government, Chi-amuszu POW Farm, 1,000.

Liaoning People's Government, Peipiao Herb Farm, 8,000.

Hopei People's Government, Huachuan Water Conservancy Farm, unknown.

Kiangsu People's Court, Huapei Hsinjen Village Reclamation District, 2,000.

APPENDIX IV

NARCOTICS REFINERIES

Area, Name of Factory, and Products

Northeast China—Dairen Pharmaceutical Works, opium morphine; Dairen: Dashuang Pharmaceutical Works, heroin; Shenyang (Mukden) Pharmaceutical Works, morphine; Mukden: China Company Nicotine Refinery, nicotine; Liaoning: Peipiao Pharmaceutical Works, opium; Liaoning: Chinchow Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works, morphine, opium; Fusung, Kirin: Northeast Chemical Pharmaceutical Works, morphine, ether; and Yenchí, Kirin: Special Product Refinery of Northeast Korean Nationality Autonomous District, opium.

North China—Peiping: Narcotic Laboratory affiliated with Medical Institute of Academy of Science (with four branches), morphine; Peiping: Narcotics Works under direct control of Pharmaceutical Bureau, Ministry of Health, opium; Peiping: Raw Materials Works, Narcotics Control Bureau, Ministry of Health, opium; Peiping: Narcotics Works of China Pharmaceutical Company (with three branches), opium, morphine; Peiping: Special Products Refinery, opium, heroin; Tientsin: Special Products Manufactory, heroin; Tientsin: Chinese Products Export Company Refinery, Ministry of Foreign Trade (with five branches), opium; Tientsin: Refinery under direct control of Monopoly Enterprise of Ministry of Commerce (with nine branches), opium; Chingwan, Hopei: Special Products Experimental Refinery, Ministry of Agriculture; opium; Kupeikou, Hopei: Native Products Refinery, opium, morphine; and Taiyuan, Shansi: Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works, morphine.

East China—Hangchow, Chekiang: Chekiang Pharmaceutical Works, opium, morphine; and Shanghai Pharmaceutical Works, opium, morphine.

South China—Paoan, Kwangtung: Paoan Pharmaceutical Works, morphine, heroin; and Canton: Kwangtung Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works, morphine.

Central China—Hankow: Special Products Refinery, Agricultural Products Purchase Bureau, opium.

Southwest China—Kunming, Yunnan: China Chemical Materials Company, Special Materials Refinery (with four branches), morphine, ether; and Tali, Yunnan: Yunnan Provincial Materials Works under direct control of China Pharmaceutical Company, opium.

Northwest China—Chengtú, Szechwan: Szechwan Pharmaceutical Works, the Third Branch, morphine; Chungking Opium Laboratory, morphine; Kangting, Sikang: Sikang Pharmaceutical Works, opium; and Ching tze, Tibet: Tibet Refinery, the Second Branch, opium.

APPENDIX V

BRANDS OF NARCOTICS PRODUCED BY THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Type, Brand, and Grade

Opium—138, B; 139, A; Ginseng, C; Shun-feng, C; Lao-peí-kou, A; Ta-chen, A; Heng-tiao, C; Kang-fu, A; Sung-pao, B; Hung-hsing (Red Star), A; Chin-feng (Golden Phoenix), A; and, Fan-chuan (Sail Boat), B. Morphine—Tsal-feng (Variegated Phoenix), B; Yin-lung (Silver Dragon), B; Lung-tze (Dragon Son), A; Chin-yen (Gold-Silver), B; Hei-chi (Black Chicken), A; Lo-to (Camel), B; Huang-shang-huang (King of Kings), C; Hsung-chi (Cock), B; and, Hung-shih (Red Lion), A.

Heroin—Pei-chi (North Pole), B; Hung-chin (Red Gold), A; Yin-ting (Silver Tripod), A; Shih-chiu (Lion-Ball), A; Hsiang-

pin (Champion), A; Chin-yu (Gold Fish), B; and, Hsiang-nan, B.

SIDNEY HOLLANDER

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the death of Sidney Hollander at 90 years of age has deprived us of a great and vigorous presence. Mr. Hollander was one of the pioneers in this country in the fight for racial justice. Decades ago, when racial segregation was a generally accepted premise in this country, and black people were almost uniformly treated as inferiors, Mr. Hollander fought hard and effectively for equality. The comments of our colleague, Mr. Hollander's lifelong home city of Baltimore testifies to his far-sighted compassion. Mr. Mitchell said:

Mr. Hollander was one of the few persons in the community who really was able to grasp the full dimension of racism and repression directed against black Americans.

I did not know Mr. Hollander personally, but I have friends who did. They testify not only to his vigor and to the force of his delightful personality, but to the fact that, unlike many reformers, his compassion and dedication to the less fortunate did not wane with advancing age. He was as devoted a fighter for justice at 90 as he had been in the early years of his life.

We have too few men of Sidney Hollander's moral fiber and I join those who knew him in deeply mourning his death.

At this time, I would like to insert a sampling of the newspaper comments on Mr. Hollander's life:

[From the Baltimore Morning Sun]

SIDNEY HOLLANDER, 90, DIES

Sidney Hollander, a vigorous champion of society's dispossessed, died yesterday at Sinai Hospital. He was 90.

Mr. Hollander, whose lifelong intense opposition to discrimination, ignorance and injustice began before the turn of the century, had been in failing health. He entered the hospital Monday.

No funeral services have been scheduled. Mr. Hollander requested that his body be donated to the Anatomy Board of Maryland.

One of Baltimore's youngest men in spirit, he conveyed robust indignation when discussing inequality at a testimonial for his 90th birthday.

"I was always warned by my conservative friends that if you give Negroes one finger, they'll want the whole hand," Mr. Hollander told an interviewer.

"That's what I'm for," he declared. "If they get the whole hand, then they'll finally be equal."

"We've broken down a lot of the taboos and restrictions," Mr. Hollander said of the fight for black equality, "but we haven't broken down the emotions behind those taboos and restrictions."

CHALLENGED SEGREGATION

Mr. Hollander personally challenged the segregationist policies of the Peabody Conservatory concerts by escorting black guests with him.

He raised money to hire the city's first two black recreation leaders, was instrumental in

bringing the first black performer, Marian Anderson, to the Lyric and led a campaign of 38 national organizations not to hold conventions in Baltimore until local hotels ended racial discrimination.

He is remembered as a man who worked unflinchingly in any activity he undertook. His battle for social justice included local as well as national arenas.

He picketed Ford's Theater for unequal racial practices, aided the foundation of the Urban League of Baltimore; was a former trustee of the Maryland Welfare Department, and a former vice president of both the National Conference of Social Work and the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Born in Baltimore on December 29, 1881, he was the son of Edward and Fannie Hollander. His father was a struggling manufacturing druggist and Mr. Hollander had to assume responsibility for his father's business.

"I didn't want to go into business," he said. "I knew nothing about business or drugs. I wanted to go to Johns Hopkins."

Instead he attended City College and the Maryland College of Pharmacy, forerunner of the University of Maryland, where he earned a doctoral degree in pharmacy.

He characterized his education at City College as irrelevant, and it was he as editor of the year book, "Green Bay," which depicted faculty members as zoo animals, that caused the entire senior class of 1900 to be denied graduation exercises.

He and the other seven staff members of the publication received their diplomas in 1950.

With his brother, Walter Hollander, he transformed the sluggish Maryland Pharmaceutical Company into a lucrative corporation.

The firm created and promoted a cough remedy labeled REM into a national product. Mr. Hollander was president and chairman of the board of the company until it was sold in 1956.

With distinctive frankness he conceded in a 1970 interview that financial security delivers certain advantages in advocating unpopular social changes.

His first volunteer work was among newly arrived Jewish families, during which time he labored to bridge the split between German and Near Eastern Jews.

On the national level alone he served on boards or executive committees of the Family Service Association of America, Community Chests and Councils of America, American Jewish Congress, Child Welfare League of America, American Council of Race Relations, National Travelers Aid Association and Welfare Retirement Association among many others.

Survivors include his wife of 64 years, the former Clara Drey Lauer; two sons, Sidney Hollander Jr., of Baltimore, and Edward D. Hollander, of Washington; two daughters, Mrs. Frank Furstenberg and Mrs. Frederick Kunreuther, both of Scarsdale, N.Y., and 17 grandchildren.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1972]
SIDNEY HOLLANDER DEAD AT 90; LONG ACTIVE IN SOCIAL WELFARE

BALTIMORE, February 23.—Sidney Hollander, industrialist and for many years a national leader in social welfare, died today in Sinai Hospital. His 90th birthday was celebrated last Dec. 29.

Mr. Hollander was national president of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds from 1939 to 1946. He was president of the National Social Welfare Assembly in 1955-56 after having served on its executive committee since 1945. He was also a founder of the national Americans for Democratic Action.

For many years Mr. Hollander served on the National Community Relations Advisory

Council, the National Urban League, the American Jewish Committee and the Travelers Aid Association. He was a former head of the Baltimore American Jewish Congress.

Mr. Hollander, a graduate in pharmacy of the University of Maryland in 1902, entered the pharmaceutical manufacturing business. He was president of the Maryland Pharmaceutical Company and the REM Company from 1900 to 1956, when the family business was sold to the Block Drug Company.

After stepping down as head of the National Social Welfare Assembly, Mr. Hollander became head of the National Citizens Committee on Careers in Social Work in 1957. Noting an imminent shortage of persons with graduate training in the field, he undertook to raise funds to encourage more recruits.

Mr. Hollander's avocation was mountaineering. He had been president of the Trail Riders of the Canadian Rockies and the Trail Hikers of the Canadian Rockies as well as a member of the Alpine Club of Switzerland.

Surviving are his widow, the former Clara Lauer; 2 sons, Edward D. and Sidney Jr.; 2 daughters, Mrs. Edith Furstenberg and Mrs. Emily Kunreuther; a brother, Walter; 17 grandchildren and 8 great-grandchildren.

In view of the outpouring of tributes on Mr. Hollander's 90th birthday, there will be no memorial service.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 24, 1972]

SIDNEY HOLLANDER, RIGHTS ACTIVIST, 90

Sidney Hollander, 90, a longtime activist in social welfare and civil rights matters, died in Baltimore yesterday.

Mr. Hollander, a Baltimore native, was a graduate in pharmacy from the University of Maryland in 1902. He was president of the Maryland Pharmaceutical Co. from 1900 until 1956 when the family firm was sold to another drug company.

An active worker in numerous Jewish, civil rights and social welfare organizations, Mr. Hollander had been president of the National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds from 1938 until 1946, a member of the executive committee of the National Social Welfare Assembly since 1945 and its president in 1955-56 and a member of the board of the National Urban League since 1945.

He leaves his wife, Clara D.; two sons, Edward D. and Sidney; two daughters, Mrs. Edith Furstenberg and Mrs. Emily Kunreuther and 17 grandchildren.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1972]

SIDNEY HOLLANDER, 90, FOUGHT RACIAL INJUSTICE SEVEN DECADES
(By Michael Hodge)

Sidney Hollander, 90, a Baltimore civic leader who dedicated his life to fighting racial injustices and discrimination, died Wednesday at Baltimore's Sinai Hospital. He had been in failing health for some time.

He was remembered yesterday by Rep. Parren J. Mitchell (D-Md.) as "... one of the few persons in the community who really was able to grasp the full dimensions of racism and repression directed against black Americans.

"He was that kind of man who bore all the vilifications and insults from the larger white community and yet did not become bitter because he recognized the legitimacy and the morality of the black man's struggle for freedom," Mitchell said.

Mr. Hollander's opposition to racism began around the turn of the century. At one point he led a campaign to persuade 38 national organizations not to hold conventions in Baltimore until hotels there ended racial discrimination.

He also helped raise money to hire the city's first black recreation leaders; helped bring the first black performer, Marian Anderson, to the Lyric Theatre, and personally

broke the color line at the Peabody Conservatory concert by escorting black guests.

He was once quoted as saying, "I was always warned by my conservative friends that if you give Negroes one finger, they'll want the whole hand. That's what I'm for," he said. "If they get the whole hand, then they'll finally be equal."

By profession Mr. Hollander was a pharmacist.

He attended Baltimore City College and the Maryland College of Pharmacy where he earned a doctoral degree in pharmacy.

He and his brother, Walter, took over his father's business, the Maryland Pharmaceutical Company around 1900. He was president of the firm until it was sold in 1956.

Mr. Hollander had been president of the National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, was a member of the executive committee of the National Social Welfare Assembly, and a member of the board of the National Urban League since 1945.

He was also on boards or executive committees of the Family Service Association of America, Community Chests and Councils of America, American Council of Race Relations, Child Welfare League of America and the Welfare Retirement Association.

Mr. Hollander is survived by his wife, Clara, whom he married 64 years ago; two sons, Sidney Jr. of Baltimore and Edward D. of Washington; two daughters, Mrs. Frank Furstenberg and Mrs. Frederick Kunreuther, both of Scarsdale, N.Y., and 17 grandchildren.

[From the Baltimore Morning Sun,
Feb. 24, 1972]

SIDNEY HOLLANDER'S PERSONAL COMMITMENT

In an interview several years ago Sidney Hollander described his lifetime activism in the broad field of social justice as being "hit or miss, supported by indignation at unfair play." But in reality there was a consistency, strong and steady, that marked his concern for injustice from early manhood until his final, mercifully brief illness at the age of 90. The consistent factor was a personal commitment to do what he could to right wrongs, large or small, by putting himself on the side of justice in person or through financial contributions or through the influence he mustered in daily correspondence.

A burning indignation fired his life, but it was reduced to a comfortable room temperature in conversation by his ready humor and ability to laugh at himself and at colleagues. As often as he criticized institutions, organizations and programs, he was one of Baltimore's best loved as well as respected citizens with so many acts of kindness and friendship to his credit that he himself could not have begun to tally his gifts of love and goodwill. While often critical, he also often was right, as was evident on the occasion of his 90th birthday when his family published a small collection of his speeches. Viewpoints which he expressed 30 and 40 years ago still have a freshness and relevancy today in a society which is only now catching up with some of his early realizations of what is required to root out poverty and discrimination.

Mr. Hollander became a national mover and shaker in the fields of social welfare and civil rights, as news obituaries indicate. Here in his home city as well, he was an unwavering champion of good causes and spread his influence wide. While he himself is now gone, he inspired many others, including children and grandchildren, to share and carry forward his sense of fair play.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun,
Feb. 24, 1972]

SIDNEY HOLLANDER

Sidney Hollander's position as one of the outstanding Baltimoreans of his era was compounded of many loves and many la-

bors, but none of them was for renown per se. His was, happily, a long era, nine whole decades down to his death yesterday, and he lived it one cause at a time—except when as so often happens public policy and mass attitudes had taken several simultaneous wrong turnings.

It was one of his special gifts not to be sour or despairing, no matter how widespread the indifference to injustice, and conversely not to be self-satisfied or lax in the occasional hour of advance. Sidney Hollander was splendidly lacking in the vanity that pretends to have all the answers to divine the future, to grasp every last detail. But he did have an uncanny ability to know right from wrong, as practiced in the city and the nation by majority against minority, by the strong and grasping against the voiceless and the powerless.

His example will long remain, to inspire later-comers in the struggles that are undeniably necessary, if this society is to provide justice for both individual and group, for blacks, for the poor, the old, the undereducated. Sidney Hollander was, as the phrase goes, with it all the long way, in marvelous contrast to those antagonists who never in a lifetime catch up to the world we live in.

SIDNEY HOLLANDER IS DEAD AT 90, LONG CHAMPION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Sidney Hollander, 90, a life-long champion of social justice, died today at Sinai Hospital.

Mr. Hollander, whose vigorous opposition to discrimination, injustice and ignorance began before the turn of the century had been in failing health for some time. He entered the hospital Monday.

One of Baltimore's most venerable social welfare activists, he still conveyed a robust spirit of indignation when discussing inequality on the occasion of his 90th birthday, in December.

"ONE FINGER, WHOLE HAND"

"I was always warned by my conservative friends that if you give Negroes one finger, they'll want the whole hand," Mr. Hollander told an interviewer.

"That's what I'm for," he declared, without equivocation. "If they get the whole hand, then they'll finally be equal."

"We've broken down a lot of the taboos and restrictions," he said of his fight for equality for blacks. "But we haven't broken down the emotions behind those taboos."

RECREATION LEADERS

He personally broke the color line at Peabody Conservatory concerts by taking black guests with him.

He helped raise money to hire the city's first two black recreation leaders; he led a campaign to end racial discrimination at local hotels; he helped found Baltimore Neighborhoods and the Baltimore Fellowship House.

In his ninth decade he had no trouble identifying with youthful anti-war sentiments.

He recalled his own outrage at the Spanish-American War, which he still characterized as the "phony Hearst war."

Mr. Hollander took pride in the spread of his ideals among succeeding generations of his family.

FAMILY INFLUENCE

"Rebellion, race relations and social welfare are strong strains that run through the entire family," he said, with evident satisfaction.

"The dominant note is dissatisfaction with existing conditions and the determination Born in Baltimore December 29, 1881, he was the son of Edward and Fannie Hollander. His father was a manufacturing druggist and Mr. Hollander bowed to parental pressure and went into the drug business.

He attended City College the College of Pharmacy and the University of Maryland, eventually earning a doctor of pharmacy degree.

His rebellious nature was evident at City College, where he was editor of a yearbook that caricatured faculty members as zoo animals and cost the Class of 1900 its graduation exercises.

With his brother Walter he founded the Maryland Pharmaceutical Company, which manufactured and promoted a cough syrup named Rem into a national moneymaker.

FIRM SOLD IN 1956

Mr. Hollander was president and chairman of the board of the company when it was sold in 1956.

With characteristic frankness, he conceded to a 1970 interviewer that being financially secure is a great advantage in championing unpopular causes.

The range of the causes he supported was detailed in a two-page addition to his biography in the *Sunpapers* library.

Among the national organizations in which he served as an executive or director of were the Family Service Association of America, National Conference of Social Work, Community Chests and Councils of America, American Jewish Congress, United Service for New Americans.

Also, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Urban League, Child Welfare League of America, National Legal Aid Bureau, American Council on Race Relations, National Travelers Aid Association, Fair Employment Practices Committee and National Health and Welfare Retirement Association.

Survivors include his wife of 64 years, the former Clara Drey Lauer; 2 sons, Sidney, Jr., of Baltimore, and Edward D. Hollander, of Washington; 2 daughters, Mrs. Frank Furstenberg and Mrs. Frederick Kunreuther, of Scarsdale, N.Y., and 17 grandchildren.

There will be no funeral.

RAPE OR LOVE?

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the environmental disaster lobby and the apostles of doom are abroad in the land. Of course we must protect and improve the environment, but we can do nothing if we follow the advice of the disaster lobby. I commended to the attention of the Congress and all the American people the following perceptive article, entitled "Rape or Love?" by the well-known broadcast commentator Paul Harvey:

RAPE OR LOVE?

(By Paul Harvey)

When a great tree slides through the blades of a saw, professional ecologists cry, "Shame"! Professional lumbermen use the tree while professing devotion to the forest, concern for its future.

Is it "rape" or "love"?

The forest is a dynamic part of the ecosystem in which we live, supplying oxygen, watershed protection, wildlife habitat, recreation.

Environmentalists are urging us to lock up what's left, fence in the trees, fence out the man with the saw.

And since 1900 we have locked up 16 million acres of forestland. That's equivalent to

the land area of Rhode Island, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Delaware—preserved permanently as parks and wilderness areas.

Elsewhere, however, the lumberman continues to harvest the forest.

But before we indict him for rape—certainly before we convict him—let's check the numbers.

In the last 15 years he has cut down and used up 197 billion cubic feet of timber.

But during those same 15 years, he and we have grown 246 billion cubic feet of new wood.

Until 1925, man had planted a total of only 1.6 million acres of trees. We're now planting that many every year.

But, the protesters protest, new seedlings are not to be compared to the irreplaceable magnificence of virgin timber, rife with wildlife.

Well, let's see.

Any forester knows that the unmanaged forest is destined to self-destruct. It cuts off its own sunlight. It chokes to death leafy browse. There are 30% to 300% more deer in managed forests than in dense, uncut forests.

I'm not "making a case" for the man with the ax. I saw him abuse his prerogatives in the first half of this century. Unrestrained, he might indeed have ravaged our woodlands beyond resurrection.

But unwise restraint is equally shortsighted. We each need 560 pounds of paper per year now and we'll need 1,000 pounds each within 25 years. We will need 25 billion cubic feet of lumber; twice as much as now.

Our forests cannot afford to stagnate; they've got to be growing.

Now, about pollution.

You and I consume oxygen, exhale carbon dioxide.

Trees consume carbon dioxide, give off oxygen.

In this way more than in any other, we need each other.

But an old forest of overly mature trees consumes as much oxygen as it generates.

An average acre of vigorously growing young trees consumes five to six tons of carbon dioxide per year, gives off four tons of fresh oxygen—while producing four tons of new wood.

And it cools and humidifies the atmosphere.

The growing commercial forest is the most efficient antipollution "device" so far developed.

The forest has real enemies; careless people, disease, insects. The insect consumes one-fourth as much as the saw and produces nothing.

The man with the saw, planting more than he is cutting, is building us an ark.

UTILITY RATE INCREASE REQUESTS EXCEED \$5 BILLION ACCORDING TO COMMISSION REPORTS TO MUSKIE SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last fall Senator MUSKIE's Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations asked State regulatory commissions, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission to report the amount of electric, gas, and telephone rate increase requests pending before them. The subcommittee has done this twice before, because this information is not otherwise assembled.

The previous reports from the commissions showed that, as of June 1, 1969, approximately \$1 billion in rate increases were pending before the commissions, and that as of June 19, 1970, more than \$2 billion was required.

The subcommittee compilation of rate increase requests pending as of November 5, 1971, has now been completed. It shows that they total more than \$5 billion.

This includes \$2,276,513,460 filed by telephone utilities, \$1,582,860,643 by electric utilities, and \$1,226,726,033 by gas utilities, the latter including \$910,743,545 in natural gas pipelines requests before the FPC.

This is, of course, an all-time record high in rate increase requests. It is important that the magnitude of those requests be recognized. The Price Commission has not yet decided how to control them or if, indeed, it is going to control them.

In seven States the total of requests pending before the State commissions exceeds \$200 million. Those States are as follows:

New York	\$684,635,910
Ohio	325,554,054
Illinois	313,610,618
California	255,327,879
Pennsylvania	252,327,879
New Jersey	226,649,128
Michigan	204,990,528

Mr. President, I would point out that the \$5 billion plus total reported to the subcommittee by commissions does not include all rate increase proposals. Texas has no utility regulatory commission. The Minnesota and South Dakota commissions do not regulate electric and gas utilities.

In addition, increases filed since the commissions reported to the subcommittee have probably added to the total.

For example, as of last November, \$88,488,366 in rate increases were pending before the Florida commission. Subsequently, Tampa Electric, which had requested \$13.9 million, was granted \$11.5 million. Southern Bell Telephone, which had asked \$48 million, was granted \$47 million. Hearings are still in progress on Gulf Power's request for \$6.7 million, and Florida Power Corp.'s request for \$19.5 million. But, in addition, a week before Christmas, Florida Power & Light applied for \$85 million a year in additional revenues.

In New Hampshire, the \$9 million request for Public Service Co. of New Hampshire has, subsequent to that State commission's report to the subcommittee, been increased to \$13 million.

I would point out that Tampa Electric, Gulf Power, and Public Service Co. of New Hampshire would all be exempt from the Price Commission's prenotification procedure, because their annual revenue is less than \$100 million. Such exemption is equivalent to no Price Commission protection in this important area for the people in Tampa, Pensacola, or Manchester. The Price Commission should provide protection for customers of these moderately large monopolies. And it should note that these companies already enjoy above-average profits.

For example, in 1970 Tampa Electric earned a return of 15.6 percent on its common equity. Gulf Power earned 15.1 percent, Public Service Co. of New Hampshire 15.3 percent. The national average for electric utilities in 1970, according to the FPC, was 11.8 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the rate increase request data provided by the commissions to Senator MUSKIE.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATE INCREASE REQUESTS PENDING BEFORE STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS AS OF NOV. 5, 1971

Commission, name of utility, and category	Amount requested	Date filed	Status
Alabama Public Service Commission:			
Ardmore Telephone Co.: Telephone	\$64,343		
General Telephone Co.: Telephone	2,500,000		
Alaska Public Service Commission: Consolidated Utilities, Ltd.: Electric	186,000	Sept. 28, 1971	Hearing to be held.
Arizona Corporation Commission:			
Arizona Public Service Co.: Electric/gas	25,400,000	Dec. 28, 1970	Under advisement.
Southern Union Gas Co.: Gas	275,000	July 13, 1971	Do.
Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.: Electric	397,000	Feb. 2, 1968	Do.
Arkansas Public Service Commission:			
Woodruff Electric Coop. Corp.: Electric	(?)	Feb. 30, 1970	Pending.
Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.: Gas	(?)	Oct. 1, 1971	
Boone County Telephone Co.: Telephone	154,000	Oct. 5, 1971	Hearing set for Dec. 3, 1971.
Mountain Home Telephone Co.: Telephone	231,000	Oct. 14, 1971	Pending no hearing set.
California Public Utilities Commission:			
General Telephone Co.: Telephone	60,000,000	May 5, 1970	Submitted.
Western Union Tel. & Tel. Co.: Telegraph	3,536,000	Nov. 13, 1970	Do.
Southwest Gas Corp. (gas offset): Gas	167,300	June 1, 1971	Do.
Southern California Gas Co.: Gas	64,243,000	June 18, 1971	Hearings in progress.
Pacific Telephone (offset): Telephone	77,400,000	Aug. 6, 1971	Do.
San Diego Gas & Electric Co.:			
Electric	35,540,000	Aug. 10, 1971	Do.
Gas	9,980,000	do	Do.
Continental Telephone Co.: Telephone	4,900,000	Sept. 13, 1971	Under investigation.

Footnotes at end of table.

RATE INCREASE REQUESTS PENDING BEFORE STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS AS OF NOV. 5, 1971—Continued

Commission, name of utility, and category	Amount requested	Date filed	Status
Colorado Public Utilities Commission:			
Public Service Co. of Colorado:			
Gas	\$1,194,241	Apr. 7, 1971	Commission allowed gas revenue increase of \$493,807 and electric revenue increase of \$6,894,662. Increases are subject to economic stabilization regulations. Rates not yet filed to obtain allowed increase.
Electric	10,065,582		
Kansas Nebraska Natural Gas Co., Inc.: Gas	343,789	June 14, 1971	Heard by Commission, decision pending.
Rock Mountain Natural Gas Co., Inc.: Gas	2,738	Aug. 20, 1971	
		Aug. 11, 1971	Heard by Commission, increase allowed subject to economic stabilization regulations.
The Midland Telephone Co.: Telephone	7,367	Oct. 28, 1971	To be heard by Commission on Dec. 14, 1971.
Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Telephone	349,500	Sept. 1, 1970	A partial increase became effective Apr. 28, 1971. Protestants, petition for rehearing was granted; after rehearing, final Commission decision pending.
Connecticut Public Utilities Commission:			
Bozrah Light and Power Co.: Electric	49,960	Oct. 8, 1971	Hearing set for Nov. 11, 1971.
Southern New England Telephone Co.: Telephone	55,000,000	Nov. 5, 1971	Hearing set for Jan. 11, 1972.
Delaware Public Utilities Commission:			
Delmarva Power & Light Co.: Electric	10,627,804	Sept. 30, 1971	Pending hearings.
Lincoln & Ellendale Electric Co.: Electric	13,800	Aug. 9, 1971	Approved.
District of Columbia Public Service Commission:			
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.: Telephone	20,857,000	Aug. 31, 1971	Cross-examination to be held.
Potomac Electric & Power Co.: Electric	24,757,000	July 12, 1971	Company cross-examination complete. Staff and intervenors to be heard.
Washington Gas Light Co.: Gas	2,539,544	July 9, 1971	Company's testimony and exhibits filed Nov. 4, 1971.
Florida Public Service Commission:			
Tampa Electric Co.: Electric	13,900,000	Nov. 17, 1970	Awaiting decision.
Gulf Power Co.: Electric	6,730,000	July 21, 1971	Further hearings scheduled.
Florida Power Corp.: Electric	19,390,000	Aug. 4, 1971	Do.
Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Telephone	48,191,000	June 28, 1971	Awaiting decision.
Southern Gas Co.: Gas	125,360	Apr. 29, 1971	Do.
Central Florida Gas Co.: Gas	152,006	Aug. 2, 1971	Do.
Georgia Public Service Commission:			
Georgia Power Co.: Electric	45,000,000	May 17, 1971	\$25,888,764 granted.
Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Telephone	24,400,000	July 30, 1971	Pending.
Byron Telephone Co.: Telephone	264,169	Oct. 8, 1971	Do.
Hawaii Public Utilities Commission	7,892,000	Apr. 27, 1971	Pending. Hearing set to January.
Idaho Public Utilities Commission:			
Utah Power & Light Co.: Electric	1,861,000	June 3, 1971	Hearings to continue.
Gem State Utilities: Telephone	18,334	Aug. 9, 1971	Pending decision.
Wn. Water Power Co.: Gas	434,000	Sept. 30, 1971	Granted Oct. 29, 1971.
Intermountain Gas Co.: Gas	1,505,807	Aug. 31, 1971	Denied Nov. 1, 1971.
Illinois Commerce Commission:			
Union Electric Co.: Electric	4,566,500	Nov. 10, 1970	Order pending.
Commonwealth Edison Co.: Electric	95,200,000	Jan. 14, 1971	Do.
Illinois Power Co.: Electric	21,500,000	June 18, 1971	In hearing.
Interstate Power Co.: Electric	236,000	July 2, 1971	Do.
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co.: Electric	3,034,000	Aug. 30, 1971	Do.
Illinois Gas Co.: Gas	178,337	Mar. 23, 1971	Order pending.
Eastern Illinois Gas & Security Co.: Gas	168,708	Mar. 23, 1971	Do.
North Shore Gas Co.: Gas	3,000,000	July 1, 1971	In hearing.
Kaskaskia Gas Co.: Gas	54,500	Aug. 9, 1971	In hearing.
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co.: Gas	1,356,000	Aug. 30, 1971	Do.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	2,214,000	Dec. 18, 1970	Pending.
Morrison Telephone Co.: Telephone	57,812	Feb. 8, 1971	In hearing.
Midland Telephone Co.: Telephone	34,761	Aug. 16, 1971	Order pending.
Illinois Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	182,000,000	Sept. 23, 1971	In hearing.
Indiana Public Service Commission:			
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.: Electric	16,000,000	July 30, 1971	Awaiting order.
Northern Indiana Public Service Co.: Electric	19,900,000	Aug. 27, 1971	Do.
Public Service Co. of Indiana: Electric	18,261,272	Sept. 3, 1971	Awaiting hearing.
Bainbridge Gas Co.: Gas	20,379	Feb. 11, 1971	Awaiting order.
Westfield Gas Corp.: Gas	12,446	Apr. 30, 1971	Order Dec. 6, 1972.
General Telephone Co.: Telephone	3,765	Aug. 30, 1971	Awaiting order.
Do	4,078	Sept. 29, 1971	Order Feb. 4, 1972.
Do	8,261,672	July 2, 1971	Order Jan. 28, 1972.
Illinois Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	4,763,595	Apr. 1, 1971	Order Dec. 23, 1972.
Iowa State Commerce Commission:			
Union Electric: Electric	878,900	Nov. 6, 1969	Hearings completed.
Iowa Power & Light: Electric	5,200,000	Jan. 28, 1971	Hearings in progress.
United Telephone: Telephone	559,693	Aug. 29, 1969	Do.
Iowa Public Service: Electric	5,000,000	Dec. 28, 1970	Do.
Iowa Telephone Co.: Telephone	267,046	Apr. 29, 1967	Do.
Hawkeye Telephone Co.: Telephone	210,004	Dec. 16, 1968	Hearings in spring, 1972.
Central Natural Gas: Gas	15,000	May 7, 1971	Do.
Interstate Power Co.: Electric	1,773,000	June 1, 1971	Do.
Keokuk Gas Serv.: Gas	180,790	July 1, 1971	Do.
Iowa Electric Light & Power: Electric	4,352,896	July 15, 1971	Do.
Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	15,000,000	July 21, 1971	Do.
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric: Electric and gas	7,194,000	Aug. 30, 1971	Do.
North Central Public Service: Gas	420,000	Sept. 13, 1971	Do.
Kansas State Corporation Commission:			
Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	14,783,000	Oct. 8, 1971	Under investigation
Kansas Telephone Co.: Telephone	440,914	Aug. 4, 1971	Hearing scheduled
Kansas Gas & Electric Co.: Electric	7,200,000	June 25, 1971	Under investigation.
Central Kansas Power Co.: Gas	85,111	Nov. 13, 1970	Decision pending.
Kentucky Public Service Commission:			
Western Kentucky Gas Co.: Gas	2,254,967	June 29, 1971	Further hearing scheduled.
Wiser Oil Co.: Gas	32,930	June 21, 1971	Hearing completed.
Johnson County Gas Co.: Gas	12,999	July 21, 1971	Do.
Hazard Gas Co.: Gas	122,104	Aug. 3, 1971	Further hearing may be required.
Mountain Investment, Inc.: Gas	16,132	Sept. 30, 1971	Hearing completed.
Martin Gas Co.: Gas	42,878	Aug. 30, 1971	Do.
Buck's Branch Gas Co.: Gas	5,466	do	Do.
Peoples Gas Co.: Gas	105,000	Nov. 1, 1971	Hearing scheduled Dec. 1, 1971.
Delta Natural Gas Co., Inc.: Gas	43,286	do	Pending.
Louisville Gas & Electric Co.: Gas	444,342	Aug. 20, 1971	Order entered Nov. 9, 1971—approved.
Louisiana Public Service Commission:			
South Louisiana Electric Co.: Electric	5,619,000	Jan. 28, 1971	Pending freeze order.
Gulf States Utilities Co.: Electric	8,100,000	July 16, 1971	Hearing incomplete.
Maine Public Utilities Commission:			
Rangeley Power Co.: Electric	72,000	May 15, 1971	Hearings concluded.
Central Maine Power Co.: Electric	11,684,050	Aug. 16, 1971	Staff investigation.
Bangor Hydro-Electric Co.: Electric	1,600,000	Sept. 22, 1971	Do.
New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Telephone	9,975,000	Oct. 15, 1971	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

Commission, name of utility, and category	Amount requested	Date filed	Status
Maryland Public Service Commission:			
Potomac Edison Co.: Electric	\$4,000,000	May 19, 1971	
Potomac Electric & Power Co.: Electric	18,500,000	July 12, 1971	
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative: Electric	1,328,873	May 24, 1971	
Conowingo Power Co.: Electric	650,105	Nov. 1, 1971	
Chestertown Electric Light & Power Co.: Electric	78,686	May 3, 1971	
Accomack-Norhampton Electric Cooperative: Electric	1,112	May 6, 1971	
Stockton Light & Power Co.: Electric	7,665	May 21, 1971	
Choptank Electric Cooperative: Electric	34,277	Mar. 1, 1971	
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative: Electric	(^c)	Aug. 10, 1971	
Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant: Electric	(^c)	July 7, 1971	
Columbia Gas of Maryland Inc.: Gas	1,126,000	May 10, 1971	
Emmitsburg Gas Co.: Gas	67,868	July 20, 1971	
Washington Gas Light Co.: Gas	6,248,645	July 9, 1971	
Cambridge Gas Co.: Gas	22,202	Nov. 11, 1971	
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Maryland: Telephone	42,627,000	Apr. 23, 1971	
Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities:			
Brockton-Taunton Gas Co.: Gas	1,650,000	Apr. 16, 1971	Suspended until March 1972.
Fitchburg Gas & Electric Light Co.: Gas	270,000	Aug. 13, 1971	Suspended until July 1972.
Electric	480,000	Oct. 15, 1971	Suspended until September 1972.
New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Telephone	106,000,000	Oct. 1, 1971	Do.
Michigan Public Service Commission:			
Camden Rural Telephone Co.: Telephone	53,716	May 14, 1971	Granted \$41,657, Nov. 22, 1971.
New Citizens Telephone Co.: Telephone	132,443	May 27, 1971	Granted full amount Nov. 22, 1971.
Cloverland Electric Cooperative: Electric	164,707	July 15, 1971	Granted \$130,073, Nov. 22, 1971.
Top O' Michigan Rural Electric Co.: Electric	312,000	July 29, 1971	Granted full amount Nov. 22, 1971.
Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.: Gas	10,591,534	June 21, 1971	Granted full amount Nov. 23, 1971.
Michigan Gas Utilities Co.: Gas	3,849,019	Dec. 30, 1970	Granted \$3,040,019, Nov. 24, 1971. ^a
Drenthe Telephone Co.: Telephone		June 7, 1971	Granted \$649, Nov. 29, 1971.
Michigan Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	59,663,000	Dec. 10, 1970	Granted \$18,000,000, Dec. 1, 1971. ^a
Consumers Power Co.: Electric	28,500,000	Aug. 13, 1970	Granted \$10,559,400, Dec. 14, 1971.
Gas	31,714,000	Apr. 30, 1971	Granted \$6,500,000, Dec. 22, 1971. ^a
The Detroit Edison Co.: Electric	70,000,109	Do	In process.
Hickory Telephone Co.: Telephone		June 30, 1971	To be withdrawn.
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.: Electric		July 30, 1971	Hearings to be scheduled.
Upper Peninsula Power Co.: Electric		Aug. 2, 1971	Hearings scheduled.
Minnesota Public Service Commission (does not regulate electric or gas utilities):			
N. W. Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	38,000,000	June 17, 1971	Pending.
Central Telephone Co.: Telephone	1,515,000	July 30, 1971	Do.
Mid State Telephone Co.: Telephone	100,900	Sept. 20, 1971	Do.
Eckles Telephone Co.: Telephone	60,500	Aug. 19, 1971	Do.
Mississippi Public Service Commission:			
South Central Bell: Telephone	20,100,000	June 28, 1971	Order dated Nov. 30, 1971. Granted \$12,900,000.
Mississippi Valley Gas Co.: Gas	2,394,451	Nov. 5, 1971	Order dated Nov. 12, 1971. Granted request.
Missouri Public Service Commission:			
St. Joseph Light & Power Co.: Electric	\$1,720,000	Jan. 29, 1970	Pending.
Missouri Power & Light Co.: Electric	2,883,683	Nov. 13, 1970	Do.
Missouri Utilities Co.: Electric	1,450,000	Dec. 30, 1970	Do.
Missouri Edison Co.: Electric	1,105,000	Apr. 1, 1971	Do.
Missouri Public Service Co.: Electric	2,715,000	July 12, 1971	Do.
Gas	380,294	July 12, 1971	Do.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	63,500,000	Oct. 1, 1971	Do.
Verona Telephone Co.: Telephone	18,900	Sept. 30, 1971	Do.
Montana Public Service Commission:			
Montana Power Co.: Gas	9,000,000	July 5, 1971	Further hearings scheduled.
Electric	8,000,000	July 5, 1971	Do.
Great Falls Gas Co.: Gas	1,500,000	Oct. 19, 1971	Hearings to be held.
Nebraska State Railway Commission (does not regulate electric and gas utilities):			
Southeast Nebraska Telephone Co.: Telephone	182,722	Apr. 24, 1970	Decision pending.
Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	13,464,000	June 11, 1971	Hearing pending.
Rock County Telephone Co.: Telephone	5,628	Oct. 18, 1971	Do.
Nevada Public Service Commission: ¹			
Southwest Gas Corp.: Gas	(^c)	Mar. 12, 1971	Denied Dec 6, 1971.
Do	228,300	Oct. 7, 1971	Heard. Decision pending.
Sierra Pacific Power Co.: Gas	739,142	Mar. 24, 1971	Granted \$4,657, Nov 15, 1971.
Do	182,442	Dec. 2, 1971	Suspended 150 days.
Electric	3,718,959	Mar. 24, 1971	Granted \$2,817,099, Nov 15, 1971.
Do	427,743	Nov. 29, 1971	Suspended 150 days.
Nevada Power Co.: Electric	4,558,577	June 16, 1971	Heard. Decision pending.
California-Pacific Utilities Co.: Electric	72,500	June 12, 1971	Granted \$23,473, Dec 8, 1971.
Do	97,800	Sept 10, 1971	Heard. Decision pending.
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission:			
New England Telephone Co.: Telephone	162,000	July 29, 1971	In hearing stage, but any implementation deferred pending clarification of wage/price freeze.
Do	9,950,000	Aug. 6, 1971	Do.
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire: Electric	9,123,426	July 8, 1971	Do.
Granite State Electric Co.: Electric	446,062	June 18, 1971	Do.
New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners:			
Public Service Electric & Gas Co.: Electric	63,370,000	Mar 6, 1970	Authorized \$36,400,000 by interim order, Oct 29, 1971. Final decision due.
Rockland Electric Co.: Electric	2,400,000	Mar. 17, 1971	Final decision due.
Atlantic City Electric Co.: Electric	13,000,000	Nov. 23, 1970	Do.
Jersey Central Power & Light Co.: Electric	42,471,618	Sept. 20, 1971	Hearing in progress.
New Jersey Power & Light Co.: Electric	16,413,454	Sept. 20, 1971	Do.
Public Service Electric & Gas Co.: Gas	8,591,000	Mar. 6, 1970	Authorized \$4,956,000 by interim order dated Oct. 29, 1970. Final decision due.
New Jersey Telephone Co.: Telephone	1,325,703	Apr. 19, 1971	Final decision due.
Warwick Valley Telephone Co.: Telephone	77,353	Nov. 16, 1970	Do.
New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	79,000,000	Sept. 16, 1970	Do.
New Mexico Public Service Commission:			
Public Service Co. of New Mexico: Electric	3,603,139	July 30, 1969	Pending in court.
Southern Union Gas: Gas	4,083,936	July 1, 1969	Do.

RATE INCREASE REQUESTS PENDING BEFORE STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS AS OF NOV. 5, 1971—Continued

Commission, name of utility, and category	Amount requested	Date filed	Status
New York Public Service Commission:			
New York State Electric & Gas Corp.: Electric	\$16,050,200	Apr. 30, 1971	Hearings completed. No opinion or decision issued.
Village of Freeport: Electric	512,194	Dec. 21, 1970	The initial request increased to the listed amount Nov. , 1971. Hearings in progress.
Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc.: Electric	8,099,983	Feb. 2, 1971	Temporary increase of \$3,400,000 granted July 14, 1971. Hearing examiner's report issued, Commission's decision on final rates pending.
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.: Electric	55,798,000	Mar. 1, 1971	Temporary increase of \$36,236,000 granted July 14, 1971. Hearing examiner's report issued, Commission's decision on final rates pending.
Long Island Lighting Co.: Electric	5,958,100	Oct. 1, 1971	Staff investigation.
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.: Electric	142,763,237	Mar. 31, 1971	Temporary increase of \$52,192,000 granted May 18, 1971. Hearings completed. No opinion or decision issued.
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp.: Electric	944,350	Oct. 15, 1971	Staff investigation.
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.: Gas	20,000,000	Sept. 22, 1970	The initial request filed was for \$12,490,000. \$15,980,000 granted Aug. 27, 1971, subject to Federal stabilization regulations.
Columbia Gas of New York, Inc.: Gas	806,400	Nov. 17, 1970	\$494,600 granted Oct. 31, 1971, subject to Federal stabilization regulations.
Iroquois Gas Corp.: Gas	20,943,457	Dec. 21, 1970	Temporary increase of \$4,891,000 granted Jan. 26, 1971. Hearing examiner's report issued, Commission's decision on final rates pending.
Pavilion Natural Gas Co., The: Gas	96,600	Sept. 28, 1971	Staff investigation.
New York State Electric & Gas Corp.: Gas	3,375,600	Jan. 29, 1971	Hearing examiner's report issued, Commission's decision on final rates pending.
Brooklyn Union Gas Co., The: Gas	11,868,100	Feb. 26, 1971	Hearings completed. No opinion or decision issued.
St. Lawrence Gas Co.: Gas	703,810	Apr. 29, 1971	Temporary increase of \$331,900 granted July 28, 1971, subject to Federal stabilization regulations. Hearings completed. No opinion or decision issued.
Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.: Gas	5,230,000	May 14, 1971	Hearings completed. No opinion or decision issued.
Corning Natural Gas Corp.: Gas	236,600	July 9, 1971	Hearings ordered.
Producers Gas Co.: Gas	91,500	do	\$91,500 granted Oct. 19, 1971, subject to Federal stabilization regulations.
Pennsylvania & Southern Gas Co.: Gas	25,800	May 15, 1971	\$22,800 granted Sept. 9, 1971, subject to Federal stabilization regulations.
Chazy & Westport Telephone Corp.: Telephone	12,572	July 2, 1971	\$12,572 granted Aug. 23, 1971, subject to Federal stabilization regulations.
Chautauqua & Erie Telephone Corp.: Telephone	95,000	May 21, 1970	\$95,000 granted Oct. 6, 1971, subject to Federal stabilization regulations.
Middleburgh Telephone Co., The: Telephone	45,407	Aug. 2, 1971	Staff investigations.
New York Telephone Co.: Telephone	391,000,000	Feb. 16, 1971	Temporary increase of \$190,000,000 granted July 9, 1971. Hearing examiner's report issued, Commission's decision on final rates pending.
North Carolina Utilities Commission:			
Carolina Power & Light Co.: Electric	30,624,718	May 3, 1971	Pending.
Roselle: Electric	28,598	Mar. 1, 1971	Do.
Domestic: Electric	27,589	May 13, 1971	Do.
Duke Power Co.: Electric	30,884,000	Apr. 28, 1971	Do.
Virginia Electric & Power: Electric	1,365,487	July 15, 1971	Do.
New River Power & Light Co.: Electric	75,887	Jan. 20, 1971	Do.
Piedmont: Gas	1,100,340	Aug. 5, 1971	Do.
N.C. Natural Gas: Gas	700,547	Oct. 1, 1971	Do.
Do.		Sept. 17, 1971	Pending.
Public Service: Gas	1,079,282	July 23, 1971	Do.
Do.		Sept. 13, 1971	Do.
N.C. Gas Service: Gas	118,850	Aug. 13, 1971	Do.
United Cities: Gas	95,483	July 7, 1971	Do.
Southern Bell: Telephone	29,650,000	Oct. 15, 1971	Do.
Central: Telephone	1,423,451	June 30, 1971	Do.
Lee: Telephone	139,115	do	Do.
North Carolina: Telephone	835,700	Oct. 28, 1971	Do.
General: Telephone	2,497,848	Nov. 5, 1971	Do.
United: Telephone	1,197,285	Jan. 27, 1971	Do.
Thermal Belt: Telephone	106,576	Feb. 24, 1971	Do.
First Colony: Telephone	8,679	Feb. 26, 1971	Do.
North Dakota Public Service Commission: Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	3,500,000	July 30, 1971	Pending.
Ohio Public Utilities Commission:			
Ohio Edison Co. (Industrial): Electric	6,267,375	Nov. 13, 1970	Investigation pending.
Col's & So. Ohio Electric Co.: Electric	5,360,100	Dec. 31, 1970	Do.
Toledo Edison Co.: Electric	7,663,000	Mar. 18, 1971	Investigation starting.
Ohio Eastern Co. (rural): Electric	7,751,354	Apr. 21, 1971	Do.
Ohio Power Co.: Electric	24,050,000	May 7, 1971	Do.
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.: Electric	53,538,000	Oct. 7, 1971	Investigation not started
Dayton Power & Light Co.: Electric	19,545,829	Nov. 16, 1971	Do.
Col's & So. Ohio Electric Co. (Col's): Electric	4,160,500	Dec. 21, 1970	Do.
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.: Electric	9,925,000	June 3, 1970	For Commission decision.
Gas	4,378,945	June 3, 1970	Investigation proceeding.
Columbia Gas Co., Inc.:			
Columbus: Gas	4,675,000	Nov. 12, 1970	Do.
Franklin: Gas	1,310,903	Dec. 30, 1970	Investigation starting.
Middleburg: Gas	156,000	Mar. 11, 1971	Investigation proceeding.
Worthington: Gas	189,626	July 22, 1971	Investigation starting.
Groveport: Gas	50,099	July 27, 1971	Investigation proceeding.
Wellston: Gas	115,333	Nov. 17, 1971	Investigation not started.
Clinton Gas Co.: Gas	5,528	Dec. 10, 1970	Investigation proceeding.
Permian Oil & Gas: Gas	56,810	May 7, 1971	Investigation not started.
Ohio Valley Gas Co.:			
Coal Grove: Gas	30,000	Oct. 19, 1971	Do.
Southpoint: Gas	26,000	Sept. 11, 1970	For Commission decision.
West Ohio Gas Co.: Gas	486,374	Aug. 19, 1969	Do.
Do.	115,761	Aug. 21, 1969	Do.
Lewisville Fuel & Supply Co.: Gas	4,080	Mar. 10, 1971	Awaiting hearing.
Waterville Gas & Oil Co.: Gas	7,537	Jan. 1, 1970	For Commission decision.
Ottoville Telephone Co.: Telephone	2,000	Aug. 7, 1969	Investigation proceeding.
Telephone Service Co.: Telephone	105,768	Sept. 8, 1970	Do.
Columbus Grove Telephone Co.: Telephone	30,953	July 28, 1970	Do.
Harlan Telephone Co.: Telephone	4,611	Oct. 23, 1970	Do.
Morenci Home Telephone Co.: Telephone	1,652	Mar. 15, 1971	Investigation not started.
Northern Ohio Telephone Co.: Telephone	3,470,567	July 13, 1971	Do.
Ohio Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone	165,042,000	Aug. 9, 1971	Investigation proceeding.
United Telephone Co.: Telephone	4,632,000	Nov. 4, 1971	Investigation not started.
Chillicothe Telephone Co.: Telephone	938,300	Dec. 2, 1971	Do.
Southeastern Telephone Co.: Telephone	320,561	Oct. 7, 1970	For Commission decision.
Lorain Telephone Co.: Telephone	1,156,488	May 11, 1971	Do.
Oklahoma Corporation Commission:			
General Telephone of the Southwest: Telephone	1,539,319	Sept. 15, 1969	Pending.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Co.: Gas	13,970,578	July 2, 1971	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

Commission, name of utility and category	Amount requested	Date filed	Status
Oregon Public Utility Commission:			
California-Pacific Utilities:			
Gas.....	\$317,900	Jan. 25, 1971	Suspended to Nov. 25, 1971.
Gas (tracking—El Paso).....	339,026	Oct. 7, 1971	Suspended to Nov. 13, 1971.
Cascade Natural Gas:			
Gas.....	1,270,950	Oct. 13, 1971	Suspended.
Gas (tracking—El Paso).....	339,732	Oct. 7, 1971	Suspended to Nov. 13, 1971.
Northwest Natural Gas: Gas (tracking—El Paso).....	2,800,000	Oct. 7, 1971	Do.
Pacific Northwest Bell: Telephone.....	26,500,000	Feb. 18, 1971	Suspended to Dec. 19, 1971.
Pennsylvania Public Service Commission:			
The Peoples Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	12,412,313	Jan. 29, 1971	Under investigation.
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	42,004,341	Mar. 15, 1971	Suspended to Feb. 14, 1972. Hearings in progress.
Duquesne Light Co.: Electric.....	16,021,306	Apr. 20, 1971	Suspended to Mar. 19, 1972. Hearings in progress.
Metropolitan Edison Co.: Electric.....	10,021,306	Apr. 30, 1971	Suspended to Mar. 30, 1972. Hearings in progress.
Philadelphia Electric Co.: Electric.....	98,199,000	Nov. 18, 1970	Has been adjudicated. \$72,571,000 allowed. Order issued Nov. 9, 1971.
Bethel & Mount Aetna Tel. & Tel. Co.: Telephone.....	304,613	Nov. 10, 1971	Report in progress.
The Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania: Telephone.....	73,365,000	Dec. 3, 1970	Has been adjudicated. \$52,895,000 allowed. Order issued Dec. 14, 1971.
Rhode Island Department of Business Regulation:			
Narragansett Electric Co.: Electric.....	8,889,000	Nov. 30, 1970	Pending. Hearing completed.
Newport Electric Co.: Electric.....	491,000	June 21, 1971	Pending. Hearings not completed.
Providence Gas Co.: Gas.....	4,870,000	Dec. 11, 1970	Pending. Hearing completed.
Valley Gas Co.: Gas.....	899,000	Feb. 12, 1971	Pending. Hearings not completed.
South County Gas Co.: Gas.....	93,680	Apr. 15, 1971	Do.
New England Tel. & Tel. Co.: Telephone.....	14,800,000	Apr. 16, 1971	Do.
South Carolina Public Service Commission:			
Carolina Power & Light Co., Inc.: Electric.....	6,472,130	Oct. 29, 1971	Hearing set for Feb. 24, 1972.
S.C. Electric & Gas Co., Inc.: Electric, gas.....	5,312,090	Apr. 29, 1971	Granted Nov. 23, 1971.
Bluffton Telephone Co., Inc.: Telephone.....	1,796,967	do.	Granted \$1,209,876, Nov. 23, 1971.
Citizens Telephone Co., Inc.: Telephone.....	12,174	Aug. 30, 1971	Granted \$10,719, Nov. 23, 1971.
Farmers Telephone Cooperative, Inc.: Telephone.....	65,000	Nov. 1, 1971	Hearing date pending.
General Telephone Co., of Southwest, Inc.: Telephone.....	248,606	Sept. 6, 1971	Hearing held. Pending decision.
Inman Telephone Co., Inc.: Telephone.....	2,004,890	Aug. 23, 1971	Hearing date pending.
Jackson Telephone Co., Inc.: Telephone.....	172,996	do.	Application pending.
Pond Branch Telephone Co., Inc.: Telephone.....	16,537	Oct. 29, 1971	Hearing date pending.
Ridge Telephone Co., Inc.: Telephone.....	28,254	Oct. 5, 1971	Hearing set.
Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Inc.: Telephone.....	35,227	May 24, 1971	Hearing held Jan. 18, 1972. Action pending.
United Telephone Co., of Southwest: Telephone.....	12,200,000	Aug. 10, 1971	Partial request approved Dec. 22, 1971.
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission (does not regulate electric and gas utilities).....	672,324	Sept. 28, 1971	Hearing Jan. 4, 1972. Action pending.
Tennessee Public Service Commission:	None		
Ardmore Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	25,239	Oct. 14, 1971	Staff investigation in progress.
Powell Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	27,459	Sept. 27, 1971	Do.
South Central Bell: Telephone.....	24,200,000	Sept. 13, 1971	Hearing scheduled.
General Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	780,380	June 25, 1971	Pending. Hearings completed.
Tennessee Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	362,700	Nov. 19, 1970	Do.
Nashville Gas Co.: Gas.....	2,491,134	Aug. 27, 1971	Hearing scheduled.
Texas Railroad Commission (does not regulate electric and gas utilities):			
Utah Public Service Commission:			
Mountain Fuel Supply Co.: Gas.....	\$3,875,000	Mar. 30, 1971	Pending.
Utah Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	8,841,101	June 8, 1971	Do.
Vermont Public Service Board:			
Central Vermont Public Service Corp.: Electric.....	4,500,000	June 15, 1970	Hearing completed. Discussion pending.
Green Mountain Power Corp.: Electric.....	2,500,000	May 13, 1971	Do.
Vermont Electric Cooperative: Electric.....	138,000	Sept. 10, 1970	Do.
		Sept. 16, 1970	
		Jan. 19, 1970	
Virginia State Corporation Commission:			
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Va.: Telephone.....	52,000,000	Apr. 15, 1971	Hearing held. \$33,000,000 allowed.
		July 1, 1971	
Southern Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	171,000	July 14, 1971	Under advisement.
Virginia Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Telephone.....	3,456,000	do.	Hearing scheduled.
Virginia Electric & Power Co.: Electric.....	55,000,000	Apr. 15, 1971	Do.
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission:			
Cascade Natural Gas Corp.: Gas.....	5,518,356	June 2, 1971	Under suspension. Hearing being held.
Puget Sound Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	10,900,000	May 3, 1971	Do.
Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	24,900,000	Jan. 29, 1971	Record closed. Order being drafted.
General Telephone Co. of Northwest, Inc.: Telephone.....	5,300,000	Apr. 28, 1971	Do.
Peninsula Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Telephone.....	9,570	Mar. 15, 1971	Under suspension. Being investigated.
Orting Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	21,134	July 23, 1971	Do.
West Virginia Public Service Commission:			
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of West Virginia: Telephone.....	11,133,000	Oct. 22, 1969	In effect under bond as of Mar. 21, 1970. Heard and submitted Oct. 5, 1971.
General Telephone Co. of Southeast: Telephone.....	1,299,543	Jan. 25, 1971	In effect under bond as of June 24, 1971. Heard and continued.
Short Line Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	51,839	June 22, 1971	Suspended to Nov. 18, 1971.
Consumer Gas Utility Co.—Huntington and Pennsboro: Gas.....	78,647	Sept. 22, 1971	Suspended to Feb. 21, 1972.
Independent Gas Co.: Gas.....	16,926	Sept. 24, 1971	Do.
Spenser Gas Co.: Gas.....	48,000	Oct. 12, 1971	Suspended to Mar. 13, 1972.
Ravencliff Fuel & Gas Supply Co.: Gas.....	29,825	Mar. 10, 1971	Heard and submitted Oct. 22, 1971.
Hope Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	5,989,000	Oct. 16, 1970	In effect under bond as of Apr. 30, 1971. Heard and submitted Oct. 4, 1971.
Lumberport-Shinnston Gas Co.: Gas.....	145,294	Nov. 30, 1970	Do.
Spenser Gas Co.: Gas.....	9,739	Dec. 10, 1970	In effect Jan. 1, 1971 (30-B proceeding to pass on supplier's increase).
Standard Gas Co.: Gas.....	8,835	June 4, 1971	Suspended to Nov. 5, 1971.
Indian Creek Gas Co.: Gas.....	19,585	Sept. 2, 1971	Suspended to Jan. 30, 1972.
Virginia Electric & Power Co.: Electric.....	299,945	Oct. 2, 1970	In effect under bond as of Feb. 28, 1971. Heard and submitted Sept. 9, 1971.
Monongahela Power Co.: Electric.....	8,564,000	Nov. 4, 1970	In effect under bond as of Apr. 3, 1971.
Appalachian Power Co.: Electric.....	9,073,757	Feb. 22, 1971	In effect under bond as of July 29, 1971. Accounting audit.
Potomac Edison Co. of West Virginia: Electric.....	1,249,847	May 28, 1971	Suspended to Oct. 25, 1971. Under bond after freeze.
Wisconsin Public Service Commission:			
Wisconsin Public Service Corp.: Electric.....	5,028,000	Nov. 3, 1970	Hearings held Dec. 16, 1970 and June 8, 9, and 10, 1971. At adjourned hearings held on June 8, 9, and 10, 1971, cross examination of the company's presentation was completed and evidence and testimony by members of the Commission staff were introduced into the record. Awaiting Commission action.
			Do.
Gas.....	1,931,000	do.	Do.
Wisconsin Electric Power Co.: Electric.....	33,598,000	Nov. 6, 1970	Hearings held Dec. 18, 1970 and May 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1971. At adjourned hearings on May 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1971, cross examination of the company's presentation was completed and evidence and testimony by members of the Commission staff were introduced into the record. Awaiting Commission action.

RATE INCREASE REQUESTS PENDING BEFORE STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS AS OF NOV. 5, 1971—Continued

Commission, name of utility, and category	Amount requested	Date filed	Status
Wisconsin Public Service Commission—Continued			
Lake Superior Dist. Power Co.: Electric.....	\$739,351	Jan. 11, 1971	Hearings held Feb. 17, 1971 and May 26 and 27, 1971. At adjourned hearings held on May 26 and 27, 1971, cross examination of the company's presentation was completed and evidence and testimony by members of the Commission staff were introduced into the record. Hearing closed.
Gas.....	44,265	do.	Do.
Wisconsin Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	5,978,000	Feb. 1, 1971	Hearings held Mar. 16, 1971 and July 27, 28, and 29, 1971. At adjourned hearing held on July 27, 28, and 29, 1971, cross examination of the company's presentation was completed and evidence and testimony by members of the Commission staff were introduced into the record. Hearing closed.
La Valle Telephone Co-op, Inc.: Telephone.....	(11)	Mar. 15, 1971	Hearings held May 10, 1971. Hearing was adjourned and staff investigation completed. Hearing closed.
Spooner Municipal Utility: Electric.....	(11)	Mar. 23, 1971	Hearing May 6, 1971. Hearing closed.
Lodi Municipal Water & Electric Utility: Electric.....	4,851	May 11, 1971	Hearing June 15, 1971. Hearing closed.
Deerfield Municipal Water & Electric Utility: Electric.....	22,314	May 14, 1971	Hearing June 23, 1971. Hearing closed.
Manitowoc Public Utility Commission: Electric.....	(11)	do.	Hearing June 28, 1971. Hearing adjourned.
Waterloo Water & Electric Commission: Electric.....	29,485	do.	Hearing July 1, 1971. Hearing closed.
Algoma Municipal Water & Electric: Electric.....	(11)	May 13, 1971	Hearing June 16, 1971. Hearing closed.
Weyauwega Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	(11)	May 19, 1971	Hearing postponed until completion of present construction program and discontinuance of multiparty service.
Hartford Municipal Water & Electric: Electric.....	32,522	May 27, 1971	Hearing July 7, 1971. Hearing closed.
Northern States Power Co.: Electric.....	1,600,000	June 14, 1971	Hearings held July 20, 1971 and Oct. 26, 27, and 28, 1971. At adjourned hearings held on Oct. 26, 27, and 28, 1971 cross-examination of the company's presentation was completed and evidence and testimony by members of the Commission staff were introduced into the record. Further hearing scheduled for Dec. 6, 1971.
Whitehall Municipal Electric Utility: Electric.....	(11)	June 19, 1971	Hearing Aug. 27, 1971. Hearing closed.
Wisconsin Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	41,341,000	July 22, 1971	Hearing held Sept. 8, 9, and 10, 1971. Application includes request for interim relief of \$10,500,000. Hearings for interim request held on Nov. 15 and 16, 1971. Staff presently engaged in investigation with respect to review of company's exhibits and records and preparation of staff exhibits and testimony if necessary.
Menasha Municipal Water & Electric Utility: Electric.....	(11)	July 23, 1971	Hearing Sept. 3, 1971 adjourned. Staff investigation in progress with respect to review of applicant's exhibits and records to result in preparation of staff exhibits and testimony if deemed necessary.
Kiel Municipal Utilities: Electric.....	33,200	Aug. 2, 1971	Hearing Sept. 16, 1971. Hearing closed.
Gleason Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	16,621	Aug. 12, 1971	Hearing Sept. 21, 1971 adjourned to time and place to be set.
Bloomer Municipal Water & Electric Utility: Electric.....	(11)	Aug. 19, 1971	Hearing Sept. 21, 1971. Hearing closed.
Stockbridge & Sherwood Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	86,600	Aug. 20, 1971	Hearing Oct. 7, 1971 adjourned. Staff investigation with respect to review of exhibits and books of the company in progress to result in preparation of staff exhibits and testimony if deemed necessary.
Valders Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	(11)	do.	Hearing scheduled for Nov. 16, 1971.
Fennimore Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	(11)	do.	Hearing scheduled for Nov. 30, 1971.
Waunakee Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	(11)	Aug. 20, 1971	Hearing Nov. 3, 1971. Adjourned.
Mount Vernon Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	124,067	do.	Hearing Oct. 29, 1971. Adjourned.
Cross Plains Electric Utility: Electric.....	(11)	Aug. 24, 1971	Hearing Sept. 30, 1971. Adjourned.
Mount Horeb Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	\$20,953	Sept. 2, 1971	Hearing held Oct. 18, 1971. Staff investigation in progress with respect to review of company's exhibits and records to result in preparation of staff testimony and exhibits if deemed necessary.
Cedarburg Light & Water Commission: Electric.....	86,814	Sept. 9, 1971	Hearing Oct. 19, 1971.
Bangor Municipal Utility: Electric.....	22,714	Sept. 20, 1971	Hearing Oct. 18, 1971.
New Holstein Public Utility: Electric.....	39,423	Oct. 8, 1971	Hearing Nov. 11, 1971.
Farmers & Merchants Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	(11)	Oct. 27, 1971	Hearing scheduled for Nov. 30, 1971.
Manawa Telephone Co.: Telephone.....	28,871	Oct. 29, 1971	Hearing scheduled for Dec. 2, 1971.
General Telephone Co. of Wisconsin: Telephone.....	14,857,000	July 22, 1971	Hearing held Oct. 12, 13, 14 1971.
Wyoming Public Service Commission:			
Mountain States Tel. & Tel. Co.: Telephone.....	4,296,000	Nov. 4, 1971	First public hearing to be held February or March.
United Telephone Co. of the West: Telephone.....	46,093	Sept. 10, 1971	Hearing set for Jan. 25, 1972.
Wyoming Industrial Gas Co.: Gas.....	18,097	Mar. 30, 1971	Additional studies required.
Northern Utilities, Inc.: Gas.....	229,538	Aug. 30, 1971	Public hearings held; now under consideration.
Mountain Fuel Supply Co.: Gas.....	1,197,000	Mar. 29, 1971	Do.
Frannie-Deaver Utilities: Gas.....	20,644	Feb. 6, 1971	Do.
Utah Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	175,346	June 4, 1971	Do.
Hot Springs County Rural Electric Association:			
Electric.....	6,867	June 2, 1971	Public notice. Now under consideration (to be allowed).
Do.....	12 (17,534)	do.	Do.
Subtotal, all states, all categories.....	3,714,189,884		
Federal Communications Commission:			
American Tel. & Tel. Co.: TELPAK.....	54,000,000	Mar. 25, 1968	Effective Sept. 1, 1968, subject to accounting order issued in docket No. 18128.
Do.....	64,000,000	Oct. 1, 1969	Effective Feb. 1, 1970, subject to accounting order issued in docket No. 18128.
Private line Teletypewriter equipment.....	13,400,000	Jan. 9, 1967	Effective Nov. 1, 1968, subject to accounting order issued in docket No. 18128.
Interstate Public Message Telephone Service.....	250,000,000	Nov. 20, 1970	Effective Jan. 26, 1971, subject to accounting order issued in docket No. 19129.
	(545,000,000 requested).	Jan. 26, 1971	Do.
Subtotal, FCC.....	381,400,000		
Boston Edison Co.: Electric.....	2,733,000	Mar. 30, 1970	Suspended; hearing in progress.
Georgia Power Co.: Electric.....	12,220,000	May 25, 1970	Do.
West Penn Power Co.: Electric.....	13,378	June 29, 1970	Suspended; hearing scheduled.
Monongahela Power Co.: Electric.....	405,644	do.	Do.
Duke Power Co.: Electric.....	5,353,980	Aug. 19, 1970	Suspended; hearing in progress.
Union Electric Co.: Electric.....	818,889	Dec. 22, 1970	Suspended; awaiting Commission decision.
Carolina Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	8,823,971	Sept. 30, 1970	Suspended; hearing in progress.
Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.: Electric.....	294,207	Nov. 9, 1970	Suspended; hearing scheduled.
Delmarva Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	896,976	Sept. 18, 1970	Suspended; hearing in progress.
Mississippi Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	819,381	Dec. 22, 1970	Suspended; hearing scheduled.
Commonwealth Edison Co.: Electric.....	454,570	Nov. 23, 1970	Do.
Union Electric Co.: Electric.....	1,299,081	Jan. 27, 1971	Suspended; awaiting Commission decision in companion case.
Missouri Power & Light Co.: Electric.....	338,453	Jan. 28, 1971	Do.
Narragansett Electric Co.: Electric.....	1,030,493	Dec. 14, 1970	Suspended; hearing scheduled.
New England Power Co.: Electric.....	16,160,897	Jan. 15, 1971	Do.
Central Telephone & Utilities Corp.: Electric.....	1,636,380	Apr. 19, 1971	\$1,400,000 rejected; \$200,000 suspended; hearing scheduled.
Southern California Edison Co.: Electric.....	3,840,126	Mar. 23, 1971	Suspended; hearing scheduled.

Footnotes at end of table.

Commission, name of utility, and category	Amount requested	Date filed	Status
Mississippi Power Co.: Electric.....	\$1,059,228	Apr. 19, 1971	Pending.
Wisconsin Public Service Corp.: Electric.....	654,848	Apr. 27, 1971	Suspended, hearing scheduled.
Metropolitan Edison Co.: Electric.....	1,317,637	Apr. 30, 1971	Do.
Upper Peninsula Power Co.: Electric.....	40,416	June 4, 1971	Do.
Public Service Co. of Indiana: Electric.....	670	June 28, 1971	Pending.
Public Service Co. of Indiana: Electric.....	4,573,114	July 9, 1971	Suspended; hearing scheduled.
Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc.: Electric.....	149,171	July 23, 1971	Pending.
Potomac Edison Co.: Electric.....	58,839	July 9, 1971	Suspended; hearing scheduled.
Cambridge Electric Light Co.: Electric.....	49,700	Aug. 19, 1971	Pending.
Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.: Electric.....	2,909,125	Nov. 1, 1971	Do.
Alabama Power Co.: Electric.....	3,367,050	do.	Do.
Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.: Electric.....	31,000	June 26, 1964	Suspended; consolidated for hearing with another proposed rate increase.
Southern Indiana Gas and Electric Co.: Electric.....	132,274	Aug. 30, 1968	Suspended; customer is not currently buying power under the suspended rate schedule.
Central Vermont Public Service Corp.: Electric.....	1,026,348	Nov. 29, 1971	Suspended; hearing scheduled.
The Detroit Edison Co.: Electric.....	1,818,290	Nov. 24, 1971	Do.
Florida Power Corp.: Electric.....	4,155,522	Nov. 12, 1971	Do.
Gulf Power Co.: Electric.....	1,096,897	Dec. 1, 1971	Do.
Interstate Power Co.: Electric.....	29,286	Dec. 15, 1971	Pending.
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.: Electric.....	157,766	Dec. 17, 1971	Do.
Sub subtotal, FPC, electric.....	79,766,707		
El Paso Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	50,268,881	Oct. 13, 1969	Before Commission for final action.
Algonquin Gas Transmission Co.: Gas.....	12,320,454	Apr. 16, 1970	Do.
Florida Gas Transmission Co.: Gas.....	1,700,000	Aug. 16, 1965	Awaiting examiner's decision on rate of return; other matters before Commission for final action.
Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	1,903,481	Sept. 1, 1970	Rate of return decided; other matters before Commission for final action.
Pacific Gas Transmission Co.: Gas.....	2,997,748	Apr. 1, 1971	Rate settlement approved by order issued January 4, 1972.
El Paso Natural Gas Co., South Div.: Gas.....	58,283,070	Sept. 30, 1970	Examiner decision issued January 11, 1972; matter awaiting filing of exceptions.
El Paso Natural Gas Co., N/W Div.: Gas.....	17,649,389		
Consolidated Gas Supply Corp.: Gas.....	30,248,118	Dec. 7, 1970	Awaiting examiner's decision on all issues.
Do.....	929,495	Nov. 16, 1971	Do.
Southern Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	20,585,375	Dec. 16, 1971	Under staff analysis.
United Gas Pipe Line Co.: Gas.....	27,225,706	Nov. 30, 1971	Hearings scheduled for June 6, 1972.
Texas Gas Transmission Corp.: Gas.....	36,095,217	Oct. 1, 1971	Hearings scheduled for April 1, 1972.
Kansas-Nebraska Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	3,573,496	Aug. 31, 1971	Hearings scheduled for March 23, 1972.
Trunkline Gas Co.: Gas.....	36,235,189	Aug. 17, 1971	Tentative settlement reached; formal agreement not yet filed.
Colorado Interstate Gas Co.: Gas.....	9,383,510	July 1, 1971	Tentative settlement reached; agreement filed January 10, 1972.
Do.....	109,650	Oct. 15, 1971	Do.
El Paso Natural Gas Co., N/W Div.: Gas.....	15,893,149	June 30, 1971	Hearings scheduled for March 6, 1972.
Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America: Gas.....	58,782,877	May 28, 1971	Tentative settlement reached; agreement filed December 20, 1971.
Northern Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	\$18,323,823	Apr. 26, 1971	Phase II hearings now in progress; Phase I, priority of service has been settled pending Commission approval.
Cities Service Gas Co.: Gas.....	17,946,398	Apr. 22, 1971	Tentative settlement reached on all but one issue; agreement filed Nov. 9, 1971.
Great Lakes Gas Transmission Co.: Gas.....	9,647,370	Apr. 16, 1971	Tentative settlement reached; agreement filed Sept. 8, 1971.
United Gas Pipe Line Co.: Gas.....	56,079,803	Nov. 13, 1970	Tentative settlement reached on all but two issues; agreement filed Nov. 22, 1971.
The Manufacturers Light and Heat Co.: Gas.....	30,687,061	Oct. 1, 1970	Company has filed for Commission approval a Settlement Stipulation and Agreement; opposition has been filed.
Home Gas Co.: Gas.....	3,899,266	Oct. 1, 1970	Do.
Cumberland and Allegheny Gas Co.: Gas.....	740,461	Oct. 1, 1970	Do.
Ohio Fuel Gas Co.: Gas.....	33,333,000	Oct. 1, 1970	Do.
Kentucky Gas Transmission Corp.: Gas.....	12,287,000	Oct. 1, 1970	Do.
Atlantic Seaboard Corp.: Gas.....	27,550,000	Oct. 1, 1970	Do.
United Fuel Gas Co.: Gas.....	63,081,000	Oct. 1, 1970	Do.
Columbia Gulf Transmission Co.: Gas.....	42,654,000	Oct. 1, 1970	Do.
Midwestern Gas Transmission Co.: Gas.....	21,792,622	Sept. 30, 1970	Hearings to be scheduled.
East Tennessee Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	7,250,123	Sept. 30, 1970	Do.
Tennessee Natural Gas Lines, Inc.: Gas.....	2,137,000	Sept. 16, 1970	Do.
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co.: Gas.....	108,396,100	Sept. 1, 1970	Commission order issued 12-23-71, postponing consideration of motion to approve settlement agreement.
Southern Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	16,293,437	June 16, 1970	Hearings scheduled for February 29, 1972. Company has filed for Commission approval of its Settlement Stipulation and Agreement.
Northern Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	2,378,650	Nov. 14, 1969	Under Staff Analysis.
The Sylvania Corp.: Gas.....	37,830,641	Aug. 15, 1969	Do.
Algonquin Gas Transmission Co.: Gas.....	2,097,281	Dec. 27, 1971	Do.
Lawrenceburg Gas Transmission Corp.: Gas.....	5,908	Dec. 20, 1971	Do.
United Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	115,242	Dec. 23, 1971	Do.
Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.: Gas.....	16,293	Dec. 22, 1971	Do.
Southern Natural Gas Co.: Gas.....	113,204	Dec. 14, 1971	Do.
Consolidated Gas Supply Corp.: Gas.....	67	Dec. 3, 1971	Do.
Southwest Gas Corp.: Gas.....	508	Dec. 3, 1971	Do.
Baca Gas Gathering System, Inc.: Gas.....	33,452	Nov. 29, 1971	Do.
Western Transmission Corp.: Gas.....	217,721	Nov. 18, 1971	Do.
Lawrenceburg Gas Transmission Corp.: Gas.....	18,258	Nov. 9, 1971	Do.
	69,930	Sept. 17, 1971	Awaiting Commission opinion.
	208,986	Oct. 7, 1971	Hearings being scheduled.
	34,357	Apr. 28, 1971	Do.
	8,289	Feb. 18, 1971	Do.
	17,339	June 23, 1970	Do.
	60,329	Mar. 25, 1970	Do.
	238,600	Aug. 26, 1969	Do.
Florida Gas Transmission Co.: Gas.....	1,614,158	Oct. 15, 1970	Awaiting Commission opinion on prior rate cases.
	6,032,054	Mar. 16, 1970	Do.
	3,349,000	Aug. 1, 1968	Do.
Subtotal, FPC, Gas.....	910,743,535		
Subtotal, FPC, electric and gas.....	990,510,252		
Grand total, all categories, State and Federal.....	5,086,100,136		

¹ Set in on interim basis Mar. 29, 1968; hearing held Oct. 27, 1971.

² Commercial and industrial rate schedule (no dollar amount).

³ Rate schedules No. 4 and 5 suspended and industrial rate of 25 cents per MCF granted (no dollar amount).

⁴ Purchased gas adjustment.

⁵ Fuel adjustment based on 1970 costs.

⁶ Filed new tariffs only.

⁷ The request and grant was limited to the increased wholesale cost of gas to the gas utility resulting from federally approved gas pipeline increases. The order of the Commission provides that Michigan Consolidated will not receive another general rate increase at least until 1973. The only exception to the moratorium would be in the event the utility's wholesale cost of gas increases. Wholesale gas rates are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. In the event the wholesale costs are later reduced and refunds are made by the suppliers, Michigan Consolidated must make corresponding refunds to its customers. Since the order the cost of

pipeline gas to Michigan Consolidated has been reduced and the Commission is about to issue a rate reduction order in the amount of \$5,300,000 and refunds to the ratepayers in the amount of approximately \$750,000.

⁸ Interim relief.

⁹ As of Feb. 1, 1972.

¹⁰ 3 cases combined of hearing purposes.

¹¹ Cases for which no amount of revenue requirement is indicated represent either small companies or instances where actual additional revenue requirements have not been indicated at the present stage of the proceeding. It is planned that in such proceedings the Commission staff will examine exhibits, working papers and underlying records to the extent deemed necessary for the purposes of providing cross examination of company witnesses or preparation of exhibits with respect to cost of service as may be necessary in the individual case.

¹² Decrease.

¹³ FPC data indicate rate increase requests as of Dec. 31, 1971.

A HISTORY OF RECOMPUTATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on a subject in which this House, the other House, and all Presidents beginning with President Eisenhower, excepting John Kennedy, have been derelict. That subject is recomputation of military retired pay; namely, basing retired pay as a percentage of active duty pay, giving increases or decreases to the retirees as those are received by active duty personnel.

I have introduced several bills since coming to the Congress in 1966, on this subject, but have never been able to obtain action, with the explanation that righting the wrong done our retired uniformed personnel, officers, enlisted, and widows would be too expensive. This during a time when we have poured uncounted billions into a war which cannot be won, and domestic programs of known questionable value. A small portion of any of these funds would have more than paid for this obligation.

For the benefit of those Members who are not totally familiar with this problem, I should like to recount this historic situation.

Retirement for officers of the uniformed services began in 1870 and for enlisted personnel in 1885. Each time active duty pay was increased or decreased so was retired pay, always in direct relation to that active duty pay.

In 1922, President Harding, like his successor 36 years later, President Eisenhower, deprived officers alone of this recomputation.

In 1926, the Congress restored recomputation saying that the 1922 act had been a violation of "the basic law under which (they had) gained their retirement rights."

In 1930, the Secretary of War conceded that imputed contributions were made by retirees, while on active duty—active duty pay rates were depressed in contemplation of retirement benefits. This has been recognized in each congressional and executive study since including the second quadrennial review of military compensation submitted to the chairmen of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee on January 25, 1972, which states in volume 1, page 3:

Regular Military Compensation is depressed by 7% to reflect on imputed contribution toward the member's retirement.

In 1933, when active duty pay was reduced, so was retired pay.

In 1948, the first serious recent study of uniformed retired pay was made, which recommended continuance of the imputed system as a convenience to the Government, rather than burden the United States with the cost of a contributory system.

In 1956, the Congress incorporated the recomputation system into title 10 United States Code so that recomputation thereafter was expressly required.

In 1958, without asking repeal of the recomputation statute, President Eisenhower attempted to deprive all retirees of any increase in retired pay. However, the Congress insisted that rights of retirees be recognized. Those on active duty were given a 6½-percent increase while retirees were given a 6-percent increase.

In 1961, this House passed recomputation legislation on which no action was taken by the other body.

In 1962, President Kennedy attempted to fulfill his promise and requested recomputation. The result of this request was, indeed, strange.

In 1963, the recomputation legislation—title 10—was repealed, and a cost-of-living increase for retirees was established, which has resulted in a staggering loss to each retiree, so that now there are 10 different scales for retirees, all of whom have the same obligation.

It is against this background which I asked this House to act on my bills, but to no avail.

While all this was taking place, in 1959, President Eisenhower was saying that recomputation "involves a sense of justice of the Government" and that the 1958 legislation was a "flaw."

In 1960, the Vice President called the situation unjust pay discrimination, unfair treatment, and an injustice.

In 1962, Vice President Humphrey noted the need to reestablish fairness and eliminate the penalties being applied to the oldest group of retirees and inequities of the present system.

In 1968, candidate Nixon promised if elected to urge Congress at the earliest possible time to pass legislation then pending and sponsored by Senator Tower, to correct the unfair discrimination against the older retirees, the intolerable and unfair burden, and injustice.

To date, no action has been taken.

We continue to penalize these retirees whose only fault was to rely upon the word of the United States that if the retirees served their time, and made their contributions, they would receive the benefits promised them. We, the Congress and the President, have in effect passed a special tax assessed against the retirees.

I am pleased that a group of my constituents, the Retired Officers Association of Contra Costa County, has taken the lead against this background of frustration by both congressional and Presidential inaction. There is now pending an action in the court of claims to establish their legal rights, so that for those people on active duty prior to 1958, the United States will keep its word.

I hope that the courts will do what many of us have promised but have not been able to accomplish.

LATF RECEIVES STRONG LATIN AMERICAN SUPPORT

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have watched carefully during the past 3 years

the development of the Latin American Teaching Fellowships—LATF—program of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. I have been pleased to serve as a member of the National Advisory Board of the LATF program, along with several of my distinguished colleagues from the Congress: Congressman MACDONALD, Congressman FASCELL, Congressman FRASER, Senator CHURCH and Senator JAVITS.

The LATF program is worthy of special note because of the dynamic expansion which it has maintained during the recent years. The program now has 60 young scholars and scientists teaching in universities in 12 Latin American countries. The program will have over 100 fellows in the field by the end of 1972. This represents a 1,000-percent increase in only 4 years.

The process and technique of LATF is nowhere better illustrated than in Venezuela. Mr. Stephen M. Johnson, director of the LATF program in Venezuela and Colombia, points out in his article "L.A. Teaching Fellowships—Reversing the Brain Drain," which appeared in the November-December issue of *Business Venezuela*, how the LATF program has developed in Venezuela. I am including Mr. Johnson's article in the *Record* since I feel certain that it will be of interest to all who are concerned with our relationships with Latin America.

I share the views of Representative DON FRASER, my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, who said:

And I believe this applies to all programs, governmental, private, and mixed—must interact with local institutions in a plan that has been defined by the local institution and which is implemented under their direction. This approach has been the hallmark of the innovative Tufts program.

More than 20 fellows will be teaching in Venezuela by the end of 1972 under the LATF program. I note with real interest that many of the LATF fellows in that country are associated with the Universidad Simon Bolivar, which is well on its way to a position of preeminence in scientific and technological studies in Latin America.

I have been very interested in the question of how the LATF program has managed to develop so rapidly. The key seems to be the active involvement of the program with local institutions, and LATF is responding to their clearly expressed needs and requirements.

In summary, here is an education program in Latin America that has demonstrated drive, innovation and imagination. LATF, particularly in Venezuela, has demonstrated a great capacity for growth. The reason is summed up in the comments of Dr. Ignacio Iribarren of the Universidad Simon Bolivar who said:

I dare say, as a Venezuelan who dedicates his efforts to education, that L.A.T.F. is making an important contribution to our country. . . .

It is my firm view that this spirit and technique should characterize all of our development efforts in Latin America—not only because it is right—but especially, because it works. The experience of LATF and of its distinguished Representative in Latin America, Mr. Steve Johnson, indicates that this is so. Mr. Johnson's article follows:

TALENT RECRUITMENT: LA TEACHING FELLOWSHIPS—REVERSING THE BRAIN DRAIN

(By Stephen M. Johnson)

(NOTE.—Mr. Stephen M. Johnson is Director of the Latin American Teaching Fellowships in Venezuela and Colombia. A graduate of Northwestern University, he received his law degree from Tulane University and was admitted to the Illinois Bar. Before coming to Caracas, he served as an L.A.T.F. Fellow in Santiago, Chile, where he developed a course on Anglo-American Public Law at the Catholic University and worked as a legal intern for the Ford Motor Company.

"It is clear that the essential cause of underdevelopment is the scarcity of qualified people for industry, government, research and other important areas." Those are the words of a prominent university educator at Universidad Simón Bolívar, a university committed to eradicating this root cause of underdevelopment through a decided orientation towards technical and scientific fields offering degrees in such fields as Computer Science, Engineering and the Physical Sciences.

University authorities acknowledge that their main difficulty has been recruiting suitably qualified teachers in these areas.

One program is meeting demand for highly skilled professors and doing so in a unique way. The program is Latin American Teaching Fellowships, administered by means of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts.

What makes it unique?

The support of the business community, in particular the multinational corporation, within Venezuela and throughout nine other Latin American countries where the program is operating.

Started some six years ago with a grant from the Ford Foundation, Latin American Teaching Fellowships undertook to send PhD candidates to Central and South America to complete dissertation research while at the same time making a solid contribution through their active participation within the classroom of Latin American universities. In this fashion, L.A.T.F. Fellows have taught courses not heretofore offered within the normal curriculum and assisted full-time professors, imparting the benefit of their training in both the substance and the methodology of their subject.

The philosophy behind the program was best described by Profesor William S. Barnes, of the Fletcher School, founder and Chairman of the National Advisory Board of L.A.T.F.:

"We didn't want to send graduate students to Latin America who would be asking a lot of questions and not making a contribution. We didn't want our Fellows to be wandering minstrels."

From the outset, private industry has played a major role in the success and growth of this effort through its financial support, both in the form of donations and by associating L.A.T.F. Fellows with their firms as "interns".

UNIQUE FEATURES

The internship component of this program is its most unique feature. Under this arrangement, L.A.T.F. Fellows, specialists in such areas as economics, business, administration, law and, more recently, the physical sciences, work on a flexible part-time basis for periods of up to three years with private enterprise while simultaneously teaching at local universities.

Originally conceived as an alternate means of financing when the Ford Foundation made a major policy decision to divert resources previously allocated to Latin American programs to urban areas within the U.S., the internship component of L.A.T.F. has demonstrated advantages not present when the program was solely academic.

First, the multinational corporation receives a direct benefit as the intern works with them directly in their own operation. The intern comes to the company with real skills and a high degree of knowledge about the culture and the language of the country. He also serves as a direct link between the company and the university where he teaches.

One top executive of an important manufacturing concern in Venezuela has summed up that link:

"The student at our local university gains the profit from the intern's U.S. education and practical application from the intern's exposure to commerce in the student's country. We feel this dual effect important to the development of our student population. It gives them another viewpoint which is frequently ignored or unavailable from other types of teachers."

Second, the Latin American university receives a first-rate teacher for the two to three-year period that the Fellow serves as an intern. Because one is a much more effective teacher the second and third year, this time factor is significant. Also, because the living stipend of the Fellow is provided by the company, the university's frequently limited resources are not further diluted.

Third, the teaching intern, because of his novel experience, gains a much greater understanding of the people in the country where he works and, upon returning to the U.S. to work or teach, brings with him his understanding and awareness.

Participating companies, in exchange for the services of an intern, commonly cover the Fellow's roundtrip transportation and reasonable baggage allowance and provide his monthly stipend which averages between \$550 and \$650, payable directly to L.A.T.F. to avoid conflict with local labor law stipulations.

One banking firm active in Latin America has acknowledged the modest cost of contracting the services of an L.A.T.F. intern: the bank frequently pays as much as \$32,000 to bring down one of its own trainees for a one year period.

The duration of the internship arrangement varies from two to three years and the firm maintains the right to cancel the association at any time.

FILL IMPORTANT GAPS

The experience of the multinational corporation in Venezuela with L.A.T.F. interns has revealed that these highly specialized people can fill important gaps in local planning, market research or legal projects.

An example is the case of a major chemical firm who put its economist intern to work devising alternate funding strategies for its bulk chemical facilities while also doing contingency planning for the company in the event Venezuela joins the Andean Common Market.

As automotive company made the decision to sponsor an L.A.T.F. lawyer on a permanent basis after its first intern became in effect the legal middleman between parent company counsel and the local firm of attorneys. The L.A.T.F. intern centralized company contracts and made possible a verification of attorney billings. Although not a Venezuelan lawyer, he was able to save the company time and money by researching basic points of law on his own. This experience led the automotive company to associate a second intern, also an attorney, with its Chilean subsidiary.

On the basis of such results, IBM asked for and received the services of an L.A.T.F. intern trained in law, bringing to four the number of Fellows associated with that company in as many Latin American countries.

A national program, Latin American Teaching Fellowships annually receives over

200 applications from top universities all over North America.

Although the majority of Fellows are U.S. citizens, that is not a pre-requisite to application. In fact, a reading of the roster reveals citizens of such countries as Germany, Switzerland, England, Mexico, Chile, Colombia, Brazil and Argentina. As a vehicle that enables and indeed encourages Latin Americans to return to their own or neighboring countries, the L.A.T.F. program is also seen as a means of reversing the so-called "brain drain".

During the current year, 34 Fellows were selected. As they join their colleagues already working and teaching in Latin America, they will bring the number of active Fellows to approximately 60 spread over 10 countries from Mexico to, quite literally, Tierra del Fuego where LATFER Eugene McCarthy has conducted seminars.

An intern with the Chilean National Oil Company for over a year and a half and a Chemistry professor at the Catholic University in Valparaíso, Chile, Gene McCarthy, whose British accent assures no relationship to the former Senator from Minnesota, is typical of the caliber of Fellow selected. A PhD in Organic Chemistry from the University of California, Berkeley, Gene has worked with two Nobel Prize Laureates: Melvin Calvin at Berkeley and Konrad Block of Harvard University while a post-doctoral research grant recipient.

ORIENTATION SESSION

Prior to departing for Latin America to assume their responsibilities, the group of selected candidates is brought to the Fletcher School for a week's orientation session. This fall the 34 Fellows and their wives joined executives from Gillette and Arthur D. Little to discuss the private sector in Latin America and the role of private foreign capital and the multinational corporation. Also on hand for a similar seminar was U.S. Congressman Donald Fraser, who serves, along with Representative H. Bradford Morse and Senator Jacob Javits, on the L.A.T.F. National Advisory Board.

From the group of selected candidates, five will be heading for Venezuela where they will be teaching at such institutions as Universidad de Oriente, Universidad Católica Andrés Bello and Universidad Simón Bolívar.

At a time when many feel it is decisive to U.S.-Latin American relations, participating U.S. business can feel the same measure of pride as the L.A.T.F. Fellows themselves to hear comments like the one recently made by a university professor and administrator:

"I dare say, as a Venezuelan who dedicates his efforts to education, that L.A.T.F. is making an important contribution to our country . . ."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

LETTER FROM AMERICAN COTTON SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, recently I submitted an article entitled, "A Knife at the Jugular," March 1, page 6403, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues.

Subsequently, I received a copy of a letter from Mr. Neal P. Gillen, vice president and general counsel of the American Cotton Shippers Association, who alleges plagiarism of material which appeared in a similar article. In order to set the record straight, a copy of a letter from Mr. Gillen to the editors of the American Cotton Grower is attached.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN COTTON SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
Memphis, Tenn., March 6, 1972.

GENTLEMEN: Plagiarism can be avoided when appropriate credit is given to the actual author of the cited material. The attached article printed in the Congressional Record by Representative William Alexander is replete with material that should have been credited to the American Cotton Shippers Association, or this writer.

For the benefit of your editorial staff, I enclose a copy of our testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Exports of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The writer testified on November 5, 1971 when the Subcommittee called hearings to ascertain the effects of the dock strike on U.S. agriculture. If you compare the attached article and testimony, you will note many similarities.

Accuracy in quotation is probably the most important single rule in both print and broadcast journalism. I would respectfully point out that the quotation attributed to the U.S. Supreme Court, "neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize public health, safety, or interest", was never uttered by that distinguished body. This language was taken from the preamble of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act. A careful reading of the attached testimony by your editors will set the record straight.

Sincerely,

NEAL P. GILLEN,
Vice President and General Counsel.

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY 1972
NATIONAL WINNER

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, we in America often take for granted that we live in a democracy. That we have the freedom to do whatever we please, within the limits of the law, is our constitutional right. Yet, how many of us stop to think what freedom and democracy really mean and how fortunate we are to have these?

Mr. Evan Spangler of Fort Shafter, Hawaii, did and he expressed his

thoughts in a very eloquent and sincere way. He expressed his thoughts through a speech entered in the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy contest in December. He was this week declared the national winner of that contest.

We of Hawaii are especially proud of Evan's achievements. He is a junior at Radford High School in Honolulu and recently became an Eagle Scout.

I am proud to share with you today, Evan Spangler's winning Voice of Democracy speech:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

By Evan Spangler

Demographers tell us that some where in this world a baby is born every three seconds—that in the United States a new American is born every seven seconds.

Consider for a moment that man, with his great capacity to create and produce, has no choice over the time, place or ancestry of his birth. That I am an American is an accident. To be born free is an accident.

But to live free is a challenge.

In the divided city of Berlin in 1945, Peter Fechter was born and by accident in the Communist-controlled sector. Seventeen years later, Peter Fechter was working as an apprentice mason on the east side of the infamous Berlin wall.

As he looked at the wall, he clearly understood the challenge to live free. One day during his lunch break, Peter made his decision.

Without a second thought, he hurdled the barbed wire barricade, dashed across the sandy strip between the wire and the wall, and clawed his way to the top.

A volley of pistol fire cut him down. East Berliners watched terrified as his body fell. For an hour he lay bleeding, screaming for help, clutching at the sand. When his youthful body became quiet and cold, the Communist soldiers carried him away.

To be born free is an accident. To live free is a challenge. To die free is an obligation.

Because I was born free, I have a responsibility to freedom. It is an inescapable responsibility that was born at Valley Forge, nurtured at New Orleans, tempered at Shiloh and Gettysburg, and tested in the Belleau Wood.

My defense of freedom is not always by the sword. I defend freedom when I exercise my responsibilities as an American citizen through constitutional processes that have prevailed for nearly two centuries.

My freedom of speech is only as strong as the free speech enjoyed by my fellow citizens. If their voices are restrained, then my voice is hushed also. Voltaire recognized this responsibility when he said, "I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

To be born free is an accident; to live free is a challenge.

I face up to this challenge when I express my views through letters to my representatives in government and through letters to the editors of newspapers. In another year, I will exercise my responsibility to freedom through the ballot box, recognizing that if I fail to vote I have weakened the legacy of my forefathers.

I must not abuse my freedom. To do so is to risk its loss. Any freedom that I enjoy at the expense of my fellow man is mockery. I strengthen my freedom when I champion the rights of others. We are a nation of laws and not a nation of men. Frederic Bastiat wrote: "Liberty does not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it is because freedom existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place. The law exists only to protect freedom."

To be born free is an accident; to live free is a challenge; and to die free is an obligation.

The defense of freedom is my obligation for history documents that once a people lost their freedom, they never regained it. I accept my obligation knowing full well the price. I abhor war and the anguish it reaps. Yet I cannot ignore the alternative for as General Omar Bradley observed: "A soldier's pack is not so heavy as a prisoner's chains."

Another American said: "If we do not defend freedom we will lose it, and if we fail, I fear we will face telling our children what it was we found more precious than freedom."

Peter Fechter understood the consequence that day when he dashed to the top of the wall.

I understand it, too. I accept my responsibility because to be born free is an accident; to live free is my challenge; and to die free is my obligation.

EFFECTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this bill which will help check skyrocketing unemployment in those communities which have the greatest need for federally assisted public works programs. Those areas which suffer most from the ravaging effects of unemployment; namely, our black communities—where unemployment rates are more than double those of the national average—are likely to be significantly assisted.

The national average of 6 percent unemployment represents a tragic waste of manpower. Manpower which, if the tremendous resources of this country were put behind an honest effort to achieve full employment, would make a vast contribution to the further human development of the United States.

In 1972, as in the past 2 years, we are faced with the specter of rising unemployment figures. More and more people want to enter the job market, only to find that there are fewer and fewer jobs available for them. They want to work, but the jobs are not there. This 6-percent figure, therefore, is wasteful and tragic.

If we turn our attention away from the national unemployment figure for a moment, and concentrate, as we must, on where the real problems of underemployment and unemployment rests, the picture is even more distressing.

We see areas containing millions of people where the unemployment figure is 12 percent. We see, in certain groups, such as men between the ages of 17 to 24 years old, 35 to 50 percent unemployment. We see minimal social services in areas whose density of population requires that social services be numerous and effective. We see a devastating lack of permanent public facilities. This bill, if enacted and signed by the President, will begin to alleviate some of these serious problems in our communities most seriously affected by unemployment.

In addition to the most important remedial aspects of this bill, I would suggest that it also draws the national attention to those areas which suffer from chronic unemployment or underemployment. It is important to remember the unforgivably bad conditions that are allowed to exist in so many of our black communities, despite the abundant wealth that America possesses. We have the capacity to develop these areas as we have developed other areas of our country and, in fact, other areas of the free world.

My own city, the city of Detroit, is illustrative of the reasons why H.R. 13300 should be supported fully by both Democrats and Republicans interested in reducing the rate of unemployment in this country.

For example, a recent national business publication, reported that while only 3.7 of the white males in metropolitan Detroit were unemployed, in the black community there was a 30-percent unemployment figure for the same age group. In late February of last year 1 out of 8 Detroiters were out of work. In the inner city, nearly 1 in 4 persons was unemployed.

Because of a dwindling tax base, Detroit, like most of our large cities, finds it increasingly difficult to maintain its social services; much less expand them to meet future needs.

H.R. 13300 would go a long way toward meeting the twin challenges of severe unemployment rates and the lack of public services in our Nation's most economically crippled communities. Last year I supported a similar bill to aid those areas of our Nation with extra high unemployment. The need has grown greater since then, and I support this bill which would raise to a more reasonable and effective level the authorization in section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I will reiterate today what I said at that time:

This bill is the kind of legislation with a national purpose, which will concentrate national energies toward economic recovery, which has proven effective in the early 1960s and which can prove itself effective again in the 1980's.

DAY CARE CENTERS—A WORTHY EXAMPLE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, child care controversies have been debated repeatedly during the past year. Many Americans are trying to grapple with the unique problem of the working woman and her children. But while many debate, others have recognized the need and shown welcome initiative.

In 1969, the Church United Women of Grinnell, Iowa, started a day care center. Operating from the basement of the

Presbyterian Church and charging only enough to meet utility costs, the center has now grown into an active, thriving communitywide effort. The center has become such a success it must move to larger quarters.

The center provides an excellent place for preschool children to learn, play, and grow. Under the guidance of an excellent professional staff, a forward-looking board of directors, and many volunteers, the day care center is continuing to grow.

Recently, Picture magazine of the Des Moines Register carried a story on this center and its achievements. The center provides a worthy example of what can, and is, being done to provide necessary child care facilities.

The magazine article follows:

HOW CIVIC EFFORT BUILT A DAY CARE CENTER (By Jim George)

The Grinnell Community Day Care Center is a gratifying success story of local civic action to meet a specific need. At this lively, bustling center, young children of Grinnell working women have an excellent opportunity to learn while their mothers earn.

"We work toward total development of the child—intellectually, emotionally, physically, psychologically and socially," explains Mrs. Charles Sells, the director. Unlike ordinary babysitting, the non-profit Grinnell agency conducts an on-going program in which youngsters can learn how to get along with each other, learn about the world and learn how to do things for themselves. This is accomplished through a combination of play and educational experiences.

Church Women United of Grinnell started the Day Care Center ball rolling, and the project then developed into a communitywide effort. The Center opened in September, 1969, as a incorporated organization licensed by the State Department of Social Services. It is in the basement of the Presbyterian Church, which charges only enough rent to cover utilities. Larger quarters are now being sought.

APPRECIATIVE GRANDMOTHER SENT A \$2 CONTRIBUTION

After a slow start the Center is a busy place now from 6:45 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Twenty-five youngsters are enrolled, some part-time; about 70 children have participated since the agency opened and there is a waiting list now. Any child between the ages of 3 and 6 is eligible to attend. Low-income families have an equal opportunity, as rates range from \$1 to \$4.50 a day, based on a confidential statement of the family income and the number of persons in the family.

Children at the Center follow a loosely structured day. Mornings include breakfast, free play, group activities, occasional field trips, outdoor play when weather permits, snack time and additional free play. A hot noon meal is served and quiet play precedes stories and nap time. Most of the tots sleep about two hours, then it's snack time and additional play.

Grinnell's Day Care Center operates on an annual budget of about \$12,000, fees being the major source of income. Other financial support comes from the United Fund and donations by civic clubs, businesses, and individuals such as the man who gave a check to cover the first year's rent and an appreciative grandmother who sent \$2. Many organizations, including youth groups and the retired people at Mayflower Home, have given equipment and materials.

ONE ADULT ON HAND FOR EACH FIVE CHILDREN

On the regular staff are Mrs. Charles Sells, director; Mrs. Dennis Haas, head teacher,

Mrs. Ted Mueller, teacher, and Miss Mary Ellen Brock and Philip Mears (a 1971 Grinnell College graduate), assistants. All have B.A. or M.A. degrees. Other members are Mrs. Leonard Thon, cook; Mrs. Mary Adkins, an assistant affectionately known as "grandma"; and Ellen McDonald, high school student who is a Neighborhood Youth Corps worker.

About 30 volunteers—half Grinnell College students and half housewives—round out the crew needed to maintain the Center's ratio of one adult to five children. Most of the volunteers work one three-hour shift a week.

The Day-Care Center is administered by a board of directors representing a cross-section of the community. The directors are Mrs. Don Renaud, president; John Annin, vice-president; Mrs. Eunice Moberly, secretary; Roger Roland, treasurer; Father Michael Tan Creti, finance chairman; Avis Tone, Dr. Sara Ann Brown, Mrs. Don Larsen, James North, Mrs. Imogene Knowles, Dr. L. E. Phipps, Mrs. Ruth Campbell, Rick Bierman and Mrs. William Deminoff.

ABORTION AND MATERNAL HEALTH

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, abortion is so often tossed off as "so simple," "relatively painless" and "foolproof," but startling statistics to the contrary have been exposed recently. The mortality rate is almost 100 percent for the child involved.

Not only are there often physical and psychological complications for the mother after an abortion, but the actual maternal mortality rate after abortion is shockingly high.

In the third of a series on abortion written for the North Carolina News Service, Mary Kay Williams considers the question of abortion and its relationship to maternal health, and I insert the article into the RECORD.

The article follows:

III. ABORTION AND MATERNAL HEALTH (By Mary Kay Williams)

The picture that forms when a person mentions "back-street abortionists" is a chilling one. Immediately one thinks of the fear and the humiliation the woman may feel in seeking an illegal abortion. One cannot be cold to her situation. She is a woman in a critical period facing a society which, in the past, was largely unsympathetic and smugly self-righteous.

And so, when one hears the argument that abortion-on-demand will put an end to illegal abortionists and to maternal health hazards rising from them, the argument may seem on the surface highly convincing.

We look, first of all, to what has been the pattern in countries which have relaxed their abortion laws. Several doctors at the Mayo Clinic did research on this subject and their findings were startling. Their data from Japan, Britain, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Poland, the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic concluded that not one of these countries has seen a decrease in the criminal abortion rate as a result of liberal abortion laws.

